

The Week That Was 2010-04-10 (April 10, 2010) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####

The Heartland Institute's Fourth International Conference on Climate Change will be held in Chicago, Illinois on May 16-18, 2010 at the Chicago Marriott Magnificent Mile Hotel, 540 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. It will call attention to new scientific research on the causes and consequences of climate change, and to economic analyses of the cost and effectiveness of proposals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To register, click [here](#).

#####

Donations: We have been asked if we accept donations – we assure you most willingly! Please make your check out to SEPP and mail to 1600 S Eads St., # 712-S, Arlington, VA 22202

#####

Quote of the Week

"One of the surprising privileges of intellectuals is that they are free to be scandalously asinine without harming their reputation." Eric Hoffer as quoted by Thomas Sowell in his book, "Intellectuals and Society,"

THIS WEEK:

Last week's TWTW contained Fred Singer's science editorial on the report from the UK House of Commons Select Committee investigating ClimateGate. Fred termed the report a "whitewash." Fred's editorial was also carried on "Watts Up With That" blog by Anthony Watts. Richard S. Courtney, who generally agrees with Fred's views, took exception to the term "whitewash" and posted comments on the blog. In a paper published by SPPI, Richard Courtney more fully develops his views.

If we understand his comments correctly, the Committee had no choice but to conclude its investigation as it did. The methodology used by the Committee was the type used by a court of law with the rules of evidence used by courts. These rules of evidence include weighing the credibility of opinions expressed. Greater credibility may be given to those in positions of authority than those who are not in such positions of authority.

Of course, this is contrary to the rules of evidence in physical science whereby credibility comes from the rigors of observations of the physical world. Authority be hanged.

If the above interpretation is correct, then those litigating against the EPA must recognize this difference. Fortunately, in ruling that carbon dioxide is a pollutant, the Supreme Court called for a scientific determination that carbon dioxide endangers human health and welfare, not a legal one.

A robust discussion on this issue may be appropriate.

This week two well known skeptics of the claim humans are the major cause of global warming released separate findings that many alarmists will no doubt declare supports human-caused global warming. On his web site, Roy Spencer reported that March 2010 temperatures measured by satellites were well above the 32-year average. This continues the atmospheric warming trend that started in the fall. William Gray, the founder of modern hurricane forecasting, with his colleague Philip J. Klotzbach released their predictions of a stronger than normal hurricane season in 2010. [For Spencer see <http://www.drroyspencer.com/latest-global-temperatures/> for the hurricane report see below.]

Alarmists will immediately seize upon both reports as supporting their cause which they do not. As both these researchers, and others, explain, such changes are likely natural, internal to the earth's climate

system, and not due to human influences. By promptly publishing their findings, Spencer, Klotzbach and Gray exhibit the integrity of reporting scientific results so essential for the advancement of science.

In other news, it appears that the alternative-energy edicts passed by California when unemployment was less than 5% and government coffers were full may be too expensive now that unemployment is 12.5% and government coffers are empty. Of course, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) continues to advocate “green jobs.” Affordable, reliable electricity greatly contributed to prosperity and welfare of this country. Yet many government officials continue to insist that more expensive, unreliable electricity is the key to future prosperity.

It appears that other countries such as Australia and New Zealand are also questioning the wisdom of imposing cap-and-trade or similar measures. Yet the UN alarmists continue to meet in planning for the next big offensive.

Casting aside any scientific or legal restraint, US EPA continues its march to control the US economy, more to follow in the next TWTW.

IPCC Latest Assessment Report (AR4): As discussed in the past few TWTWs, the IPCC claimed that it was less than 10% probable that the recent warming was caused by natural changes and less than 5% probable the warming was caused by changes internal to the earth’s climate system. Calculations from the IPCC report show the IPCC models project increases in greenhouse gases are about 25 times more powerful in causing warming than all natural causes. [Please note that the analysis ignored aerosols which are poorly understood.]

As expressed in last week’s TWTW, greenhouse gases cannot begin to explain the extensive warm period known as the Holocene Climate Optimum about 5000 to 8000 years ago when it was about 2-3 degrees C warmer than today.

In the Paleoclimate section of AR4, IPCC admits the Holocene Climate Optimum existed but declares it was not global. According to the IPCC the Holocene Climate Optimum did not exist in the tropical Pacific and Indian Oceans – their models show a prolonged cooling in this area.

Here the logic becomes breathtaking. The El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) influences the temperatures of the tropical Pacific and Indian Oceans. During the Holocene Climate Optimum, ENSO was less pronounced than today, and was largely in the cool La Niña phase. There is some evidence that when, say Europe, is warm, the ENSO is in a cool La Niña phase and the reverse. Therefore, the logic goes, during the Holocene Climate Optimum when the northern part of the Northern Hemisphere was very warm, the tropical Pacific and Indian Oceans were about 0.5 to 2 degrees C colder than today because ENSO was in the cool La Niña phase. Thus, according to the IPCC, the warming was not global and should be discounted.

Needless to say, the physical evidence presented by the IPCC is less than compelling – scanty at best. But the logic is staggering for two reasons. One, the IPCC rejects the hypothesis that a warm El Niño phase of the ENSO (that may be associated with the Pacific Decadal Oscillation) could be a cause of the recent warming. And, two, satellite measurements demonstrate the recent warming is not uniformly global but mainly concentrated in the upper latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere.

Logic and physical evidence challenge the IPCC models and its conclusions.

[Recent studies, including one by McLean, de Freitas, and Carter “Influence of the Southern Oscillation on tropospheric temperature,” show a strong correlation between ENSO and tropospheric temperature with a 7 month lag. Of course, correlation is not causation.]

Please Note: Mark Gillar has begun a new radio show featuring well known skeptics. Those who wish to ask the guest questions can do so over the call lines. Today’s guest is Joanne Nova from Australia. Prior guests included Lord Monckton and Patrick Michaels. For more information please visit:

<http://www.globalcoolingradio.com>

SCIENCE EDITORIAL #11-2010 (April 10, 2010)

By S. Fred Singer, President, Science and Environmental Policy Project

Holes in Climate Science

A recent News Feature in 2010 *Nature* [pp 284-287] discusses what it calls “The Real Holes in Climate Science.” The problem is that it misses the “real holes” and therefore echoes the IPCC mantra that warming in the last thirty years is anthropogenic.

The author, Quirin Schiermeier, bases his views on the ‘RealClimate’ blog and some of its authors. Needless to say, he has not talked to any climate skeptics. To give a better view of his bias: In his opinion, the leaked CRU emails do not challenge the “scientific consensus” on climate change but only show “rude behavior and verbal faux pas.” The holes he identifies are the conventional ones:

- Regional climate prediction – although this does not stop alarmists from attempting to publish such predictions that promote catastrophic futures
- Precipitation – everyone would agree that this is a “real hole” in climate science -- difficult to fill until we understand better the formation of clouds
- Aerosols – even the IPCC admits there are huge errors when assessing particles such as sulfates, black carbon, sea salt and dust, all of which have different optical properties and can also produce indirect effects on clouds
- The tree ring controversy: QS brings back the hockeystick and blithely ignores the fact that it has been thoroughly discredited. He still insists that the 20th century is unusual in terms of temperature rise. He asserts that the emails that mention “hide the decline” and “Mike’s *Nature* trick” merely refer to the divergence issue between tree ring data and instrument data. He says that “many scientists are tired of the criticisms” – perhaps because they have run out of excuses.

He finally quotes Susan Solomon, the former co-chair of the IPCC 2007 Science Team, as claiming that “multiple lines of evidence support AGW” – without listing any.

QS tries to dispose of what he calls “Enduring climate myths [by skeptics]” – which all happen to be facts:

- Climate models cannot provide useful information about the real world
- Global warming stopped ten years ago
- Temperatures were higher in pre-industrial times
- Temperature records taken in the lower atmosphere indicate that the globe is not warming
- A few degrees of warming are not a big deal
- Measured increases in temperature reflect the growth of cities around weather stations rather than global warming

But the real holes in climate science are these facts, never mentioned by QS or by the IPCC:

- The absence of ‘fingerprint’ data that would indicate a substantial warming from CO2

- The absence of data for positive feedbacks that might amplify the effects of greenhouse gases like CO₂
- The empirical evidence that shows the control of climate fluctuations on a decadal scale by solar activity by way of cosmic rays.

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

1. Richard Courtney’s Comments on Fred Singer’s Science Editorial about the House of Commons “whitewash.”

[Carried in last week’s TWTW and “Watts Up With That.”]

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/03/singer-on-climategate-parliamentary-inquiry/#more-18147>

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/03/singer-on-climategate-parliamentary-inquiry/#comments>

2. Another California Dream: A La La Land climate law ignores economic reality

WSJ Editorial, Apr 5, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304370304575152051848500916.html>

3. Climate change is simply natural and disaster isn’t imminent

By Richard Lindzen, Modesto Bee, Apr 4, 2010

http://www.modbee.com/2010/04/04/1114073_p2/climate-change-is-simply-natural.html

4. Global warming’s unscientific method: Science is undermined by scaremongers’ abuse of peer-review process

Editorial: Washington Times, Apr 7, 2010, [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/07/global-warmings-unscientific-method/>

5 Unwarranted trust

From Professor David Henderson, London Financial Times, Apr 7, 2010, From SPPI blog, [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://sppiblog.org/news/unwarranted-trust>

6. Earth is never in equilibrium

By Richard Lindzen, Janesville WI Gazette Extra, Apr 8, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://gazettextra.com/news/2010/apr/08/con-earth-never-equilibrium/>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Weathering Change

Warming after a cold winter will disappear quickly as it did in 2007

By Joseph D’Aleo, ICECAP, Apr 6, 2010

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

[SEPP Comment: This article has extensive graphs that cannot be easily sent by email. Please refer to the web site given.]

[Excerpt]

“The pop in global temperatures, even the satellite lower troposphere, the last few months seems surprising to some in the Northern Hemisphere where the winter was hard. In Russia, it may have been the coldest on record, while across northern China, Europe and the southern and central United States, it was the coldest since the late 1970s or even the early 1960s. It was not unexpected. In the late fall, we showed the following upper level anomaly pattern was likely for the winter given the low solar, El Nino and developing east Quasi-Biennial Oscillation or QBO (shown in research by our own Climate Prediction Center to modulate solar and El Nino Southern Oscillation or ENSO.”

Extended Range Forecast of Atlantic Seasonal hurricane Activity and Landfall Strike Probability for 2010

By Philip J. Klotzbach and William M. Gray, Tropical Meteorology Project, Colorado State University, Apr 7, 2010

<http://hurricane.atmos.colostate.edu/Forecasts/>

Arctic ice recovers from the great melt

By Jonathan Leake, The Sunday Times, Apr 4, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7086746.ece>

[SEPP Comment: Will polar bears be removed from the list of threatened species – or perhaps they now will be threatened by the growth in Arctic ice?]

California Dreaming and Other Lands

California's Green Jobs Mirage

By Senator Bob Dutton, GWPF, Apr 1, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/opinion-pros-a-cons/749-californiaas-green-jobs-mirage.html>

L.A. Spars Over Green Energy: City Balks as Utility Demands Big Rate Increase to Fund Move Away From Coal

By Rebecca Smith, WSJ, Apr 5, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052702303450704575160092725253492.html#mod=todays_us_page_one

Calif. climate law under assault in poor economy

By Samantha Young, Associated Press, Apr 4, 2010

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100404/ap_on_bi_ge/us_calif_climate_law_backlash

Power Play

By Gary Jason, Liberty Magazine, Apr 2010 From NCPA

http://www.ncpa.org/sub/dpd/index.php?Article_ID=19203

America Headed To CO2 Prison [Maine]

By Jay Dwight, Energy Tribune, Mar 16, 2010 [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

<http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm?aid=3520>

Cap-and-Trade Or Emissions Trading Elsewhere

Calls to delay ETS get cool response

By James Weir, Business Day, NZ, Apr 9, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/business/3563347/Calls-to-delay-ETS-get-cool-response>

Carbon trading on backburner

By Simon Kearney, The Sunday Mail, AU, Apr 4, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.couriermail.com.au/news/carbon-trading-on-backburner/story-e6freon6-1225849223899>

Climate Change Act Will Cost Britain Hundreds of Billions,

By Christopher Booker, The Sunday Telegraph, Apr 3, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/news/760-climate-change-act-will-cost-britain-hundreds-of-billions.html>

Problems with the Orthodoxy

Atmospheric Aerosols: Another Major IPCC Omissions

By Tim Ball, Canada Free Press, Apr 5, 2010

<http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/21674>

France to hold official debate on climate change

By Lawrence Solomon, Financial Post, Apr 3, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://network.nationalpost.com/NP/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2010/04/03/lawrence-solomon-france-to-hold-official-debate-on-climate-change.aspx>

Hiding NASA Decline

IBD Editorials, Apr 1, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=529211>

How Amazongate blighted the rainforest harvest for WWF

By Christopher Booker Telegraph, UK, Apr 3, 2010

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7550292/How-Amazongate-blighted-the-rainforest-harvest-for-WWF.html>

[SEPP Comment: President Obama's science advisor, John Holdren, is a former director of the Woods Hole Research Center. Some may find his power point presentation of interest which is still posted with the center.]

It Is Time To Rethink Public Policy On Climate Change

By Stephen Murgatroyd, Troy Media, Apr 3, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.troymedia.com/?p=9566>

When the Germans give up on AGW you really do know it's all over

By James Delingpole, Telegraph, UK, Apr 1, 2010

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100032460/when-the-germans-give-up-on-agw-you-really-do-know-its-all-over/>

The Orthodoxy Continues

Bonn or bust – The UN's last, desperate bid for unelected world government

By the Viscount Monckton of Brenchley in Bonn, SPPI, Apr 9, 2010

<http://sppiblog.org/news/bonn-or-bust-the-uns-last-desperate-bid-for-unelected-world-government>

UN climate talks to resume amid fear of more divisions

By Richard Black, BBC News, Apr 8, 2010

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/8610316.stm>

How Congress can get a smart climate-change bill passed

Washington Post Editorial, Apr 5, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/04/AR2010040402706.html?nav=hcmoduletmv>

Science, Climate Change and Integrity

By Keith Hunter, Royal Society of New Zealand, Apr 7, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/SC1004/S00006.htm>

“My personal prediction is that if they [the alarmists] are right, those who promote doubt and dissension, and thus inaction, will be vilified for their influence. If they [the alarmists] are wrong, nobody will care much because the efforts made to mitigate the now-perceived problems will lead to a better world in any event.”

[SEPP Comment: The author is invoking the Precautionary Principle in the manner used by climate alarmists. He then argues it is prudent to damage the economy and yield to greater government control of personal lives and liberties because it will create a better world.]

Errors in Royal Society of NZ climate change paper

By Ian Wishart, Scoop Sci-Tech, Apr 8, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/SC1004/S00008.htm>

Scientists' use of computer models to predict climate change is under attack

By David Fahrenhold, Washington Post, Apr 6, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/05/AR2010040503722_pf.html

“If policymakers don't heed the models, "you're throwing away information. And if you throw away information, then you know less about the future than we actually do," said [Gavin Schmidt](#), a climate scientist at NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies.”

[SEPP Comment: If the models are wrong, then policy is based on them is not only based on ignorance of the future, but, worse, false belief of the future. During the housing mania, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston used a model to show that housing prices in the US would never fall.]

Former VP Gore to Receive Honorary Doctorate from UT Knoxville?

Former VP Gore to Receive Honorary Doctorate from UT Knoxville

Press Release UT Knoxville, Feb 26, 2010 [H/t Brad Veek]

<http://www.utk.edu/tntoday/2010/02/26/gore-honorary-doctorate/>

Doctor of Lies

Investors Business Daily, Mar 15, 2010

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

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

Issues on Nuclear Power

Atomic Dreams (Nuclear power not ready for prime U.S. time)

By Jerry Taylor, Master Resource, Apr 9, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/04/atomic-dreams/#more-8698>

Nuclear Energy Facts Report – April 2010

By Theodore Rockwell, April 2010

<http://learningaboutenergy.com>

New York Denies Indian Point a Water Permit

By David Halbfinger, NYT, Apr 3, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/04/nyregion/04indian.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: Another example of using the Federal Clean Water Act to deny permits to nuclear.]

Alternative Issues

Case Study on Methods of Industrial-scale Wind Power Analysis (Part I & II)

By Kent Hawkins, Master Resource, Apr 6, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/04/case-study-on-methods-of-industrial-scale-wind-power-analysis-part-i/#more-8609>

GE Leads U.S. Wind Market But Faces more Competition

By Paul Glader, WSJ, Apr 8, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303720604575170500339244626.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

Solar Power Demand Fades

By Pui-Wing Tam, WSJ, Apr 8, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304871704575160562778909180.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

Explosive Silicon Gas Casts Shadow on Solar Power Industry: Silane gas has killed and injured workers at cell-making plants. Can the photovoltaic industry live without it?

By David Biello, Scientific American, Apr 2, 2010 [H/t Randy Randol]

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=explosive-gas-silane-used-to-make-photovoltaics>

Stop ‘Big Corn’

Editorial, Washington Times, Apr 2, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/02/stop-big-corn/print/>

US EPA

Backdoor Energy Tax

IBD Editorial, Apr 5, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=529345>

EPA’s ginormous power grab: Congress should block agency’s effort to regulate climate policy

By Iain Murry, Washington Times, Apr 8, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/08/epas-ginormous-power-grab/>

Regulating CO2 Emissions for Local Air Quality; Another EPA Bad Idea

By Chip Knappenberger, Master Resource, Apr 5, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/04/regulating-local-co2-emissions/>

More on President Obama’s Drilling Announcement

Drilling for truth and action in Obama’s latest proposal

By George Allen, The Daily Caller, Apr 1, 2010 [H/t Randy Randol]

<http://dailycaller.com/2010/04/01/drilling-for-truth-and-action-in-obamas-latest-proposal/>

Empty rhetoric, empty gas tanks: Obama’s energy policy is just for show

By Dave Harbour, Washington Times, Apr 5, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/05/empty-rhetoric-empty-gas-tanks/>

Obama Misses the Big Oil

By Michael Lynch, NYT, Apr 4, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/05/opinion/05lynch.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: A frank assessment in the New York Times.]

Miscellaneous Topics

A Complete List Of Bad Things Attributed To Global Warming

IBD Editorials, Apr 5, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=529363>

<http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/warmlist.htm>

[SEPP Comment: John Brignell has been compiling this staggering list for years demonstrating his dedication to maintaining rigorous standards in science. Thankfully, at least one US newspaper recognizes it.]

How Much Risk is Too Much

By Robert T. Smith, American Thinker, Apr 10, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/04/how_much_risk_is_too_much.html

[SEPP Comment: Article on how the precautionary principle is being misused with too much emphasis on precaution and not enough emphasis on realistic benefits from the opposite.]

Scientists Discover Heavy New Element

By James Glanz, NYT, Apr 6, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/07/science/07element.html>

Climate-change research in Canada waning: scientists

By Ian Munroe, CTV.CA, Apr 3, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/20100401/climate_funding_100403/20100403?hub=TopStoriesV2

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

The alarmist blog Real Climate.org, criticized the eight part special in Der Spiegel, mentioned in last week's TWTW, which highlighted some of the failings of global warming orthodoxy. Real Climate ignored the substantive issues and claimed the series largely an attack on the scientists such as Phil Jones, former head of the Climatic Research Unit.

<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2010/04/climate-scientist-bashing/>

Below is an amusing comment by Jo Abbess, Comment # 5

I would like to propose that we form a "Phil Jones Devotional Circle", and put a nice logo on our personal and organisational websites, linking through to a page here at RealClimate (or elsewhere) that extols the virtues of said Phil Jones, and catalogues his many great achievements.

That, at least, could warm Phil Jones' heart, in letting him know how much we value and support him. If those suffering from septicaemia choose another target, we should have a "We Love..." page for them as well. I think it's about time we had a page explaining just how much we venerate and adore Michael Mann, for example. And James Hansen. And Malte Meinshausen. And Tom Wigley... There's such a long list...

Over Easter, I was reflecting on the work of J. S. Bach in his Johannespassion, based on Chapters 18 and 19 of the Gospel of John. So many parallels to the campaign to denigrate, humiliate and crucify Phil Jones...including that immortal, mocking question "What is truth ?"...

We could perhaps entitle our Phil Jones page “Der Jonespassion” ? Or “Stations of the Climate” or somesuch ? Or is that going a tad too far ?

Coming to a beach near you? The highly venomous purple jellyfish swarming into British waters

By David Derbyshire, Daily Mail, Apr 7, 2010

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1264147/Venomous-purple-jellyfish-swarming-Britain-warn-experts.html>

Flat-headed cat, the world’s least known feline, is now endangered

By Byran Nelson, Mother Nature Network, Mar 23, 2010 [H/t Froncois Guillaumat]

<http://www.mnn.com/earth-matters/wilderness-resources/stories/flat-headed-cat-the-worlds-least-known-feline-is-now-enda#>

How Will Climate Change Impact Bread?

By David Biello, Scientific American, Apr 4, 2010

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode.cfm?id=how-will-climate-change-impact-brea-10-04-04>

What’s the Next ‘Global Warming’? – Herewith I propose a contest to invent the next panic.

By Bret Stephen, WSJ, Apr 6, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304017404575165573845958914.html>

IER Teams Up with AWEA, Sierra Club to Take Mother Earth to Court

Institute for Energy Research, Apr 1, 2010, [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

<http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2010/04/01/ier-teams-up-with-awea-sierra-club-to-take-mother-earth-to-court/>

[SEPP Comment: It is good to conclude with a little levity.]

#####

1. Richard Courtney’s Comments on Fred Singer’s Science Editorial about the House of Commons “whitewash.”

[Carried in last week’s TWTW and “Watts Up With That.”]

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/03/singer-on-climategate-parliamentary-inquiry/#more-18147>

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/03/singer-on-climategate-parliamentary-inquiry/#comments>

Friends:

I consider it a privilege that I count Fred as being one of my friends. I have known him for many years. He is a gentleman and a great scientist with several astonishing achievements.

I have always agreed with him until now, but I disagree with him on this issue. He rightly says:

“None of the investigations have gone into any detail on how the data might have been manipulated. But this is really the most important task for any investigation, since it deals directly with the central issue: Is there an appreciable human influence on climate change in the past decades?”

But he does not address why the investigations have so dismally failed in this manner.

I explain my understanding of the problem at

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

And I say there:

“These comments conclude that there was no ‘whitewash’ but that both the completed investigations used the same flawed method to assess the affair, and this method inevitably provides findings that seem to exonerate the Team. The used method was to adopt a legal definition of ‘evidence’, and this has resulted in the enquiries saying those under suspicion are exonerated because the suspected persons said they had done nothing wrong.

Hence, the two completed enquiries have resulted in greater suspicion of the involved scientists by providing an impression of a whitewash.

Importantly, neither of the completed enquiries provides a proper assessment of the fact that the released emails indicate that the ‘Team’

- (i) Usurped the peer review process by conspiring to review (and approve) the papers of each other,
- (ii) Usurped the peer review process by concerted effort to use the peer review process to prevent publication of papers which did not support their agenda,
- (iii) Attacked journals that published papers which did not support their agenda,
- (iv) Attempted to remove a journal Editor who would not reject all papers that did not support their view (soon after he did leave the job),
- (v) Wrote to the University that employed another journal’s Editor in an attempt to discredit her because she refused to reject for publication a paper which did not support their view,
- (vi) Attempted to redefine peer review as a method to excuse refusal to mention a paper in the most recent IPCC Report (it was not mentioned in the Report but several not-reviewed papers were),
- (vii) Misrepresented scientific findings (e.g. of paleoclimate data obtained from tree-ring studies) when publishing results of scientific studies.

These points seem to be clearly and unambiguously spelled-out in their own words by the ‘Team’ in the released emails.

So, any enquiry must provide a specific explanation of each of these points if it is to be generally accepted. The PSU and UK Parliamentary Select Committee Enquiries failed to provide specific explanations of each of these points any one of which would be damning of the Team if it were true.

Suspensions will remain concerning members of the Team and their actions until a different form of enquiry is completed. Hence, whatever the ‘truth’ of the Climategate affair, such a different form of enquiry is needed if that ‘truth’ is to be divined and is to be generally accepted. That different form of enquiry needs to assess the information in the emails and the computer code by using a scientific definition – not a legal definition – of ‘evidence’.

It is to be hoped that the investigations of Climategate that are now being conducted will be such a different form of enquiry. Failure to conduct such a different form of enquiry would result in continued suspicion of the affected climate scientists and could damage the reputation of science as a whole.”

Anyway, that essay explains what I think about the matter.

Richard

2. Another California Dream: A La La Land climate law ignores economic reality

WSJ Editorial, Apr 5, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304370304575152051848500916.html>

California originates many ideas that roll across the country, for better or, lately, for worse. Now it has a global-warming law with no real name, just this: AB32. Last month, the California Air Resource Board (CARB) proclaimed in a report that AB32 would grow 10,000 jobs. This was widely cheered as good news. That's true only if you also repeal basic market economics and the state's current business indicators.

AB32 creates a statewide cap-and-trade program and imposes numerous command-and-control mandates that CARB calls "complementary measures" on businesses, such as low-carbon fuel standards and a goal of achieving 33% energy from renewable sources by 2020. Companies say compliance costs will force them to cut jobs and raise prices.

To meet renewable energy goals, the Southern California Public Power Authority has warned of a 30% rate hike. L.A.'s Department of Water and Power has told businesses to expect a 21% hike this year, though the city council recently nixed a three-month 5.7% rate increase. Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa inveighed to the L.A. Times that the city council must raise rates because "the state is breathing down our necks . . . where we could be looking at fines of \$300 million [in 2012] and \$600 million on top of that." CARB's report pays lip service to these early red flags and claims the law will neither hurt taxpayers nor the economy. Of course not.

Their reasoning? Forcing businesses to comply with the complementary measures will make businesses more energy efficient, and this in turn will save businesses money on emissions allowances under cap and trade. CARB is essentially saying that forcing businesses to comply with one set of regulations will reduce the costs of having to comply with other, more onerous regulations. The good news is, you're not dead.

CARB's report concludes that if the "complementary measures" aren't carried out, household income per capita will fall by 0.6% (with residential electric and gas prices increasing by 13% and 49%, respectively). But successful implementation would increase income by 0.1%.

A study by the Charles River Associates, performed at CARB's invitation, reached the opposite conclusion. The Charles River analysts say the complementary measures would *reduce* income by 0.9% or \$414 per year. Using a variety of scenarios, Charles River calculated the program would cost between \$28 billion and \$97 billion over the next decade.

Though the two studies relied largely on the same assumptions and data, they differed in one major respect. The CARB report says market failures "have prevented the penetration of energy-efficient devices among some customers," though remarkably they "assume that this efficiency potential exists without being specific as to what market failures are being corrected by the policy intervention." That is, CARB assumes market failures exist, but it won't specify them or how its policies will correct them.

This assumption that businesses are behaving irrationally when they fail to invest in energy-efficient technologies undergirds their conclusion that forcing businesses to adopt green technologies will reduce costs.

But if these technologies were really going to save businesses money, why would they be so reluctant to adopt them? The Economic Impacts Subcommittee of the Economic and Allocation Advisory Committee that was appointed by CARB Chairman Mary Nichols and charged with reviewing the report concludes that "many of the technologies that would be adopted under AB32 are either yet to be developed or currently prohibitively expensive." So how does CARB manage to make cost predictions about technologies that don't even exist? With a lot of uncertainty.

The Economics Impact Subcommittee notes that the report is full of "uncertainties relating to the supply costs of alternative fuels and the costs of energy-efficient improvements" and "behavioral responses to energy price changes" as well as "assumptions about 'technology cost curves.'" Is there anything in the CARB report that *isn't* uncertain?

Perhaps most uncertain of all is the projected 10,000 new green jobs, which presumably will be spurred by increased demand for renewable energy and green technology. But while CARB indicates the state will lose jobs in mining, utilities, construction, manufacturing, trade and transportation due to cost increases, it underestimates these job losses by failing to take into account businesses leaving for other states or countries.

The Economics Impact Subcommittee notes "there is reason to believe [the economic impacts of leakage] might be quite substantial" since "many of the measures and sectors from which large [greenhouse gas] reductions are drawn in the study are also the ones most vulnerable to leakage and/or reshuffling." These job losses are more than likely to eclipse the paltry 10,000 new green jobs the report forecasts.

While almost all of AB32's benefits are speculative and uncertain, its costs are hitting businesses and residents now. This is one more blow to jobs and growth that California doesn't need.

3. Climate change is simply natural and disaster isn't imminent

By Richard Lindzen, Modesto Bee, Apr 4, 2010

http://www.modbee.com/2010/04/04/1114073_p2/climate-change-is-simply-natural.html

The IPCC's claim that most of the warming since the 1950s is because of man assumed that current models adequately accounted for natural internal variability. The failure of these models to anticipate that there has been no statistically significant warming for the past 14 years or so contradicts this assumption.

However, the modelers chose not to stress this. Rather, they suggested that the models could be further corrected, and that warming would resume by 2009, 2013, or even 2030.

Global warming enthusiasts have responded to the recent absence of warming by arguing that the past decade has been the warmest on record. We are still speaking of tenths of a degree, and the records have come into question. But since we are, according to these records, in a relatively warm period, it is not surprising the past decade was the warmest on record.

Given that the evidence suggests that anthropogenic warming has been greatly exaggerated, so is the basis for alarm. But this basis would be weak even if anthropogenic global warming were significant. Polar bears, arctic summer sea ice, regional droughts and floods, coral bleaching, hurricanes, alpine glaciers, malaria, etc., all depend not on GATA, but on a regional variables including temperature, humidity, cloud cover, precipitation, direction and magnitude of wind, and the state of the ocean.

This is not to say disasters will not occur as they always have. Fighting global warming with symbolic gestures certainly will not change this. However, history tells us that greater wealth and development can profoundly increase our resilience.

One may ask why there has been the astounding upsurge in alarmism in the past four years. When an issue such as global warming is around for more than 20 years, agendas are developed to exploit it. The interests of the environmental movement in acquiring power, influence and donations are reasonably clear.

So, too, are the interests of bureaucrats who seek control of carbon dioxide. After all, carbon dioxide is a product of breathing itself. Politicians see the possibility of taxation that will be happily accepted to save the earth. Nations see exploiting the issue to gain competitive advantages. So do private firms.

Take the case of Texas energy firm Enron. Before disintegrating from unscrupulous manipulation, Enron was one of the most intense lobbyists for the Kyoto Protocol. It had hoped to become a trading firm dealing in carbon-emission rights. This was no small hope. These rights are likely to amount to trillions of dollars, and the commissions will run into many billions.

It is probably no accident Al Gore is associated with such activities. The sale of indulgences is in full swing, with organizations selling offsets to one's carbon footprint while sometimes acknowledging that the offsets are irrelevant. The possibilities for corruption are immense.

Finally, there are well-meaning individuals who believe that in accepting the alarmist view of climate change, they are displaying intelligence and virtue. For them, psychic welfare is at stake.

Clearly, the possibility that warming may have ceased could provoke a sense of urgency. For those committed to the more venal agendas, the need to act soon, before the public appreciates the situation, is real. However, the need to resist hysteria courageously is equally clear. Wasting resources on symbolically fighting ever-present climate change is no substitute for prudence.

Lindzen is the Alfred P. Sloan professor of atmospheric science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

4. Global warming's unscientific method: Science is undermined by scaremongers' abuse of peer-review process

Editorial: Washington Times, Apr 7, 2010, [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/07/global-warmings-unscientific-method/>

The prophets of global warming continue to lament as their carefully crafted yarn unravels before their eyes. Ross McKittrick, an intrepid economics professor from the University of Guelph in Ontario, Canada, has tugged apart the thin mathematical threads that once held together the story of climate change.

Recent attempts to silence Mr. McKittrick illuminate the extent to which the alarmists have abandoned proper scientific method in their pursuit of political goals.

Mr. McKittrick has spent the past two years attempting to publish a scientific paper that documents a fundamental error in the 2007 United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report. This U.N. document serves as the sole authority upon which the Environmental Protection Agency based its December "endangerment finding" that will allow unelected bureaucrats to impose cap-and-trade-style regulations without a vote of Congress. The cost to the public in higher gas and energy prices will run in the billions.

One might think that the scientific community would be extra diligent in double-checking the conclusions of a report carrying such weighty real-world consequences. In fact, the opposite happened. Seven scientific journals circled the wagons to block publication of Mr. McKittrick's explosive findings.

The IPCC report argued that temperatures rose one degree Celsius over the course of a century as a direct result of man-made carbon-dioxide emissions. This tiny change in temperature was calculated through the use of an "adjusted" set of global surface-temperature readings. Mr. McKittrick found that factors unrelated to global climate contaminated this data set, resulting in a higher temperature reading. He showed a statistically significant correlation between the change in temperature readings and socioeconomic indicators. It makes sense, for example, that replacing trees and forests with concrete and glass skyscrapers might contribute to the .01 degree annual increase in local temperature readings. This "urban heat island" effect would not be present in readings taken outside the asphalt jungle.

Scientific journals evaluate arguments of this sort using a peer-review process by which purportedly impartial experts in the relevant field verify the paper's accuracy and suitability for publication. By addressing issues raised by reviewers, researchers are able to present an improved and refined final product. In Mr. McKittrick's case, the process appears to have been abused to stifle dissent.

The leading journals Science and Nature both rejected the paper as too specialized and lacking in novelty. The Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society did not respond. Reasons given for refusing the paper in other outlets frequently contradicted one another.

One of the famous leaked e-mails from the former head of the Climatic Research Unit at Britain's University of East Anglia sheds light on what really happens behind the scenes. "I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report," professor Phil Jones wrote in reference to a 2004 journal article by Mr. McKittrick. "Kevin and I will keep them out somehow - even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!"

Mr. McKittrick's views were indeed excluded from the IPCC report, but his paper will now be published in a forthcoming edition of Statistics, Politics and Policy. One of that journal's editors told The Washington Times that the submission was treated as "fairly routine." That is to say, they treated it as scientists should.

The soundness of a statistical analysis does not change simply because the numbers point to a truth inconvenient for those seeking to manipulate science to advance political policy. Thanks to the exposure of East Anglia's unscientific method, the public can peer behind the curtains and see that the emperors of warming have no clothes.

5. Unwarranted trust

From Professor David Henderson, London Financial Times, Apr 7, 2010, From SPPI blog, [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://sppiblog.org/news/unwarranted-trust>

Sir, Your leading article of today (5 April) rightly makes the point that the conduct of climate science is currently in question. In this context, you note with good reason the contents of emails released in November from the Climatic Research Unit, and recent criticisms that have been made of the fourth and latest Assessment Report (AR4) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). But the problems have long been known, and they are more wide-ranging and fundamental than you imply.

In relation to climate change issues, the established official expert advisory process which governments have commissioned and relied on has shown itself, over many years, to be not professionally up to the mark. The situation is one of unwarranted trust.

The main headings of unprofessional conduct within the process, all identified and fully documented well before the recent revelations, have been:

1. Over-reliance on in-group peer review procedures which do not serve as a guarantee of quality and do not ensure due disclosure;
2. Serious and continuing failures of disclosure and archiving in relation to peer-reviewed studies which the IPCC and member governments have drawn on.
3. Continuing resistance to disclosure of basic information which reputable journals in other subject areas insist on as a precondition for acceptance.
4. Basic errors in the handling of data, through failure to consult or involve trained statisticians.
5. Failure to take due account of relevant published work which documented the above lapses, while disregarding IPCC criteria for inclusion in the review process.
6. Failure to take due note of comments from dissenting critics who took part in the preparation of AR4.
7. Resisting the disclosure of professional exchanges within the AR4 drafting process, despite the formal instruction of governments that the IPCC's proceedings should be 'open and transparent'. And last but far from least -
8. Failure on the part of the IPCC and its directing circle to acknowledge and remedy the above deficiencies, a failure which results from chronic and pervasive bias.

Comprehensive exposure of these flaws has come from a number of independent commentators down the years. Throughout, and even now, their work has been largely disregarded by governments and international agencies, as also by unofficial commentators including FT environment correspondents and leader writers.

In an area of policy where so much is at stake, and so much remains uncertain and unsettled, policies should be evolutionary and adaptive, rather than presumptive as they are now; and their evolution should be linked to a process of inquiry and review which is more thorough, balanced, open and objective than has so far been the case.

6. Earth is never in equilibrium

By Richard Lindzen, Gazette Extra, Apr 8, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://gazettextra.com/news/2010/apr/08/con-earth-never-equilibrium/>

CAMBRIDGE, MASS. — *EDITOR'S NOTE: The writer is addressing the question, Is climate change real?*

To a significant extent, the issue of climate change revolves around the elevation of the commonplace to the ancient level of ominous omen. In a world where climate change has always been the norm, climate change is now taken as punishment for sinful levels of consumption. In a world where we experience temperature changes of tens of degrees in a single day, we treat changes of a few tenths of a degree in some statistical residue, known as the global mean temperature anomaly (GATA), as portents of disaster.

Earth has had ice ages and warmer periods when alligators were found in Spitzbergen. Ice ages have occurred in a 100,000-year cycle for the last 700,000 years, and there have been previous interglacials that appear to have been warmer than the present despite lower carbon-dioxide levels. More recently, we have had the medieval warm period and the little ice age. During the latter, alpine glaciers advanced to the chagrin of overrun villages. Since the beginning of the 19th century, these glaciers have been retreating. Frankly, we don't fully understand either the advance or the retreat, and, indeed, some alpine glaciers are advancing again.

For small changes in GATA, there is no need for any external cause. Earth is never exactly in equilibrium. The motions of the massive oceans where heat is moved between deep layers and the surface provides variability on time scales from years to centuries. Examples include El Nino, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, the Atlantic Multi-decadal Oscillation, etc. Recent work suggests that this variability is enough to account for all change in the globally averaged temperature anomaly since the 19th century. To be sure, man's emissions of carbon dioxide must have some impact. The question of importance, however, is how much.

A generally accepted answer is that a doubling of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (it turns out that one gets the same value for a doubling regardless of what value one starts from) would perturb the energy balance of Earth about 2 percent, and this would produce about 2 degrees Fahrenheit warming in the absence of feedbacks. The observed warming over the past century, even if it were all due to increases in carbon dioxide, would not imply any greater warming.

However, current climate models do predict that a doubling of carbon dioxide might produce more warming: from 3.6 degrees F to 9 degrees F or more. They do so because within these models the far more important radiative substances, water vapor and clouds, act to greatly amplify whatever an increase in carbon dioxide might do. This is known as positive feedback. Thus, if adding carbon dioxide reduces the ability of the earth system to cool by emitting thermal radiation to space, the positive feedbacks will further reduce this ability.

It is again acknowledged that such processes are poorly handled in current models, and there is substantial evidence that the feedbacks may actually be negative rather than positive. Citing but one example, 2.5 billion years ago the sun's brightness was 20 percent to 30 percent less than it is today (compared to the 2 percent change in energy balance associated with a doubling of carbon-dioxide levels) yet the oceans were unfrozen and the temperatures appear to have been similar to today's.

This was referred to by Carl Sagan as the Early Faint Sun Paradox. For 30 years, there has been an unsuccessful search for a greenhouse gas resolution of the paradox, but it turns out that a modest negative feedback from clouds is entirely adequate. With the positive feedback in current models, the resolution would be essentially impossible.

Interestingly, according to the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the greenhouse forcing from manmade gases is already about 86 percent of what one expects from a doubling of carbon dioxide (with about half coming from methane, nitrous oxide, freons, and ozone). Thus, these models should show much more warming than has been observed. The reason they don't is that they have arbitrarily removed the difference and attributed this to essentially unknown aerosols.

The IPCC claim that most of the recent warming (since the 1950s) is due to man assumed that current models adequately accounted for natural internal variability. The failure of these models to anticipate the fact that there has been no statistically significant warming for the past 14 years or so contradicts this assumption. This has been acknowledged by major modeling groups in England and Germany.

However, the modelers chose not to stress this. Rather they suggested that the models could be further corrected, and that warming would resume by 2009, 2013, or even 2030.

Global warming enthusiasts have responded to the absence of warming in recent years by arguing that the past decade has been the warmest on record. We are still speaking of tenths of a degree, and the records themselves have come into question. Since we are, according to these records, in a relatively warm period, it is not surprising that the past decade was the warmest on record. This in no way contradicts the absence of increasing temperatures for over a decade.

Given that the evidence (and I have noted only a few of many pieces of evidence) suggests that anthropogenic warming has been greatly exaggerated, so too is the basis for alarm. However, the case for alarm would still be weak even if anthropogenic global warming were significant. Polar bears, arctic summer sea ice, regional droughts and floods, coral bleaching, hurricanes, alpine glaciers, malaria, etc., all depend not on GATA but on a huge number of regional variables including temperature, humidity, cloud cover, precipitation, and direction and magnitude of wind and the state of the ocean.

The fact that some models suggest changes in alarming phenomena will accompany global warming does not logically imply that changes in these phenomena imply global warming. This is not to say that disasters will not occur; they always have occurred, and this will not change in the future. Fighting global warming with symbolic gestures will certainly not change this. However, history tells us that greater wealth and development can profoundly increase our resilience.

One may ask why there has been the astounding upsurge in alarmism in the past four years. When an issue like global warming is around for more than 20 years, numerous agendas are developed to exploit the issue. The interests of the environmental movement in acquiring more power, influence and donations are reasonably clear. So, too, are the interests of bureaucrats for whom control of carbon dioxide is a dream come true. After all, carbon dioxide is a product of breathing itself.

Politicians can see the possibility of taxation that will be cheerfully accepted to save Earth. Nations see how to exploit this issue in order to gain competitive advantages. So do private firms. The case of Enron (a now bankrupt Texas energy firm) is illustrative. Before disintegrating in a pyrotechnic display of unscrupulous manipulation, Enron was one of the most intense lobbyists for Kyoto. It had hoped to become a trading firm dealing in carbon-emission rights. This was no small hope. These rights are likely to amount to trillions of dollars, and the commissions will run into many billions.

It is probably no accident that Al Gore himself is associated with such activities. The sale of indulgences is already in full swing with organizations selling offsets to one's carbon footprint while sometimes acknowledging that the offsets are irrelevant. The possibilities for corruption are immense.

Finally, there are the well-meaning individuals who believe that in accepting the alarmist view of climate change, they are displaying intelligence and virtue. For them, psychic welfare is at stake.

Clearly, the possibility that warming may have ceased could provoke a sense of urgency. For those committed to the more venal agendas, the need to act soon, before the public appreciates the situation, is real indeed. However, the need to courageously resist hysteria is equally clear. Wasting resources on symbolically fighting ever-present climate change is no substitute for prudence.

Richard S. Lindzen is the Alfred P. Sloan professor of atmospheric science at MIT. Readers may send him e-mail at rlindzenmit.edu. He wrote this for The Free Lance-Star in Fredericksburg, Va.

#####