

The Week That Was: 2010-09-04 (September 4, 2010)

Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

The Science and Environmental Policy Project

Fred Singer will be lecturing overseas until Sept 21, including India, Israel, and Sicily. He asks that you send him only high-priority e-mail. Please direct other correspondence to Ken Haapala. Lectures open to the public are: Sept 13 or 14 Berlin; Sept 16 or 17 Paris. Also at Princeton U on Sept 23, Annandale, VA on Sept 25, and Purdue U on Sept 27. To attend, contact ken@haapala.com for details.

If you are in the Washington DC Area, do not forget to attend the SEPP-SEEE Climate-Energy Forum at 10:30 am on Sept 25 in the Ernst Community Center at the Annandale Campus of the Northern Virginia Community College. This is located about one mile outside the Beltway off Little River Turnpike. No reservations are required. This is no fee but donations are greatly appreciated. The speakers will include Fred Singer on recent science, Marc Morano on the political situation, and Ken Haapala on energy and economics.

PLEASE NOTE that the complete TWTW, including the articles, can be downloaded in an easily printable form at the web site: <http://www.haapala.com/sepp/the-week-that-was.cfm>.

Quote of the Week

Reality is only an illusion, albeit a very persistent one. Albert Einstein, H/t Robert Carter, see book review below.

Number of the Week: 800

THIS WEEK:

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

The big news of the week is the report released by the InterAcademy Council investigating the IPCC. The Council reported severe failings in the procedures and mechanisms used by the IPCC including major errors in the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4, 2007), mismanagement and lack of supervision to correct errors, use of gray literature, and the lack of transparency. Among the more specific criticisms is that there is no scientific basis for the probability statements found in the AR4 Summary for Policymakers and many statements are scientifically meaningless.

As such, it had a little for everyone. IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri claimed it was vindication of his work, and the advocacy group, Union of Concerned Scientists, claimed it would strengthen the science behind the claim of Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW). Other comments were less sanguine. A number of newspapers editorials, including the formerly supportive Economist, ranged from calling it a sharp critique to a condemnation of the IPCC. Long range weather forecaster Piers Corbyn called a whitewash and climate change researcher Roy Spencer suggests dumping the entire IPCC process.

One of the more prudent remarks came from Craig Idso of CO2 Science and NIPCC who wrote to Harold Shapiro, chairman of the committee, pointing out that the IPCC systematically ignores a vast body of scientific research that contradicts its findings. As long as this research is ignored, IPCC reports are not scientific.

Given that the InterAcademy Council is an international organization with many members coming from the National Academies of various countries, the report may strike some as surprisingly tough. Many national academies have not only have embraced the findings of the IPCC but some, such as the US National Academy of Sciences, have actively promoted the findings as scientifically unquestionable. With their outright advocacy of scientifically questionable procedures, these organizations may be losing their prestige with developing nations. This report will not help reestablish that prestige.

The report did not go into the how the IPCC procedures violate principles of science including the principle of continuity. The Summary for Policymakers of AR4 covers warming for only the past 50 years as if the physical laws changed 50 years ago (the globe cooled from about 1940 to 1975). Also, AR4 twists the principles of hypothesis testing, as explained in the book review below.

Given the western political mania surrounding the global warming issue, perhaps the InterAcademy report is the best from an international organization one can expect at this time. At least the report substantiates a claim that the US EPA finding that human emissions of carbon dioxide endanger human health and welfare is premature and, perhaps, totally false. (Please see the first 3 number articles as well as the articles referenced under “Report of the InterAcademy Council.”)

In a new book, Bjorn Lomborg issued a call for the developed world to spend \$100 Billion a year to combat global warming with most of the money being spent on clean energy and geo-engineering schemes. This has incurred the wrath of some skeptics of AGW as well as many environmentalists. The environmental industry wants the \$100 Billion to be spent, but not for geo-engineering. Previously, Lomborg issued reports stating that addressing AGW was far down on the list of world needs. Apparently the latest announcement represents a shift in his thinking of priorities.

Before becoming too riled at this shift, one should remember that Lomborg always supported the concept of AGW and his forte is descriptive statistics, not scientific methodology. Descriptive statistics formed the basis of his trenchant work *The Skeptical Environmentalist* (1998 & 2001) in which he demonstrated that the environment, particularly in the developed world, is improving; not disintegrating. He exposed as false many of the environmental industry’s claims of massive environmental destruction. Some of these false claims still appear in IPCC reports today.

For this, Lomborg endured a virulent campaign of personal attacks not only from recognized environmental groups, but also from scientific organizations and scientific publications such as *Scientific American*. One may not agree with his views on AGW, but Lomborg should be respected for expressing views contrary to the “environmental consensus.” (Please see articles under “Bjorn Lomborg.”)

Roy Spencer reports the global average temperature of the lower troposphere in August was 0.51° C above the norm for the 32 years of satellite temperature measurements. This continues to make 2010 slightly cooler, but not statistically so, than 1998, the warmest year measured by satellites. He also reports that sea surface temperatures continue to show a cooling and measurements of the lower troposphere are now beginning to show a cooling as well. Please see:

www.drroyspencer.com

On Thursday, a brief fire occurred on an oil pumping platform in the Gulf of Mexico. The crew jumped into the Gulf, and a small oil spill occurred, reported to be less than 10 gallons. Since US journalists were preparing for the long weekend or watching the hurricane that threatened, but did not hit, the East Coast; there was little play in the press.

It should be noted that this oil pumping platform is in shallow water, anchored to the bottom, and 30 years old. This is significantly different from a deep water drilling rigs, such as the failed BP rig, that are relatively new and not anchored to the bottom. Apparently, fires are commonplace on older pumping platforms when maintenance is being performed using oxy-acetylene welding torches. Perhaps some tighter regulations on such maintenance are appropriate; but, the question is will the administration use this fire to justify continuing or even extending the moratorium on drilling in the Gulf?

We found no new, significant reports on the status of the oil plume from the BP spill. Perhaps the anaerobic, oil eating microbes have out bloomed the plume.

The Number of the Week is 800.

John Brignell has been compiling a list of things caused by global warming which passed 800 on August 19, 2010. “The honour of being number 800 goes to the story that *truffles are increasing*. You can find it just after *truffle shortage* and *truffles down*; which just about says it all.” For the complete list please see: <http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/warmlist.htm>

SEPP Amplifications and Corrections: Reader Curt Convey commented on the NSF Community Earth System Model (CESM), discussed in last week’s TWTW, pointing out it is not new but an extension of the older Community Climate System Model (CCSM) model that now includes the Earth’s carbon cycle. “The most important point to make about the CCSM / CESM is that both the complete source code and the output from simulations done at NCAR is available on the Web. Also, I can point you to a Web site that shows graphically a very large number of comparisons between model output and real-world observations. The theme of the CCSM / CESM is ‘Modeling power to the people!’ -- and let whoever is curious look at the output and decide for themselves how realistic or unrealistic the model is.”

Last week’s TWTW carried an article about violent protests in London during the G20 meeting targeting the Royal Bank of Scotland for Bank’s involvement in lending to energy companies. Actually the protests took place in Scotland, while the G20 meeting was in Toronto. Sonja A Boehmer-Christiansen pointed out that the violent protests in London took place during the G20 meeting in April 2009. Thank you for the correction.

Book of the Week: *Climate: The Counter Consensus* by Professor Robert M. Carter. In his book, Professor Carter demonstrates a rare combination of talents – an accomplished researcher who writes lucidly. He fluidly takes the reader through the entire sordid mess of what has become generally accepted climate science and he does it in a clever way.

In the introduction Carter establishes the difference between physical reality and the virtual reality that is much of climate science. In the virtual reality of IPCC science, as remarked by Richard Lindzen, “the consensus was reached before even the research had begun.” Man is the cause of global warming and his actions (carbon dioxide emissions) must be stopped. Great deterministic computer models were created to confirm the consensus. This virtual reality has been successfully substituted for physical reality in the minds of many journalists, scientists, government officials, and, to a large part, the public. The question “Do you believe in global warming?” is actually a code for “do you believe in dangerous global warming caused by human carbon dioxide emissions?” Carter’s response: “It depends.” “For there are many different realities of climate change.”

Carter then takes the reader through a brief summary of the earth’s climate history, emphasizing that, although ice ages were the dominant climate, over the past 400,000 years and the past 10,000 years there have been periods warmer than today. Thus, climate change and global warming are entirely natural and normal and today’s temperatures are not particularly high and the change is not particularly rapid. Carter establishes that the practice of using very brief meteorological periods to assert that there is something unusual about the recent temperature changes is logically and scientifically absurd. Throughout the discussion he presents natural influences on climate and temperatures that are ignored by the IPCC.

He then points out that the uncertainties of knowledge of the carbon dioxide cycle are far larger than known human emissions. Thus, attempts to correlate human emissions with temperature change in order to establish causation are statistically meaningless; the error ranges are too huge. In an effort to establish causation, the model builders use aerosols – virtually unknown variables the “effects” of which are determined by the models – a circular argument. [Some may call these variables “pixie dust.”]

Carter sums the US Supreme Court’s finding that carbon dioxide is a pollutant as “an abuse of language, an abuse of logic, and an abuse of science.”

He rejects the claims of dramatic changes in the oceans as “hobgoblins of alarm” and demonstrates them to be such, including the notion of ocean acidification. He then demonstrates why the deterministic computer models used by the IPCC are not predictive tools and suggests simplistic models may be better, including statistical climate models that are ignored by the IPCC.

It is in the chapters starting with “Circumstantial evidence and the null hypothesis” that Carter’s excellent approach comes to the fore. By using circumstantial evidence, and by using an extensive marketing effort designed by international advertising agencies to support their claims, the IPCC and its environmental industry allies have disguised the need, at least thus far, to conduct proper hypothesis testing. They falsely assert that recent global warming is unprecedented and human caused.

Since climate change is natural and normal in the Earth’s history, natural and normal climate change is the proper null hypothesis. Thus, it is incumbent on the IPCC to test its hypothesis that human emissions of carbon dioxide are causing global warming. The IPCC does not do so because, if tested, such a hypothesis would quickly be rejected. Carter presents at least eight scientific reasons why. There is no physical evidence that human carbon dioxide emissions will cause little more than minor warming that probably cannot be measured from the background noise. [SEPP Comment: of course, humans cause climate change and urbanization is a classic example. However, an increase in thermometer readings in cities around the globe as the cities grow is not global warming; it is localized warming in many places.]

Carter offers a plan B that he thinks is necessary. Climate will continue to change and humans must be prepared. Carter presents the Köppen-Geiger classification in which the earth has 28 climatological zones with larger nations having several. In plan B, Carter suggests it is important to be prepared to prepare for climate change according to climatic region, rather than globally. [SEPP Comment: the 30 + year satellite record shows that temperature change is largely regional, not global.] This requires something akin to New Zealand’s emergency civil defense organization GeoNet, rather than grand international schemes.

Carter concludes by stating the politicians, scientific organizations, and science journals advocating “global warming” are in self-denial after the failure to establish emissions controls in Copenhagen. Unfortunately, their advocacy will make the public suspicious of a realistic Plan B.

It is difficult to briefly summarize this well researched, well written, dispassionate analysis except to state that the public may have been better served if the members of the InterAcademy Council investigating the IPCC read *Climate: The Counter Consensus* before issuing their report.

[*Climate: The Counter Consensus, A Palaeoclimatologist Speaks* by Research Professor Robert M. Carter, James Cook University,, 2010, Stacey International, ISBN 978-1-906768 29 4, 315 pp including extensive endnotes and 8 pp index. Available on US Amazon.com]

#####

ARTICLES:

For the numbered articles below please see:

www.haapala.com/sepp/the-week-that-was.cfm.

1. Clearing up the climate

Editorial, The Economist, Aug 30, 2010 [H/t Charles Schafer]

http://www.economist.com/blogs/newsbook/2010/08/climate_change_and_ipcc

2. Climate of Uncertainty

Global warming science is still evolving; will future IPCC reports reflect that?

Editorial, WSJ Opinion Europe, Sep 2, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703467004575463433671739148.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

3. Meltdown of the climate ‘consensus’

By Matt Patterson, New York Post, Sep 1, 2010 [H/t Watts Up With That?]
http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/meltdown_of_the_climate_consensus_G0kWdclUvwhVr6DYH6A4uJ

4. Judge Deals New Blow to Drilling Moratorium

By Stephen Power, WSJ, Sep 1, 2010
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703882304575465634035917078.html>

5. Scientist’s Firing After 36 Years Fuels ‘PC’ Debate at UCLA

By Diane Macedo, Fox News, Aug 31, 2010 [H/t American Council on Science and Health]
<http://www.foxnews.com/us/2010/08/31/pc-professors-firing-fueling-exhaustive-debate/>
#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Challenging the Orthodoxy

NASA/NOAA Study Finds El Niños Growing Stronger

NOAA Press Release, Aug 25, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]
http://www.noaaneews.noaa.gov/stories2010/20100825_elnino.html
[SEPP Comment: For several years independent scientists have demonstrated that more frequent El Niños may be a cause of warming, which has been ignored by the Orthodoxy. Now NASA/NOAA are suggesting that global warming may cause El Niños? This is another example of the failure to conduct proper hypothesis testing.]

Clouding the debate

By Daniel James Devine, World, Aug 14, 2010
<http://www.worldmag.com/articles/16970>

Defending the Orthodoxy

Climate Change: The Facts of life

Political action seems again improbable, but remains more urgent than ever
Editorial, The Guardian, Aug 31, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]
http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/aug/31/climate-change-bjorn-lomborg?utm_source=emailalerts&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Environment

Environmental groups face their future in climate-change debate

By David A. Fahrenhold, Washington Post, Aug 29, 2010
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/29/AR2010082903699.html?hpid=topnews?utm_source=emailalerts&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Environment

Trying to Find A Middle Ground

Global warming: Fixing the IPCC

By Thomas Fuller, Examiner.com, Aug 29, 2010
<http://www.examiner.com/environmental-policy-in-national/global-warming-fixing-the-ippc>

Global warming: Fixing the IPCC, Part 2

By Thomas Fuller, Examiner.com, Aug 30, 2010

<http://www.examiner.com/environmental-policy-in-national/global-warming-fixing-the-ipcc-part-2>

[“The suggested reforms basically amount to telling the IPCC to use better judgment and critical thinking about how it goes about its business. However, those of us who have criticized the IPCC (and I am certainly one) would say that if they had better judgment and were capable of critical thinking, they wouldn't have gotten into this predicament.”]

Report by the InterAcademy Council

InterAcademy Council Report Recommends Fundamental Reform of IPCC Management Structure

Review of the IPCC, InterAcademy Council, Aug 30, 2010

<http://reviewipcc.interacademycouncil.net/ReportNewsRelease.html>

Open Letter to the InterAcademy Council

By Craig Idso, CO2 Science, Aug 31, 2010

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/sep/HaroldShapiroOpenLetter.pdf>

I am happy that truth has come out: Pachauri

By Nitin Sethi, Times of India, Sep 3, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/I-am-happy-that-truth-has-come-out-Pachauri/articleshow/6482854.cms>

Independent Audit Panel Slams U.N.'s Climate Group

By Jeremy A. Kaplan, Fox News.com, [H/t/ Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://www.foxnews.com/scitech/2010/08/30/independent-audit-slams-un-climate-panel/>

ClimateGate new probe – “Another Whitewash when really the whole climate spin machine must be closed down”

By Piers Corbyn, Climate Realists, Aug 31, 2010

<http://www.weatheraction.com/displayarticle.asp?a=236&c=5>

Dump the IPCC Process, It Cannot Be Fixed

By Roy Spencer, Aug 30, 2010

www.drroyspencer.com

U.N. agency told to cool climate advocacy

Editorial, Orange County Register, Sep 1, 2010

http://www.ocregister.com/opinion/ipcc-264715-warming-evidence.html?utm_source=emailalerts&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Global%20Warming

BP Oil Spill and Aftermath

Blaze Shakes Oil Industry

Accident Intensifies Debate on Drilling in the Gulf; All Aboard Are Rescued

By Leslie Eaton, Jeffrey Ball and Stephen Power, WSJ, Sep 3, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704206804575467600528128386.html?mod=ITP_pageone_0

Mariner Has Dealt With Fires Before

By Ben Cassellman and Russell Gold, WSJ, Sep 3, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703431604575468081605594688.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

Energy Issues

Wind Energy's House of Cards

By Steve Goreham, Energy Tribune, Aug 31, 2010

<http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm/5131/Wind-Energys-House-of-Cards>

Mass. Supreme Court Gives Cape Wind Major Legal Victory

Power News, Sep 1, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/Mass-Supreme-Court-Gives-Cape-Wind-Major-Legal-Victory_2985.html

Land leased for solar power unused

BLM quick to approve leases, slow to demand improvements

By Jason Dearen, AP, in Ventura County Star, Sep 1, 2010 [H/t Watts Up With That?]

<http://www.vcstar.com/news/2010/sep/01/land-leased-for-solar-power-unused/#ixzz0yMLDZjM2>

California Dreaming

California to Launch Next-Generation Feed-in Tariff for Solar Energy

CPUC Pilot Program Opens New Market Opportunity for Mid-Sized PV Development

Business Wire, Aug 15, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20100825006352/en>

Solar power moves ahead in California

By Staff Writers, Solar Daily, Aug 27, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.solardaily.com/reports/Solar_power_moves_ahead_in_California_999.html

EPA and other Regulators On the March

The left's war on the gasoline powered car

Move over smog ratings, smug factor is here

Editorial, Washington Times, Sep 1, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/sep/1/the-lefts-war-on-the-gasoline-powered-car/>

Oh Mann!

Cuccinelli gets another shot at Michael Mann

By Barbara Hollingsworth, Washington Examiner, Aug 30, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/blogs/beltway-confidential/cuccinelli-gets-another-shot-at-michael-mann-101827583.html#ixzz0yBTos3Ec>

A federal judge puts a damper on Mr. Cuccinelli's U-Va. witch hunt

Editorial, Washington Post, Aug 31, 2010 [H/t Dennis Manuta]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/30/AR2010083004405.html?referrer=emailarticle>

[SEPP Comment: The Washington Post did not get the jurisdiction of the judge correct. The 16th Circuit of Virginia is a Virginia jurisdiction, not a Federal one.]

Bjorn Lomborg

Bjorn Lomborg gets it coming or going

By Thomas Fuller, Examiner.com, Sep 1, 2010

<http://www.examiner.com/environmental-policy-in-national/bjorn-lomborg-gets-it-coming-or-going>

Bjorn Lomborg: the dissenting climate change voice who changed his tune.

By Juliette Jowitz, Guardian, UK, Aug 30, 2010
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/aug/30/bjorn-lomborg-climate-change-profile>

Green groups cautiously welcome Bjorn Lomborg's call for \$100bn climate fund

By John Vidal, Guardian, UK, Aug 31, 2010
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/aug/31/bjorn-lomborg-climate-fund>

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC
For a full list of articles see www.NIPCCreport.org

The Costs of Free Energy

Reference: Goncalves da Silva, C.E.T. 2010. The fossil energy/climate change crunch: Can we pin our hopes on new energy technologies? *Energy* **35**: 1312-1316. [Archived 02 Sep 2010]
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/sep/02sep2010a1.html>

Greenland Temperatures of the Past Millennium Based on Nitrogen and Argon Isotopic Ratios

Reference: Kobashi, et al., 2010. Persistent multi-decadal Greenland temperature fluctuation through the last millennium. *Climatic Change* **100**: 733-756. [Archived 02 Sep 2010]
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/sep/02sep2010a3.html>

The Ever-Increasing Productivity of Amazonian Forests: Fact or Artifact?

Reference: Gloor, et al. Does the disturbance hypothesis explain the biomass increase in basin-wide Amazon forest plot data? *Global Change Biology* **15**: 2418-2430. [Archived 03 Sep 2010]
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/sep/03sep2010a2.html>

Miscellaneous Topics of Possible Interest

The Great Collapse of the Chicago Climate Exchange

By Patrick Henniingsen, 21st Century Wire, Aug 11, 2010
<http://21stcenturywire.com/2010/08/27/the-great-collapse-of-the-chicago-climate-exchange/>

The strange case of solar flares and radioactive elements

By Dan Stober, Stanford Report, Aug 23, 2010
<http://news.stanford.edu/news/2010/august/sun-082310.html>

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

'Climate migrants' projected to flood U.S.

Report cites dire conditions in Latin America
By Shaun Waterman, Washington Times, Sep 1, 2010
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/sep/1/global-warming-will-increase-migration-report-says/>

#####

ARTICLES:

1. Clearing up the climate

Editorial, The Economist, Aug 30, 2010 [H/t Charles Schafer]
http://www.economist.com/blogs/newsbook/2010/08/climate_change_and_ipcc

WHEN the [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) (IPCC) is in the throes of producing one of its periodic assessments of the science of climate change, its plenary meetings can be a sight to behold, with all the brinksmanship, skullduggery and last-minute compromises that aficionados of foreign policy could

wish for. In between times, these meetings of the governments that give the IPCC its name, and mandate, are of little note. That may change, though, at the plenary scheduled for Busan, in Korea, this October.

Prominent on that meeting's agenda will be the results of a report on the IPCC produced under the auspices of the [InterAcademy Council](#), an umbrella group for the world's national academies of science, which was [released today](#). The report, written by a committee chaired by Harold Shapiro, a former president of Princeton University, was commissioned in March by the UN secretary general, Ban Ki-moon, and the IPCC chair, Rajendra Pachauri, after errors were spotted in the most recent IPCC report last winter. While expressing admiration for the IPCC's achievements to date, the Shapiro committee offers sharp criticisms of the way the panel organises itself and calls for reforms.

The report finds problems with the way the IPCC handles reviews of its work, the degree to which it shows fairness when considering areas that are disputed, and the way it communicates the certainty, or lack of it, wherewith it speaks. It calls for new rules on conflict of interest (or more accurately, it calls for rules—at the moment the panel has none), a new full-time leadership position and a new executive committee. Perhaps most strikingly, the report can also be read as a call for Mr Pachauri to resign, though neither Mr Pachauri nor Mr Shapiro have characterised it in quite that way.

First, a quick IPCC primer. The panel provides various types of report and analysis, most famously a series of vast “assessment reports” on the state of scientific and academic knowledge about climate. Each report comes in three volumes produced by three different working groups, one that deals with the physical science of climate change, one that deals with the impacts of change, and one that deals with ways of reducing the amount of change to be expected. Each working group consists of hundreds of authors under the leadership of two (or sometimes more) co-chairs, one from a developed country, one from a developing country. The fourth assessment report was published in 2007; the fifth is slated to come out in installments starting in 2013 and finishing in 2014.

The Shapiro committee's report points out that the IPCC has to a large extent sat out the “governance revolution” in accountability and transparency that charitable, educational and other organisations have been dealing with in the two decades of the panel's existence. One way to start getting up to date, it suggests, is to create a new executive committee able to act in the panel's name between the plenary sessions that actually bring the member governments together. This could make the IPCC a lot more responsive and communicative.

The committee would consist of the IPCC's chair, the co-chairs for each of the three working groups, an executive director (a newly created post) and three others appointed by the governments to whom the IPCC is answerable, with at least one of these council members coming from outside the world of climate science. The executive director would be a full time appointment (the chair and the working group co-chairs are part-time roles), a job for a senior scientist who could command at least as much respect within the community as the co-chairs, and who would do most of the work involved in actually running the panel.

The sting in the tale of this suggestion is that the report recommends that the IPCC insider members of this executive committee should serve for only one term—that is, they should make their contributions over only one of the six-year assessment-report cycles. Between the end of work on the fourth assessment report and the beginning of work on the fifth all but one of the working group co-chairs did in fact change over. Mr Pachauri himself, though, did not; he is now well into his second term. Mr Shapiro refused to be drawn on whether the idea that Mr Pachauri should go was the logical conclusion of the report's argument that “A 12-year appointment is too long for a field as dynamic and contested as climate change,” allowing only that it was “one possible logical response”. Mr Pachauri said that he had taken up a burden, and that putting it down was a matter not for him, but for the Busan plenary.

In a further move towards transparency, the report says the IPCC should start clearly defining the criteria by which it selects authors and others, including the chair and the new executive secretary, and documenting the steps it takes to ensure that all relevant scientific points of view are being represented or at least addressed. It should also make sure that regional assessments benefit from global expertise, not just that of those living in the regions in question. This will go some way to meeting the worries of those who see clear signs of “groupthink” in the panel’s workings, though some of those critics might still press for the entire process of author selection to be made transparent.

Beyond organisation and personnel, the Shapiro panel also has things to say about the reports themselves. The drafts attract thousands of comments from expert reviewers and governments—last time round working group II’s volume alone attracted over 36,000. Dealing with them piecemeal, as is now the case, does not make the most of the insights they express, and allows things to slip through the net, such as the now-infamous erroneous claim about Himalayan glaciers vanishing in the next three decades. From now on review editors should be more forceful in identifying major issues in the comments and getting pertinent responses from the authors.

The report also highlights what might be called the political epistemology of the IPCC. In the summaries for policymakers that each working group provides, assessments of how likely an outcome may be do not always communicate the amount of evidence and the level of understanding on which that assessment is based. Mr Shapiro and his colleagues suggest that in the working group II summary, in particular, this led to statements being given a confidence level they did not deserve. A related problem was high confidence given to statements, such as “Nearly all European regions are anticipated to be negatively affected by some future impacts of climate change, and these will pose challenges to many economic sectors,” too vague to be assessed in any rigorous way.

Mr Pachauri and his colleagues welcomed the report at a press conference, but what actions it will lead to remain to be seen. The authors for the next assessment report have already been chosen. To deselect them and go through the process again would be time consuming and erode the goodwill on which the unremunerated process depends. Other reforms, though, could be set in train more easily, if the plenary wants to do so. The IPCC is a unique and remarkable institution; the governments that make it up will soon have the opportunity to improve it, if they can agree about just how much reform they want, and who they want to lead it.

2. Climate of Uncertainty

Global warming science is still evolving; will future IPCC reports reflect that?

Editorial, WSJ Opinion Europe, Sep 2, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703467004575463433671739148.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

On Monday an independent review found that the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has downplayed uncertainties surrounding climate science. The review also found that the IPCC needs more robust safeguards against conflicts of interest, that it had committed "unnecessary errors" by failing to meet its own standards, that it had inadequately flagged its use of nonscientific sources, that it made claims with "high confidence" based on "weak evidentiary basis," and that it gave short shrift to dissenting scientists.

And for all that, the review added that the IPCC "has been successful overall and has served society well."

This week's report, in keeping with three earlier investigations into the University of East Anglia's Climatic Research Unit, limited its inquiry to the "processes and procedures" of the IPCC. While it found those wanting, it also saw no need to question their scientific result.

That's too bad, since the state of the science has moved on considerably since the IPCC concluded in its 2007 report that climate change was "unequivocal." A forthcoming paper in *Annals of Applied Statistics* details the uncertainties in trying to reconstruct historical temperatures using proxy data such as tree rings and ice cores. Statisticians Blakeley McShane and Abraham Wyner find that while proxy records may relate to temperatures, when it comes to forecasting the warming observed in the last 30 years, "the proxies do not predict temperature significantly better than random series generated independently of temperature."

Also, last month, *New Phytologist* published a series of papers examining the Amazon rain forest's vulnerability to drought, following years of increasingly dire predictions that anthropogenic carbon emissions and global warming will kill off Amazon trees. Climatologist Peter Cox, a co-author on four of those papers, told us, "One of the things that turns out to be important is the extent to which tropical forests respond positively to CO2 increases."

The specifics of that relationship remain "a key uncertainty," Mr. Cox said, and recent findings have raised more questions than they've answered. But the fact that higher CO2 levels can make plants more efficient at using water means that not only might rain forests survive CO2-induced drought better than previously thought, but that carbon emissions overall might even be good for rain forests, up to a point. That's news, even if it has been little reported.

And while you've probably heard (frequently) that this summer appears to be the warmest on record, you may not have been told that an unusually cold spell in the Antarctic brought a chill to southern South America and is responsible for the deaths of six million fish and thousands of alligators, turtles and river dolphins, according to *Nature News*.

None of this proves or disproves anything, except that our understanding of how our climate works is still evolving. Is it too much to ask the climate establishment to acknowledge as much?

3. Meltdown of the climate 'consensus'

By Matt Patterson, *New York Post*, Sep 1, 2010 {H/t Watts Up With That?}

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/meltdown_of_the_climate_consensus_G0kWdclUvwhVr6DYH6A4uJ

If this keeps up, no one's going to trust *any* scientists.

The global-warming establishment took a body blow this week, as the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change received a stunning rebuke from a top-notch independent investigation.

For two decades, the IPCC has spearheaded efforts to convince the world's governments that man-made carbon emissions pose a threat to the global temperature equilibrium -- and to civilization itself. IPCC reports, collated from the work of hundreds of climate scientists and bureaucrats, are widely cited as evidence for the urgent need for drastic action to "save the planet."

But the prestigious InterAcademy Council, an independent association of "the best scientists and engineers worldwide" (as the group's own Web site puts it) formed in 2000 to give "high-quality advice to international bodies," has finished a thorough review of IPCC practices -- and found them badly wanting.

For example, the IPCC's much-vaunted Fourth Assessment Report claimed in 2007 that Himalayan glaciers were rapidly melting, and would possibly be gone by the year 2035. The claim was actually *false* -- yet the IPCC cited it as proof of man-made global warming.

Then there's the IPCC's earlier prediction in 2007 -- which it claimed to have "high confidence" in -- that global warming could lead to a 50 percent reduction in the rain-fed agricultural capacity of Africa.

Such a dramatic decrease in food production in an already poor continent would be a terrifying prospect, and undoubtedly lead to the starvation of millions. But the InterAcademy Council investigation found that this IPCC claim was *also* based on weak evidence.

Overall, the IAC slammed the IPCC for reporting "high confidence in some statements for which there is little evidence. Furthermore, by making vague statements that were difficult to refute, authors were able to attach 'high confidence' to the statements." The critics note "many such statements that are not supported sufficiently in the literature, not put into perspective or not expressed clearly.

Some IPCC practices can only be called shoddy. As The Wall Street Journal reported, "Some scientists invited by the IPCC to review the 2007 report before it was published questioned the Himalayan claim. But those challenges 'were not adequately considered,' the InterAcademy Council's investigation said, and the projection was included in the final report."

Yet the Himalayan claim wasn't based on peer-reviewed scientific data, or on *any* data -- but on *speculation* in a phone interview by a single scientist.

Was science even a real concern for the IPCC? In January, the Sunday Times of London reported that, based in large part on the fraudulent glacier story, "[IPCC Chairman] Rajendra Pachauri's Energy and Resources Institute, based in New Delhi, was awarded up to 310,000 pounds by the Carnegie Corp. . . . and the lion's share of a 2.5 million pound EU grant funded by European taxpayers."

Thus, the Times concluded, "EU taxpayers are funding research into a scientific claim about glaciers that any ice researcher should immediately recognize as bogus."

All this comes on top of last year's revelation of the "Climategate" e-mails, which revealed equally shoddy practices (and efforts to suppress criticism) by scientists at the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia -- perhaps the single most important source of data that supposedly proved the most alarming claims of global warming.

Al Gore and many other warming alarmists have insisted that "the debate is over" -- that the science was "settled." That claim is now in shreds -- though the grants are still flowing, and advocates still hope Congress will pass some version of the economically ruinous "cap and trade" anti-warming bill.

What does the best evidence now tell us? That man-made global warming is a mere hypothesis that has been inflated by both exaggeration and downright malfeasance, fueled by the awarding of fat grants and salaries to any scientist who'll produce the "right" results.

The warming "scientific" community, the Climategate emails reveal, is a tight clique of like-minded scientists and bureaucrats who give each other jobs, publish each other's papers -- and conspire to shut out any point of view that threatens to derail their gravy train.

Such behavior is perhaps to be expected from politicians and government functionaries. From scientists, it's a travesty.

In the end, grievous harm will have been done not just to individual scientists' reputations, but to the once-sterling reputation of science itself. For that, we will all suffer.

4. Judge Deals New Blow to Drilling Moratorium

By Stephen Power, WSJ, Sep 1, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703882304575465634035917078.html>

The federal judge who struck down the Obama administration's initial six-month moratorium on deepwater oil-drilling dealt the government another blow on Wednesday.

U.S. District Court Judge Martin Feldman denied the government's request to throw out a suit challenging the drilling halt that had been filed by offshore-oil-service companies. Justice Department lawyers had argued the lawsuit was moot because the Interior Department imposed a new, temporary drilling ban on July 12, replacing a May 28 order that Judge Feldman had struck down in June.

But Judge Feldman ruled that Interior Secretary Ken Salazar's second moratorium order "is substantially the same as the first one" and "applies to the exact same rigs, to the exact same deepwater drilling, for the exact same time period."

Judge Feldman also noted that in crafting the second moratorium, Mr. Salazar appeared to have relied heavily on documents and data that he had at the time of the first moratorium order.

"Nearly every statement in the July 12 decision memorandum is anticipated by documents in the May 28 record, or by documents that were otherwise available to the Secretary before May 28," the judge said.

A spokesman for the Interior Department said the administration was reviewing the judge's ruling. A spokesman for Hornbeck Offshore Services LLC —the lead plaintiff in the case—said the company was "pleased" by the judge's decision. "It's yet another indication that the courts are concerned with this scheme of moratoria," he said.

The Obama administration has said the temporary ban on drilling in waters deeper than 500 feet is necessary to allow the government and industry to improve safety and response procedures.

The administration is fighting in court to maintain a moratorium on oil-drilling in deepwater until Nov. 30, but has said it will consider scaling back or lifting the ban earlier, depending on what it learns in the coming months about improvements in the industry's safety practices.

5. Scientist's Firing After 36 Years Fuels 'PC' Debate at UCLA

By Diane Macedo, Fox News, Aug 31, 2010 [H/t American Council on Science and Health]

<http://www.foxnews.com/us/2010/08/31/pc-professors-firing-fueling-exhaustive-debate/>

A longtime professor at UCLA, told that he would not be rehired because his "research is not aligned with the academic mission" of his department, says he's being fired after 36 years at the prestigious school because his scientific beliefs are "politically incorrect." But UCLA says Dr. James Enstrom's politics have nothing to do with its decision.

Enstrom, an epidemiologist at UCLA's School of Public Health, has a history of running against the grain. In 2003 he wrote a [study, published in the British Medical Journal](#), in which he found no causal relationship between secondhand smoke and tobacco-related death – a conclusion that drew fire both because it was contrary to popular scientific belief and because it was funded by Philip Morris.

Now Enstrom says his [studies](#) show no causal link between diesel soot and death in California – findings that once again set him far apart from the pack and put him in direct conflict with the California Air

Resources Board, which says its new standards on diesel emissions will save 9,400 lives between 2011 and 2025 and will reduce health care costs by as much as \$68 billion in the state.

The expected benefits of the new standards have been used to justify their estimated \$5.5 billion price tag, which opponents say will cripple the California trucking industry at a time when the state can least afford it. The new standards, the critics warn, also could set the stage for national regulations.

Enstrom questions the science behind the new emissions standards, and he has raised concerns about the two key reports on which they were based – exposing the author of one study as having faked his credentials and the panel that issued the other study as having violated its term limits.

He says his views are what have gotten him fired, raising serious concerns not only about the diesel regulations but about academic freedom and scientific research as a whole.

"It's quite unfortunate that it's come to this, considering I've been in this school 36 and three-quarter years," Enstrom said. "... but the reason I'm so passionate about this is because the careers of thousands of California businessmen are on the line."

Enstrom says he is committed to exposing flaws in the science and procedures by which the California Air Resources Board (CARB) passed a series of regulations on diesel exhaust, the last phase of which will require trucks and buses that enter the state either to be retrofitted or replaced entirely to meet new emission standards.

"The Scientific Review Panel of Toxic Air Contaminates in 1998 declared diesel exhaust a toxic substance based on studying truckers and railroaders from back in the '50s, '60s and '70s, when emissions were much higher," Enstrom told FoxNews.com. "They never factored in, for example, that a very high percentage of truckers are also smokers when evaluating health issues they may have had, yet they were using this research to declare that all diesel exhaust is a toxic substance."

Enstrom also expressed concerns that the review panel "is supposed to have term limits of up to three years" to keep the panel from being dominated by one school of thought, yet "many of them had been in their posts for over 20 years."

He said he voiced those concerns in 2008 to CARB, former UC President Robert Dynes, and current UC President Mark Yudof. The UC president is charged with making nominations for the Scientific Review Panel.

At least five of the nine panel members have since been replaced.

"Cal EPA had been talking internally for a while just about encouraging some more diversity on the board, in terms of expertise and in terms of opinion, so that's part of the reason for the new appointments," Lindsay VanLaningham, deputy secretary of communications for the California Environmental Protection Agency, told FoxNews.com.

VanLaningham said she wasn't sure what Enstrom's role was in the panel's recent changes, but she confirmed that some of the replaced members had been on the board past their term limits.

"We were under the legal impression that they were permitted to serve if we didn't have a new appointment," she said. "... sometimes it's a lengthy process to find new appointees."

Enstrom also blew the whistle on a CARB staffer, Hien Tran, who authored a report that was central to the legislation – after faking his credentials.

"He said he had a Ph.D. from UC Davis. Turns out he had bought his Ph.D. online for \$1,000," Enstrom said.

Tran was demoted, but his report was still used to "set the context for the health benefits of reducing diesel emissions" when the board voted on the trucking regulations, CARB spokesman Stanley Young told FoxNews.com.

What the board didn't take into consideration, Enstrom says, were the many studies, including his own, that contradict its conclusion that diesel soot has caused premature deaths in California.

So in February, he and other scientists presented the board with some of their findings, and in June he co-authored an [op-ed for Forbes.com](#) in which he voiced his concerns with the regulations.

Less than a month later he received a [letter from UCLA](#) saying his contract would not be renewed because his "research is not aligned with the academic mission of the Department."

Dr. Michael Siegel, professor and associate chairman at Boston University's School of Public Health, says the reasoning raises some red flags.

"The mission of the department is to study the impacts of the environment on human health and that's exactly what Enstrom does," Siegel told FoxNews.com. "...What the department appears to be saying is it's not the nature of his research but the nature of his findings."

Siegel says he doesn't even agree with a lot of Enstrom's findings, but he agrees with his right to relay them without fear of losing his job.

"The significance of this is a threat to academic freedom and it's also a threat to academic science," Siegel said. "If scientists have to produce work that meets a certain view to keep their jobs, researchers are going to stop publishing negative findings for fear of being fired."

But UCLA says Enstrom's findings had nothing to do with his dismissal.

"The nature of research results, political views or popularity are not appropriate factors and are not considered when evaluating individuals for reappointment," Hilary Godwin, associate dean for academic programs at UCLA's School of Public Health, said in a statement.

She said Enstrom's position at the school was non-tenured and was appointed for fixed terms that are renewable subject to established departmental and university review procedures.

When asked why Enstrom's contract wasn't renewed, UCLA spokeswoman Sarah Anderson said the school was unable to comment further because the issue "is considered a confidential personnel matter."

Richard Saller, Dean of Stanford University's School of Humanities and Sciences, says it's not every day that a school will let a research professor go because his research doesn't align with the school's mission, but it does "occasionally happen."

"At Stanford these non-tenured research faculty are generally on soft money from grants, and if the grants dry up or the research of the program/department shifts away from a faculty member's interest, the position may have to be terminated," Saller said.

Dr. Stephen Maxwell, a surgeon at Mercy San Juan Medical Center and volunteer for the American Lung Association, says Enstrom's pattern of being in the severe minority with his scientific findings also raises legitimate concerns.

"If 100 people conclude one thing and another person concludes something completely different, then it's natural for his credibility to be called into question," Maxwell said.

Robert McClernon, president of the California Dump Truck Owners Association, which opposes the diesel standards, says the officials who support them are "systematically quieting down anybody that's against what they're doing," and that Enstrom was just their latest target.

"We go to the board meetings and Mary Nichols will give someone else 15 minutes to talk and will limit us to three," McClernon told FoxNews.com, referring to CARB Chairwoman Mary Nichols, who is a former UCLA professor. "It's so one-sided it almost makes you sick to be involved in it, but of course we have to be involved in it because it's our livelihood."

McClernon, who owns a dump truck company in Sacramento, said the regulations not only make it too expensive for companies like his to maintain their fleets but also devalue the trucks they currently own, paralyzing their ability to get loans.

"Right now at Bank of American they pull all your credit lines back away from you because the value of your equipment is no good, so they don't have any basis for collateral," he told FoxNews.com. "So I have no credit line anymore."

Young said Nichols is still an active member of the UCLA community, but neither she nor anyone else on the board had anything to do with the university's vote not to renew Enstrom's contract.

The board's information officer, Karen Caesar, also denied accusations that it didn't heed different perspectives on the diesel regulations.

"We do everything we can to consider smaller businesses and the financial climate of the state and the country, so we don't make these decisions in a vacuum," Caesar told FoxNews.com. "These regulations are passed with a lot of thought and consideration and with hearing testimony from all sides."

Caesar says considering California has the worst air in the country and 28 million registered vehicles in a state of 37 million people, the regulations are necessary.

Still, the board is proposing several amendments to the regulations and inviting truckers and others to offer their input in a series of meetings to be held in different parts of the state starting Aug. 31 -- coincidentally, the day after Enstrom's last scheduled payday.

Meanwhile, Enstrom says he's not only utilizing the school's traditional appeals process but has also filed a complaint under [UCLA's Whistle Blower Protection Policies](#), which he says could mean he'll be on the payroll a little longer than previously thought.

"I filed a whistleblower complaint on Friday which I guess, according to the university policy, that trumps the normal grievance process, which I'd already filed early in August... so I just got this email saying

they're going to extend my appointment until the grievance process runs or until the end of March," Enstrom told FoxNews.com Monday night. "...it makes no mention of whether they'll keep me on even if I do win in the appeals process, but right now I'll take what I can get."

Anderson confirmed Tuesday that "Dr. Enstrom's appointment has been extended until March 31 or until the grievance process has been completed, whichever comes first," but would not discuss the issue any further because it is a "confidential personnel matter."

#####