

The Week That Was: 2011-10-29 (October 29, 2011)

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

The Science and Environmental Policy Project

#####

Climate Change Reconsidered: 2011 Interim Report

[S. Fred Singer](#), [Craig Idso](#), [Robert M. Carter](#) – August 29, 2011 Published by [Heartland Institute](#)

Summary: <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/FrontMatter.pdf>

Chapter Review and Full Report <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/2011report.html>

#####

On the Road Again: Fred Singer will be speaking at the Santa Fe Conference on Tuesday morning immediately following Richard Muller of the BEST project. Singer's comments will raise some issues concerning the BEST findings.

Schedule Of Presentations At The Third Santa Fe Conference On Global and Regional Climate Variability, October 31-November 4, 2011; Posted by Roger Pielke Sr, Pielke Climate Science, Oct 26, 2011

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2011/10/26/schedule-of-presentations-at-the-third-santa-fe-conference-on-global-and-regional-climate-variability-october-31-november-4-2011/>

#####

Quote of the Week:

Men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing ever happened. Winston Churchill [H/t Dan Cohan]

#####

Number of the Week: 15 of 44 – 34%

#####

THIS WEEK:

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

The past two weeks have been marked by several events that are causing considerable controversy in the global warming / climate change community. These events include the report on land surface temperatures from BEST, a book by Donna Laframboise on the IPCC, a paper by William Gray, and a paper claiming no major global climate change over the past 20,000 years followed by a compelling rebuttal.

BEST Report: Richard Muller, the head of the Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature (BEST) team, announced in a Wall Street Journal op-ed that BEST has submitted four articles for publication on its findings regarding the land surface temperature record. The article that garnered the greatest interest is the finding that the BEST results are consistent with the records reported by NOAA, Climatic Research Unit (CRU), and NASA-GISS, and that if there is an outlier it is NASA-GISS. BEST reports that the record shows a warming over the past two hundred years.

Perhaps because the press release was excessive, this announcement caused great controversy. But, as Fred Singer points out in his comments following an editorial in *Nature*, this should be no surprise because all groups, with some modifications, rely on the same basic data set – the *Global Historical Climatology Network* produced by NOAA's National Climatic Data Center. Singer has further comments in an op-ed scheduled for publication early next week.

BEST is to be congratulated for undertaking its difficult task without government support or involvement of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Further, the team has posted its methodology and data for independent review – an action sorely lacking in climate science. Muller's op-ed goes on to state that BEST drew no conclusions as to cause. The only record analyzed is the land

surface record, not the atmospheric or sea surface record. Seas cover about 71% of the earth's surface and will be the subject of the next project. Muller also stated that the human component in warming may be overstated.

Among the more surprising findings, subjects in separate papers, are that the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect is slight and that the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO) may have a greater impact on land surface temperatures than the El Niño Southern Oscillation. No doubt the papers and the statistical techniques used will be subject to independent scrutiny. Ocean oscillations are ignored in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), the latest report.

Commentators in a number of newspapers, such as the Washington Post and other news media, immediately proclaimed that the BEST study is proof that those labeled climate skeptics / deniers are wrong and they are anti-science. In so doing, many of these commentators committed two major logical fallacies, the strawman argument and *petitio principii*. One, these commentators misstated the position of most skeptics who challenge the findings of the IPCC and state that climate / temperature change is normal and natural. Two, the commentators assumed that late 20th century warming is proof of human cause while the challengers demand compelling evidence that human emissions of carbon dioxide are the cause of 20th century warming.

Science is built using, among other tools, rigorous logic. Thus, those who use logical fallacies to label the skeptics / deniers as anti-science are, more correctly, labeling themselves.

Among other objections to the BEST reports, the *Nature* editorial, and several others, raised the fact that the findings were announced prior to publication in a peer reviewed journal. However, it is the policies of editors of *Nature*, and many other journals, that have lead to such actions. As evidenced by the difficulties that qualified researchers, such as Richard Lindzen and Roy Spencer, have in getting articles published, the editors of many journals block publication of studies that are contrary to their beliefs (that is, contrary to the pronouncements of the IPCC). Yet, *Nature* published the "hockey-stick" that directly contradicted a large body of prior scientific work. The fact that the BEST team is willing to make its methodology and data available to all who wish to analyze it, is a greater testament to the seriousness of the work than publication in a journal that reflects the beliefs of the editors.

As of this writing, some analysts are raising issues regarding the BEST data record, particularly the most recent data. On Tuesday, Fred Singer will raise issues concerning the data record at the Santa Fe conference noted above.

Please see Articles #1 and #2, reference links under "Measurement Issues" and the discussion below under "20,000 years of climate change."

Hidden Influence on the IPCC? Writer Donna Laframboise just published a book exposing the interrelationships among principal members of the IPCC and various environmental groups, such as the WWF (World Wildlife Fund) and Greenpeace. In principle, it is the quality of the work that matters, not the associations of the participants. It should not make any difference if the participants are associated with environmental groups, oil companies, tobacco companies, or whatever. But the associations should have been revealed.

Governments have spent tens of billions of dollars of public money based upon the findings of the IPCC. It is difficult to determine that if the governments had known of extensive involvement in the IPCC by those associated with environmental groups; the governments would have spent public funds so freely. Certainly, many of those demanding action on the IPCC's questionable findings would not be doing so if the participants were associated with oil or tobacco companies.

Ms. Laframboise’s charges are serious, thus the evidence substantiating these charges must be serious. In an article published in the Financial Post, Laframboise accused Rajendra Pachauri of writing forewords to reports by Greenpeace and signing as IPCC Chairman, thus implying IPCC endorsement of the reports. There were direct links to the reports, substantiating the charges. In her review, Judith Curry states that the Kindle version of the book contains numerous links verifying the charges.

If the links in *The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken for the World’s Top Climate Expert* continue to substantiate the charges, then the book is starkly different from *Merchants of Doubt*. In the latter book, authors Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway level very serious charges against four distinguished scientists, three of whom are dead. The authors fail to provide the evidence needed to substantiate the very serious charges. Instead, they cover their failure with extensive footnotes that do not directly address the issues. One book is an exposé, the other, a smear.

It should be remembered that IPCC Vice-Chair Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, who is associated with Greenpeace, tried to suppress Fred Singer’s talk in Brussels this past September, forcing a change in venue. IPCC Vice-Chair Jean-Pascal van Ypersele falsely claimed Singer is associated the fossil fuel industry.

Please see links under “Questioning the Orthodoxy.”

Number of the Week: 15 out of 44 – 34%: The number of chapters in the IPCC – AR4 that at least one of the coordinating lead authors was affiliated with WWF (World Wildlife Fund) as reported by Donna Laframboise and cited by Judith Curry. Please see links under “Questioning the Orthodoxy.”

Extreme Weather: In a privately produced paper, “Gross Errors in the IPCC – AR4 Report Regarding Past & Future Changes in Global Tropical Cyclone Activity,” noted tropical cyclone (hurricane) expert William Gray challenges the findings in AR4 that warming will produce more intense storms, especially tropical cyclones (which are called hurricanes in the Atlantic). Gray specifically rebuts numerous statements found in AR4, particularly in Chapter 3, “Observations: Surface and Atmospheric Climate Change.” The Coordinating Lead Authors of the chapter are Kevin Trenberth and Philip Jones. Both gained notoriety in the Climategate emails by expressing a willingness to suppress contradicting research.

Gray claims that none of the lead authors have a particular expertise in the field of tropical cyclones, and that many of the conclusions are contradicted by observations. Gray’s writing is quite blunt.

Hopefully, Gray’s paper will not be ignored because the issue is extremely significant and needs to be fully addressed. Organizations such as the US EPA have claimed that global warming endangers human health and welfare because, in part, it will result in more intense storms, especially hurricanes in the US.

Please see links under “Challenging the Orthodoxy.”

20,000 Years of Climate Change: In a recent paper, Svante Björck states that over the past 20,000 years there has been no uniform, global warming and cooling until recently, thus human emissions of carbon dioxide must be the cause. As TWTW has pointed out, uniform global warming does not exist now. Thirty years of satellite measurements of atmospheric temperatures show the warming is concentrated in the northern part of the Northern Hemisphere, with little or no warming in the Tropics or the Southern Hemisphere.

Björck's findings are contradicted by the large body of studies showing both a Medieval Warm Period and a Little Ice Age. These studies can be found in the NIPCC Reports 2009 and 2011 as well as the NIPCC web site and the web site of Sherwood, Craig, and Keith Idso, CO2 Science.org.

On the web site of Anthony Watts, Don Easterbrook produced the most devastating rebuttal. He shows a graph covering the last 20,000 years compiled from proxy temperature measurements from GRIP-2 ice cores taken in Greenland. The graph shows drastic, abrupt temperature changes for the periods immediately preceding, including, and immediately following the Younger Dryas. Directly contradicting Björck, Easterbrook then shows similar abrupt changes for the same period from ice cores taken from glaciers around the world. The graph of Greenland ice cores should be required viewing for anyone claiming 20th century warming is unprecedented.

Please see links under "Changing Climate."

#####

ARTICLES:

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

1. Results confirming climate change are welcome, even when released before peer review.

By Staff Writers, Nature, Oct 27, 2011 [H/t Willie Soon]

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v478/n7370/full/478428a.html>

Followed by comments from Fred Singer.

2. The Case Against Global-Warming Skepticism

There were good reasons for doubt, until now.

By Richard Muller, WSJ, Oct 21, 2011

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204422404576594872796327348.html?KEYWORDS=Muller>

3. EPA's CO2 Endangerment Finding is Endangered

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Oct 15, 2011

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/10/epas_co2_endangerment_finding_is_endangered.html

4. A Life in Energy and (Therefore) Politics

The CEO of America's third-largest utility on competing in an electricity market built on political fads and lobbyists.

By Joseph Rago, WSJ, Oct 22, 2011 [H/t Glenn Schleede]

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204618704576641351747987560.html>

'Prostitution, horse racing, gambling and electricity are irresistible to politicians,' says John Rowe, the CEO of the Chicago-based utility Exelon.

[SEPP Comment: In an otherwise frank interview, the CEO of the company that has a large number of nuclear plants and few coal plants cannot help but criticize his coal competitors by citing EPA's dubious health claims on burning coal.]

5. The Post-Global Warming World

Moving on from climate virtue.

Editorial, WSJ, Oct 26, 2011 [H/t Anne Debeil]

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204618704576640730949448812.html?mod=ITP_opini
[on_2](#)

[SEPP Comment: The cost of an idealized climate is high – impossible?]

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Challenging the Orthodoxy

Gross Errors in the IPCC-AR4 Report Regarding Past & Future Changes in Global Tropical Cyclone Activity – A Noble Disgrace

By William Gray, SPPI, Oct 17, 2011

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/gross_errors_ipcc_ar4.html

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

Comment On The Quality Of The 2007 IPCC WG1 Report In Response To A Post On Climate Etc

By Roger Pielke, Sr, Pielke Climate Science, Oct 20, 2011 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2011/10/20/comment-on-the-quality-of-the-2007-ipcc-wg1-report-in-response-to-a-post-on-climate-etc/>

“The 2007 IPCC WG1 report ignored peer-reviewed papers which conflicts with their narrow focus on the radiative forcing of CO2 and a few other greenhouse gases.

The 2007 IPCC WG1, in my view, was a failure in the assessment of the understanding of the human role in the climate system, as well as the extent to which the natural forcings and feedbacks influence the climate.”

New Research Casts Doubt on Doomsday Water Shortage Predictions

By measuring the isotopes in river water, scientists have determined that mountain glaciers contribute less than thought to downstream water supplies

By Lisa Friedman and ClimateWire, Scientific American, Oct 24, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=research-casts-doubt-doomsday-water-shortage-predictions>

Defending the Orthodoxy

The scientific finding that settles the climate-change debate

By Eugene Robinson, Washington Post, Oct 24, 2011

http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-scientific-finding-that-settles-the-climate-change-debate/2011/03/01/gIQAd6QfDM_story.html

[SEPP Comment: See the above discussion on the illogical claims stemming from on the BEST research.]

Climate scientist - yes, we avoid debate

By Simon, Australian Climate Madness, Oct 28, 2011 [H/t Catherine French]

<http://www.australianclimatemadness.com/2011/10/climate-scientist-yes-we-avoid-debate/>

Global warming study finds no grounds for climate sceptics' concerns

Independent investigation of the key issues sceptics claim can skew global warming figures reports that they have no real effect

By Ian Sample, Guardian, UK, Oct 20, 2011 [H/t Best on the Web]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/oct/20/global-warming-study-climate-sceptics>

Where Did Global Warming Go?

By Elizabeth Rosenthal, NYT, Oct 15, 2011

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/16/sunday-review/whatever-happened-to-global-warming.html?_r=1&ref=opinion

[SEPP Comment: On par with: why did Candidate X win the election, I don't know anyone who voted for him?]

US energy secretary: Climate debate similar to argument that smoking isn't dangerous

By Staff Writers, AP, Oct 18, 2011

http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/us-energy-secretary-climate-debate-similar-to-argument-that-smoking-isnt-dangerous/2011/10/18/gIQAefL4uL_story.html

[SEPP Comment: Steven Chu is losing credibility daily. This false analogy fails.]

Questioning the Orthodoxy

Book excerpt: IPCC's activist 'experts'

New book shows key UN panel is in bed with green lobbies

By Donna Laframboise, Financial Post, Oct 24, 2011

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/10/24/book-excerpt-ipccs-activist-experts/>

Laframboise on the IPCC

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc, Oct 19, 2011

<http://judithcurry.com/2011/10/19/laframboise-on-the-ipcc/#more-5396>

[SEPP Comment: Commentary from someone who defended the IPCC until 2009.]

The Games Climate Scientists Play

By Roger Pielke Jr, GWPF, Oct 25, 2011

<http://www.thegwgf.org/best-of-blogs/4199-the-games-climate-scientists-play.html>

Cult of Global Warming Is Losing Influence

By Michael Barone, Townhall, Oct 24, 2011

http://townhall.com/columnists/michaelbarone/2011/10/24/cult_of_global_warming_is_losing_influence

Green Agenda unravelling around the world

By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Oct 21, 2011

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/10/green-agenda-unravelling-around-the-world-ex-australia/#more-18459>

Questioning European Green

EU Leak Shows Wind, Solar Energy to Double Power Bills

By Walter Russell Mead, American Interest, Oct 19, 2011 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2011/10/19/eu-leak-shows-wind-solar-energy-to-double-power-bills/>

Is Germany's Green Energy Plan Failing?

By Laura Gitschier and Christian Schwägerl, Spiegel, Oct 11, 2011 [H/t Dave Rosin]

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,790940,00.html>

[SEPP Comment: Soon the warm glow of the International Renewable Energy Agency may be replaced by the harsh cold of still winter nights.]

Say no to wind farms: Shale of the century

By Matt Ridley, Spectator, UK, Oct 15, 2011

<http://www.spectator.co.uk/essays/all/7308923/say-no-to-wind-farms-shale-of-the-century.thtml>

Fuel poverty 'will claim 2,700 victims this winter'

Interim report from an independent review of fuel poverty says the number of people living in cold homes contributes to Britain's unusually high rates of 'excess winter deaths'

By Mark King, Guardian, UK, Oct 19, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/money/2011/oct/19/fuel-poverty-2700-victims-winter>

Green Suicide: Emissions Rules Threaten More Manufacturing Jobs

By David Robertson, The Times, Oct 18, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/uk-news/4140-green-suicide-emission-rules-threaten-more-manufacturing-jobs.html>

Chopping Has Just Begun: Green Subsidies Slashed -- The Guardian & Bloomberg

By Staff Writers, GWPF Oct 20, 2011,

<http://www.thegwpf.org/uk-news/4153-chopping-wont-stop-here-green-subsidies-slashed.html>

UK renewable energy subsidies slashed

- Cuts to biomass, energy from waste and microgeneration
- Marine and offshore wind funding remains high

By Fiona Harvey, Guardian, UK, Oct 20, 2011

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/oct/20/renewable-energy-subsidies-slashed>

Coalition's green hue fades with solar cuts

By Jim Pickard and Pilita Clark, Financial Times, Oct 20, 2011

<http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/fea55166-fa6c-11e0-8fe7-00144feab49a.html#axzz1bLD67Kqm>

Chris Huhne: no change in direction on carbon budgets

Energy and climate change secretary insists no shift in UK carbon strategy, despite chancellor's pledge to match EU emissions cuts

By James Murray, Guardian, UK, Oct 10, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/oct/10/chris-huhne-carbon-budgets>

Expanding the Orthodoxy

Why we must support clean energy in U.S.: our national security

By Steven Anderson, John Castellaw, Dennis McGinn, and Norman, Seip, Tampa Tribune, Oct 9, 2011 [H/t Peter Friedman]

<http://www2.tbo.com/news/opinion/2011/oct/09/vwopino1-why-we-must-support-clean-energy-in-us-ou-ar-270340/>

“The Army is working toward a "Net Zero" strategy where bases will consume only as much energy or water as they produce.”

[SEPP Comment: These former leaders have been brainwashed. Exactly how will Fort Irwin, the National Training Center, produce the fuel used by armored vehicles in training exercises? The new \$2 billion, 500-MW project of solar panels will not do it. The term “lights out” will take on new meaning.]

Warming Revives Dream of Sea Route in Russian Arctic

By Andrew E. Kramer, NYT, Oct 17, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/18/business/global/warming-revives-old-dream-of-sea-route-in-russian-arctic.html?nl=todaysheadlines&adxnml=1&emc=tha25&adxnmlx=1318935645-0dcEvMT0Sf6W19pQT1CJRw>

[SEPP Comment: May be true, but not proof of cause.]

Problems within the Orthodoxy

Candid comments from global warming scientists

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc, Oct 27, 2011

<http://judithcurry.com/2011/10/27/candid-comments-from-global-warming-scientists/>

[SEPP Comment: Adding her comments to a post by Roger Pielke Sr.]

Climate talks may be doomed – EU

By Staff Writers, Reuters, Oct 18, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.news24.com/SciTech/News/Climate-talks-may-be-doomed-EU-20111018>

Japan Likely To Abandon Unilateral CO2 Targets

By Mari Itawa, WSJ, GWPF, Oct 20, 2011

<http://www.thegwpf.org/international-news/4152-japan-likely-to-abandon-unilateral-co2-targets.html>

The Death of the Kyoto Process

By Christian Schwägerl and Gerald Traufetter, Spiegel, Oct 18, 2011 [H/t Dave Rosin]

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,druck-792224,00.html>

Seeking a Common Ground

Study finds no evidence that climate change caused more severe flooding

By Andrew Restuccia, The Hill, Oct 24, 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/189349-study-finds-no-evidence-that-climate-change-has-caused-more-severe-floods>

Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate?

Extreme Melting on Greenland Ice Sheet

By Staff Writers, SPX, Oct 26, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Extreme_Melting_on_Greenland_Ice_Sheet_999.html

[SEPP Comment: The researchers should look at the temperature record from Greenland ice cores.]

Glaciers in China shrinking with warming

By Staff Writers, UPI, Oct 21, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Glaciers_in_China_shrinking_with_warming_999.html

[SEPP Comment: “Ever” extends back to 2005]

Severe drought, other changes can cause permanent ecosystem disruption

By Staff Writers, SPX, Oct 17, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Severe_drought_other_changes_can_cause_permanent_ecosystem_disruption_999.html

[SEPP Comment: An eight year study drawing conclusions for thousands of years.]

'Risk Atlas' assesses climate vulnerability

By Matthew Knight, CNN, Oct 26, 2011

<http://www.cnn.com/2011/10/26/world/europe/cities-climate-threat-report/>

[SEPP Comment: People vote with their feet. Urbanization has long been an example of seeking a better life, though those desiring to control humanity have considered such movements undesirable.]

Communicating Better to the Public – Make things up.

Climate change poses immediate threat to health: experts

By Staff Writers, AFP, Oct 17, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Climate_change_poses_immediate_threat_to_health_experts_999.html

Millions Will Be Trapped Amid Climate Change, Study Warns

By Hillary Rosner, NYT, Oct 20, 2011

<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/10/20/millions-will-be-trapped-amid-climate-change-study-warns/?ref=science>

Models v. Observations

Computer Model temperature predictions accurate????

By Don Easterbrook, ICECAP, Oct 22, 2011

http://icecap.us/index.php/go/joes-blog/computer_model_temperature_predictions_accurate/

A Cool Look At 2011, and 2012

By David Whitehouse, The Observatory, Oct 19, 2011

<http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/4143-a-cool-look-at-2011-and-2012.html>

[SEPP Comment: Describing two types of scientists. 1) “His point was that before us [a long roll of data] was what the universe was saying, and that it was more important than any theory.” 2) “He had won many awards for his contributions to climate science, and he introduced himself as a ‘scientist, which means my main interest is in modeling.’”]

Measurement Issues

Papers Submitted for Peer Review (October 2011)

Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature

<http://www.berkeleyearth.org/resources.php>

Earth Atmospheric Land Surface Temperature and Station Quality in the United States

Muller, R.A. et al. BEST

http://www.berkeleyearth.org/Resources/Berkeley_Earth_Station_Quality

Decadal Variations in the Global Atmospheric Land Temperatures

Muller, R.A., et al. BEST

http://www.berkeleyearth.org/Resources/Berkeley_Earth_Decadal_Variations

[SEPP Comment: Paper showing AMO is more closely correlated with land temperatures than El Niño Southern Oscillation.]

Influence of Urban Heating on the Global Temperature Land Average

Using Rural Sites Identified from MODIS Classifications

Wickham, C. et al. BEST

http://www.berkeleyearth.org/Resources/Berkeley_Earth_UHI

Muller's findings of warming are 'nothing remarkable' -- BEST study does not alter Climategate's 'serious breaches of ethics'

By Richard Lindzen and David Douglass, reproduced with permission by Marc Morano, Climate Depot, Oct 24, 2011

<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/13403/MITs-Richard-Lindzen--Physicist-David-Douglass-Mullers-findings-of-warming-arenothing-remarkable--BEST-study-does-not-alter-Climategates-serious-breaches-of-ethics>

Sceptical Berkeley Scientists Say, “Human Component Of Global Warming May Be Somewhat Overestimated”

By David Whitehouse, The Observatory, Oct 21, 2011

<http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/4161-sceptical-berkeley-scientists-say-human-component-of-global-warming-may-be-somewhat-overestimated.html>

Climate study, funded in part by conservative group, confirms global warming

The latest global warming results confirm those from earlier, independent studies by scientists at NASA and elsewhere that came under fire from skeptics in an episode known as 'climategate.'

By Pete Spotts, Christian Science Monitor, Oct 21, 2011 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/2011/1021/Climate-study-funded-in-part-by-conservative-group-confirms-global-warming>

[SEPP Comment: Except for the propaganda photo at the beginning, a fair article describing the findings.]

What BEST Means And What It Doesn't

This post is for you to link into discussions proliferating across the internet which are filled with error.

By William Briggs, The Observatory, Oct 25, 2011

<http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/4196-william-briggs-what-best-means-and-what-it-doesnt.html>

Five Climate Questions for Richard Muller (Temperature findings begin, not end, the real debate)

By Kenneth P. Green, Master Resource, Oct 24, 2011

<http://www.masterresource.org/2011/10/five-climate-questions-muller/>

BEST Is Worst: The Irrelevance of Richard Muller's Vaunted Proclamation

By E. Calvin Beisner, Cornwall Alliance, Oct 25, 2011

<http://www.cornwallalliance.org/blog/item/best-is-worst-the-irrelevance-of-richard-mullers-vaunted-proclamation/>

The Death Of Global Warming Skepticism, Or The Birth Of Straw Men?

By James Taylor, Forbes, Oct 26, 2011

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2011/10/26/the-death-of-global-warming-skepticism-or-the-birth-of-straw-men/>

Changing Weather

Natural Variability Still Plays Large Role in Winter Climate

By Patrick Michaels, World Climate Report, Oct 24, 2011

<http://www.worldclimaterreport.com/index.php/2011/10/24/natural-variability-still-plays-large-role-in-winter-climate/>

Blame the Weather for Your energy Bill

By Karolin Schaps, Planet Ark, Oct 17, 2011 [H/t Hugh Sharman]

<http://planetark.org/wen/63584>

Changing Climate

Current global warming appears anomalous in relation to the climate of the last 20000 years

By Svante Björck, Climate Research, July 19, 2011

<http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/cr/v48/n1/p5-11/>

No global climate change in the past 20,000 years?

By Don Easterbrook, WUWT, Oct 25, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/10/25/no-global-climate-change-in-the-past-20000-years/#more-49967>

Changing Seas

Sea levels not rising: Swedish scientist

By Staff Writer, The Hindu, Oct 15, 2011

<http://www.thehindu.com/sci-tech/energy-and-environment/article2538017.ece?homepage=true>

Sea levels will continue to rise for 500 years

By Staff Writers, SPX, Oct 18, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Sea_levels_will_continue_to_rise_for_500_years_999.html

[SEPP Comment: Ignore observations! The models so declare it, thus it must be so.]

Sea levels will rise, washing away climate deniers

By Fred Grimm, Miami Herald, Oct 22, 2011

<http://www.miamiherald.com/2011/10/22/v-fullstory/2467017/sea-levels-will-rise-washing-away.html>

[SEPP Comment: Much of south Florida was covered by seas about 125,000 years ago. Will controlling human emissions of carbon dioxide prevent such an occurrence in the future?]

Changing Earth

Forest fires are becoming larger and more frequent

By Staff Writers, SPX, Oct 26, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Forest_fires_are_becoming_larger_and_more_frequent_999.html

[SEPP Comment: From changes other than global warming.]

Acidic Waters

Run-off, emissions deliver double whammy to coastal marine creatures

By Chelsea Toledo, SPX, Oct 26, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Run_off_emissions_deliver_double_whammy_to_coastal_marine_creatures_999.html

“When these algae die, they sink to the sea floor and decompose, releasing carbon dioxide and decreasing the amount of oxygen in the water. The dissolved carbon dioxide reacts with water, forming an acid.”

[SEPP Comment: Combining a real issue with the phony issue of ocean acidification gets the double whammy.]

The Political Games Continue

GOP Lawmakers Challenge White House on 'Scientific Misconduct'

By Staff Writers, Fox News, Oct 20, 2011

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2011/10/19/gop-lawmakers-challenge-white-house-on-scientific-misconduct/#ixzz1bKc2wB6F>

Litigation Issues

Judge delivers 'bittersweet' polar bear ruling

Amanda Coyne, Alaska Dispatch, Oct 17, 2011 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/judge-delivers-bittersweet-polar-bear-ruling>

Cap-and-Trade and Carbon Taxes

Cardinal Pell Questions The Price Of Climate Action

By Tess Livingstone, The Australian, Oct 26, 2011

<http://www.thegwpf.org/uk-news/4208-cardinal-pell-questions-the-price-of-climate-action.html>

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

Future of Solar and Wind Power May Hinge on Federal Aid

By Kate Galbraith, NYT, Oct 25, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/26/business/energy-environment/future-of-solar-and-wind-power-may-hinge-on-federal-aid.html?ref=earth>

[SEPP Comment: Federal tax credits of 30% of cost, in cash, expire this year for wind farms and in 2016 for solar.]

Economic Slowdown Challenges Renewable Energy

By James Kanter, NYT, Oct 26, 2011

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/27/business/global/economic-slowdown-challenges-renewable-energy.html?_r=1

[SEPP Comment: The economic slowdown is making governments question policies of subsidizing solar and wind.]

Solar Power Industry Falls Short of Hopes in Job Creation

By Matthew Wald, NYT, Oct 25, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/26/business/energy-environment/in-terms-of-jobs-solar-energy-lacks-power.html>

EPA and other Regulators on the March

White House begins review of EPA air toxics rule

By Ben Geman, The Hill, Oct 25 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/189651-white-house-begins-review-of-epa-air-toxics-rule>

“On Monday EPA sent OMB the “appropriate and necessary” finding that lays out the scientific and legal basis for the upcoming regulations for coal-fired and oil-fired power plants.”

Agency to Set Standards on Fracking Waste Water

By Deborah Solomon, WSJ, Oct 21, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203752604576643440443268466.html?mod=ITP_pageone_1

"The president has made clear that natural gas has a central role to play in our energy economy," said EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson. "We can protect the health of American families and communities at the same time we ensure access to all of the important resources that make up our energy economy."

[SEPP Comment: Another highly questionable claim from EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson.]

US to set water pollution standards for 'fracking'

By Staff Writers, AFP, Oct 20, 2011

http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/US_to_set_water_pollution_standards_for_fracking_999.html

Feds eye gas drilling fluids

EPA planning new rules for wastewater disposal and other liquids from gas drilling sites

By Jennifer Dlouhy, Hearst Newspapers, Oct 20, 2011 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://www.timesunion.com/news/article/Feds-eye-gas-drilling-fluids-2229159.php>

EPA will not tighten farm dust standards

By Andrew Restuccia, The Hill, Oct 24, 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/187927-epa-we-will-not-tighten-farm-dust-standards>

Insight: N.Y. gas drillers' victory soured by tough new rules

By Edward McAllister, Reuters, Oct 21, 2011 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/10/21/us-newyork-shale-idUSTRE79K4YT20111021>

Energy Issues

Don't Be Afraid of the Keystone XL Pipeline

The Canadian pipeline won't mean "the end of safe drinking water."

By Ronald Bailey, Reason, Oct 25, 2011

<http://reason.com/archives/2011/10/25/environmentalist-keystone-cape>

Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?

Can the U.S. drill its way out of its energy crisis? Yes, it can

By Yadullah Hussain, Financial Post, Oct 26, 2011

<http://business.financialpost.com/2011/10/26/can-the-u-s-drill-its-way-out-of-its-energy-crisis-yes-it-can/>

[SEPP Comment: Another example of the energy revolution. A US company that plan to import liquefied natural gas (LNG) into the US signed an agreement with a British LNG trading company to export LNG from the US.]

Natural Gas Production Moves East

Editorial, Real Clear Energy, Oct 10, 2011 [H/t Warren Wetmore]

http://www.realclearenergy.org/charticles/2011/10/10/natural_gas_production_moves_east.html

Qatar shifts gas plan as U.S. output grows

By Staff Writers, UPI, Oct 14, 2011

http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Qatar_shifts_gas_plan_as_US_output_grows_999.html

Canada soon to export gas to Asia?

By Staff Writers, UPI, Oct 14, 2011

http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Canada_soon_to_export_gas_to_Asia_999.html

Administration's Control of Oil and Gas

Drilling and Debt

By Donn Dears, Power For USA, Oct 25, 2011

<http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2011/10/25/drilling-and-debt/>

Oil Spills & Consequences

BP Moves to Return to Gulf

By Tennille Tracy, WSJ, Oct 22, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204618704576645051108233460.html?mod=ITP_pageone_1

[SEPP Comment: May be behind a pay wall.]

Nuclear Energy and Fears

European Transmission Operators Warn of Possible Load Shedding This Winter

By Staff Writers POWERnews, Oct 19, 2011

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/4112.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2307417&hq_l=11&hq_v=5e660500d0

Fukushima units on target for cold shutdown

By Staff Wrtiers, WNN, Oct 18, 2011

http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/RS-Fukushima_units_on_target_for_cold_shutdown-1810114.html

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Energy

Concentrating Solar

By Donn Dears, Power For USA, Oct 28, 2011

<http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2011/10/28/concentrating-solar/>

[SEPP Comment: Description of various methods of concentrating solar power.]

Is America Losing the Clean Energy Race?

We Can't Win and It Doesn't Matter

By Marlo Lewis, National Journal, Oct 24, 2011

<http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2011/10/is-america-losing-the-clean-en.php#2102215>

[SEPP Comment: A phony race by wind and solar promoters. China is not even competing.]

National Academies: Ethanol Worsens Greenhouse Gases

Press Release, Environmental Working Group, Oct 4, 2011

<http://www.ewg.org/release/government-finds-ethanol-worsens-greenhouse-gases>

Windmills stopped at night after bat death

By Staff Writers, Associated Press, Boston Herald, October 18, 2011 [H/t Debbie Wetlaufer]]

http://www.bostonherald.com/news/national/northeast/view/20111018windmills_stopped_at_night_after_bat_death/srvc=home%26position=recent

Carbon Schemes

Duke to Take \$220 Million Charge on 'Clean Coal' Plant

By Rebecca Smith, WSJ, Oct 21, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203752604576643483260915402.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

[SEPP Comment: A promoter of cap-and-trade finds that clean coal is expensive.]

California Dreaming

California becomes first state to adopt cap-and-trade program

The California Air Resources Board, in a unanimous vote, adopts landmark regulations of greenhouse gas emissions to curb climate change and meet targets for reducing pollution.

By Julie Cart, LA Times, Oct 21, 2011 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-cap-trade-20111021,0,1125437.story>

[SEPP Comment: Watching the electricity bills will be an education.]

California's Green Power Crisis

By Rich Trzupsek, Front Page, Oct 25, 2011

http://frontpagemag.com/2011/10/25/californias-green-power-crisis/?utm_source=FrontPage+Magazine&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=6a6e848cfa-RSS_EMAIL_CAMPAIGN

California's Persistence

Editorial, NYT, Oct 23, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/24/opinion/californias-persistence-on-greenhouse-gas-emissions.html?nl=todaysheadlines&emc=tha211>

[SEPP Comment: In praise of California's cap and trade.]

California's Economic Suicide,

Editorial, IBD, Oct 25, 2011

<http://news.investors.com/Article.aspx?id=589338&p=1>

[SEPP Comment: A view contrary to that of the New York Times.]

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

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

Predicting the Course of Climate Change Over the Next Decade

Reference: Latif, M. and Keenlyside, N.S. 2011. A perspective on decadal climate variability and predictability. *Deep-Sea Research II* 58: 1880-1894.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/oct/25oct2011a1.html>

The two researchers of this paper list numerous problems that hamper decadal climate predictability, among which is the fact that "the models suffer from large biases"...

Primary Production in the Bering Sea

Reference: Brown, Z.W., van Dijken, G.L. and Arrigo, K.R. 2011. A reassessment of primary production and environmental change in the Bering Sea. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 116: 10.1029/2010JC006766.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/oct/25oct2011a2.html>

"Rather than declining," as the three U.S. (Stanford University) researchers of this study report, they found that mean annual sea ice extent in the Bering Sea "has exhibited no significant change over the satellite sea ice record (1979-2009)," because, as they discovered, significant warming during the satellite sea surface temperature record (1982-2009) "is mainly limited to the summer months"...

Forty Thousand Years of Coccolithophore Responses to Ocean Acidification

Reference: Beaufort, L., Probert, I., de Garidel-Thoron, T., Bendif, E.M., Ruiz-Pino, D., Metzl, N., Goyet, C., Buchet, N., Coupel, P., Grelaud, M., Rost, B., Rickaby, R.E.M. and de Vargas, C. 2011. Sensitivity of coccolithophores to carbonate chemistry and ocean acidification. *Nature* 476: 80-83.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/oct/18oct2011a2.html>

[SEPP Comment: Nature adapts!]

The Impact of Atmospheric CO₂ Enrichment on a Major Oceanic N₂-Fixing Cyanobacterium

Reference: Kranz, S.A., Sultemeyer, D., Richter, K.-U. and Rost, B. 2009. Carbon acquisition by Trichodesmium: The effect of pCO₂ and diurnal changes. *Limnology and Oceanography* 54: 548-559.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/oct/18oct2011a4.html>

[SEPP Comment: Enhanced CO₂ may enrich the oceans, not destroy them.]

Health, Energy, and Climate

Inefficient developing world stoves contribute to 2 million deaths a year

By Staff Writers, SPX, Oct 17, 2011

[http://www.energy-](http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Inefficient_developing_world_stoves_contribute_to_2_million_deaths_a_year_999.htm)

[daily.com/reports/Inefficient_developing_world_stoves_contribute_to_2_million_deaths_a_year_999.htm](http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Inefficient_developing_world_stoves_contribute_to_2_million_deaths_a_year_999.htm)

[SEPP Comment: As John Christy has remarked, a small electrical generator sufficient to supply electricity to every village hut for a microwave and one light bulb would be a great benefit for human health.]

An Inconvenient Eradication: Malaria Deaths Fall Over 20% Worldwide In Last Decade

By Ben Pile, Climate Resistance (GWPF), Oct 18, 2011

<http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/4137-an-inconvenient-eradication-malaria-deaths-fall-over-20-worldwide-in-last-decade.html>

Oh Mann!

It's Libel -- Except When Mike Does It

By Paul Driessen, Townhall, Oct 25, 2011

<http://townhall.com/columnists/pauldriessen/2011/10/25/its-libel--except-when-mike-does-it>

Environmental Industry

The WWF Plan To Make Energy Unaffordable In Britain By 2030

By Tory Aardvark, GWPF, Oct 26, 2011

<http://www.thegwpf.org/best-of-blogs/4203-the-wwf-plan-to-make-energy-unaffordable-in-britain-by-2030.html>

[SEPP Comment: Is it endorsed by IPCC Chairman Pachauri?]

Enviros warn of trade war after House vote on emissions trading

By Keith Laing, The Hill, Oct 25, 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/aviation/189585-enviros-trade-war-possible-after-house-vote-on-eu-airline-emission-trading->

Other Scientific News

See No Evil

Why have a number of areas of US science become so politicized?

By Roger Pielke Jr, His Blog, Oct 20, 2011 [H/t SPPI]

<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2011/10/see-no-evil.html>

Ozone Depletion a Bigger Deal Down Under

By Christina Coleman for Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt MD (SPX) Oct 24, 2011

<http://www.terraviva.com/reports/Ozone-Depletion-a-Bigger-Deal-Down-Under-999.html>

[SEPP Comment: Several weeks after a scare of expansion of the Arctic ozone depletion, another report that the Antarctic ozone depletion is not expanding. Could the proposed cause be wrong?]

NASA, Japan Release Improved Topographic Map of Earth

By Staff Writers, JPL, Oct 19, 2011

http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/NASA_Japan_Release_Improved_Topographic_Map_of_Earth_999.html

Other News that May Be of Interest

One Win for the Forests

Editorial, NYT, Oct 24, 2011

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/25/opinion/one-win-for-the-forests.html?_r=1&nl=todaysheadlines&emc=th211

[SEPP Comment: In addition to National Parks, etc, over one hundred million of acres are declared Wilderness Areas, off limits to the ordinary citizen. How many tens of millions acres are necessary to satisfy the greed for control of land by the environmental industry and their associates in government agencies?]

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Alligator fat as a new source of biodiesel fuel

By Staff Writers, SPX, Oct 28, 2011

http://www.biofueldaily.com/reports/Alligator_fat_as_a_new_source_of_biodiesel_fuel_999.html

[SEPP Comment: Once an endangered species, alligators will become a fuel. Call the Swamp People to get your tank filled!]

Climate change is shrinking species, study warns

By Matthew Knight, CNN, Oct 17, 2011

<http://www.cnn.com/2011/10/17/world/asia/shrinking-species-global-warming/>

[SEPP Comment: Crisis: the warming of the hot swamps may shrink the alligators – reducing our fuel supply.]

Why Is the CIA Keeping Climate Change Secret?

The Central Intelligence Agency is working on climate change, but you'd never know it.

By David Biello, Scientific American, Oct 23, 2011 [H/t Lubos Motl]

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode.cfm?id=why-is-the-cia-keeping-climate-chan-11-10-23>

[SEPP Comment: To see Motl's amusing comments see: <http://motls.blogspot.com/2011/10/sciam-cia-trying-to-keep-global-warming.html#more>

Gevo Awarded Contract to Supply Jet Fuel to USAF

By Staff Writers, SPX, Oct 20, 2011

http://www.biofueldaily.com/reports/Gevo_Awarded_Contract_to_Supply_Jet_Fuel_to_USAF_999.html

[SEPP Comment: \$54 a gallon for kerosene with a few inexpensive additives, who says the Pentagon doesn't know how to spend money!]

#####

ARTICLES:

1. Results confirming climate change are welcome, even when released before peer review.

By Staff Writers, Nature, Oct 27, 2011 [H/t Willie Soon]

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v478/n7370/full/478428a.html>

Followed by comments from Fred Singer.

Global warming is really happening — really. There was no conspiracy or cover-up. Peer review did not fail and the scientists who have spent decades working out the best way to handle and process data turned out to know how to handle and process data after all. Thank you Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature (BEST) study.

Four papers released by the BEST team at the University of California, Berkeley, last week are of undoubted interest to the media, given that they support what is portrayed as the mainstream scientific position on climate change. They could also find traction in politics, especially in the United States, where they could be used to combat the assertions of Republicans, who have effectively tossed climate science away. But the headline scientific conclusion, that a century and a half of instrumental measurements confirm a warming trend, is, well, all a little 1990.

Of course, reproduction of existing results is a valid contribution, and the statistical methods developed by the BEST team could be useful additions to climate science. But valid contributions and useful additions alone do not generate worldwide headlines, so the massive publicity associated with the release of the papers (which were simultaneously submitted to the Journal of Geophysical Research) is a curious affair.

There was predictable grumbling at the media coverage from within the scientific community, which saw it as publicity in lieu of peer review. Reporters are more than happy to cover the story now, while it's

sexy, but will they cover it later, when the results are confirmed, adjusted or corrected in accordance with a thorough vetting? The short answer is no, many of them will not. Barring an extraordinary reversal of message, the wave of press coverage is likely to be only a ripple when the papers are finally published. And this is what upsets the purists: the communication of science in this case comes before the scientific process has run its course.

Members of the Berkeley team revelled in their role as scientific renegades. Richard Muller, the physicist in charge, even told the BBC: "That is the way I practised science for decades; it was the way every-one practised it until some magazines — particularly *Science* and *Nature* — forbade it."

This is both wrong and unhelpful. It is wrong because for years *Nature* has explicitly endorsed the use of preprint servers and confer-ences as important avenues for scientific discussion ahead of submission to this journal, or other *Nature* titles. For example, on [page 493](#) this week we publish a paper that discusses the dwarf planet Eris, based on results that the lead author presented (with *Nature*'s knowledge and consent) at a conference several weeks ago. Journalists are, of course, welcome to report what they come across in such venues — as several did on Eris. What *Nature* discourages is authors specifically promoting their work to the media before a peer-reviewed paper is available for others in the field to read and evaluate.

Muller's statement is unhelpful because such inflammatory claims can only fuel the heated but misguided debate on climate-sceptic blogs and elsewhere about the way science works and how it treats those who insist on viewing themselves as outsiders.

To solicit input on results before publication is not a guerrilla action against a shadowy scientific elite. Witness the posting on a preprint server last month of the paper reporting neutrinos that apparently travel faster than light: the authors made it clear that they were seeking help from the wider community to explain the findings, and the media stories (if not the head-lines) mostly reflected that. To pretend otherwise can only erode public trust in science, as it is practised by all.

The scientific finding that *does not* settle the climate-change debate

S. Fred Singer Letter to Nature Oct 26, 2011

Dear Editors of *Nature*:

What a curious editorial – and how revealing of yr bias!

http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v478/n7370/full/478428a.html?WT.ec_id=NATURE-20111027

Scientific climate. *Nature* **478**, 428, (27 October 2011) doi:10.1038/478428a Published online 26 October 2011.

“Results confirming climate change are welcome, even when released before peer review.”

(emphasis added)

You imply that contrary results are not welcomed by *Nature*. But this has been obvious for many years.

Why are you so jubilant about the findings of the Berkeley Climate Project that you can hardly contain yourself? What do you think they proved? They certainly added little to the ongoing debate on human causes of climate change.

They included data from the same weather stations as the Climategate people, but reported that one-third showed cooling -- not warming. They covered the same land area -- less than 30% of the Earth's surface -- housing recording stations that are poorly distributed, mainly in the US and Western Europe. They state that 70% of US stations are badly sited and don't meet the standards set by government; the rest of the world is likely worse.

But unlike the land surface, the atmosphere has shown no warming trend, either over land or over ocean -- according to satellites and independent data from weather balloons. This indicates to me that there is something very wrong with the land surface data. And did you know that climate models, run on super-computers, all insist that the atmosphere must warm faster than the surface? And so does theory.

And finally, we have non-thermometer temperature data from so-called "proxies": tree rings, ice cores, ocean sediments, stalagmites. They don't show any global warming since 1940!

The BEST (Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature) results in no way confirm the scientifically discredited Hockeystick graph, which had been so eagerly adopted by climate alarmists. In fact, the Hockeystick authors never published their post-1978 temperatures in their 1998 paper in *Nature* -- or since. The reason for hiding them? It's likely that those proxy data show no warming either. Why don't you ask them?

One last word: You evidently haven't read the four scientific BEST papers, submitted for peer review. There, the Berkeley scientists disclaim knowing the cause of the temperature increase reported by their project. They conclude, however: "The human component of global warming may be somewhat overestimated." I commend them for their honesty and skepticism.

2. The Case Against Global-Warming Skepticism

There were good reasons for doubt, until now.

By Richard Muller, WSJ, Oct 21, 2011

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204422404576594872796327348.html?KEYWORDS=Muller>

Are you a global warming skeptic? There are plenty of good reasons why you might be.

As many as 757 stations in the United States recorded net surface-temperature cooling over the past century. Many are concentrated in the southeast, where some people attribute tornadoes and hurricanes to warming.

The temperature-station quality is largely awful. The most important stations in the U.S. are included in the Department of Energy's Historical Climatology Network. A careful survey of these stations by a team led by meteorologist Anthony Watts showed that 70% of these stations have such poor siting that, by the U.S. government's own measure, they result in temperature uncertainties of between two and five degrees Celsius or more. We do not know how much worse are the stations in the developing world.

Using data from all these poor stations, the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates an average global 0.64°C temperature rise in the past 50 years, "most" of which the IPCC says is due to humans. Yet the margin of error for the stations is at least three times larger than the estimated warming.

We know that cities show anomalous warming, caused by energy use and building materials; asphalt, for instance, absorbs more sunlight than do trees. Tokyo's temperature rose about 2°C in the last 50 years. Could that rise, and increases in other urban areas, have been unreasonably included in the global estimates? That warming may be real, but it has nothing to do with the greenhouse effect and can't be addressed by carbon dioxide reduction.

Moreover, the three major temperature analysis groups (the U.S.'s NASA and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the U.K.'s Met Office and Climatic Research Unit) analyze only a small

fraction of the available data, primarily from stations that have long records. There's a logic to that practice, but it could lead to selection bias. For instance, older stations were often built outside of cities but today are surrounded by buildings. These groups today use data from about 2,000 stations, down from roughly 6,000 in 1970, raising even more questions about their selections.

On top of that, stations have moved, instruments have changed and local environments have evolved. Analysis groups try to compensate for all this by homogenizing the data, though there are plenty of arguments to be had over how best to homogenize long-running data taken from around the world in varying conditions. These adjustments often result in corrections of several tenths of one degree Celsius, significant fractions of the warming attributed to humans.

And that's just the surface-temperature record. What about the rest? The number of named hurricanes has been on the rise for years, but that's in part a result of better detection technologies (satellites and buoys) that find storms in remote regions. The number of hurricanes hitting the U.S., even more intense Category 4 and 5 storms, has been gradually decreasing since 1850. The number of detected tornadoes has been increasing, possibly because radar technology has improved, but the number that touch down and cause damage has been decreasing. Meanwhile, the short-term variability in U.S. surface temperatures has been decreasing since 1800, suggesting a more stable climate.

Without good answers to all these complaints, global-warming skepticism seems sensible. But now let me explain why you should not be a skeptic, at least not any longer.

Over the last two years, the Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature Project has looked deeply at all the issues raised above. I chaired our group, which just submitted four detailed papers on our results to peer-reviewed journals. We have now posted these papers online at www.BerkeleyEarth.org to solicit even more scrutiny.

Our work covers only land temperature—not the oceans—but that's where warming appears to be the greatest. Robert Rohde, our chief scientist, obtained more than 1.6 billion measurements from more than 39,000 temperature stations around the world. Many of the records were short in duration, and to use them Mr. Rohde and a team of esteemed scientists and statisticians developed a new analytical approach that let us incorporate fragments of records. By using data from virtually all the available stations, we avoided data-selection bias. Rather than try to correct for the discontinuities in the records, we simply sliced the records where the data cut off, thereby creating two records from one.

We discovered that about one-third of the world's temperature stations have recorded cooling temperatures, and about two-thirds have recorded warming. The two-to-one ratio reflects global warming. The changes at the locations that showed warming were typically between 1-2°C, much greater than the IPCC's average of 0.64°C.

To study urban-heating bias in temperature records, we used satellite determinations that subdivided the world into urban and rural areas. We then conducted a temperature analysis based solely on "very rural" locations, distant from urban ones. The result showed a temperature increase similar to that found by other groups. Only 0.5% of the globe is urbanized, so it makes sense that even a 2°C rise in urban regions would contribute negligibly to the global average.

What about poor station quality? Again, our statistical methods allowed us to analyze the U.S. temperature record separately for stations with good or acceptable rankings, and those with poor rankings (the U.S. is the only place in the world that ranks its temperature stations). Remarkably, the poorly ranked stations showed no greater temperature increases than the better ones. The mostly likely explanation is that while low-quality stations may give incorrect absolute temperatures, they still accurately track temperature changes.

When we began our study, we felt that skeptics had raised legitimate issues, and we didn't know what we'd find. Our results turned out to be close to those published by prior groups. We think that means that

those groups had truly been very careful in their work, despite their inability to convince some skeptics of that. They managed to avoid bias in their data selection, homogenization and other corrections.

Global warming is real. Perhaps our results will help cool this portion of the climate debate. How much of the warming is due to humans and what will be the likely effects? We made no independent assessment of that.

Mr. Muller is a professor of physics at the University of California, Berkeley, and the author of "Physics for Future Presidents" (W.W. Norton & Co., 2008).

3. EPA's CO2 Endangerment Finding is Endangered

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Oct 15, 2011

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/10/epas_co2_endangerment_finding_is_endangered.html

In a narrow 5-4 decision in 2007, the US Supreme Court authorized the EPA to consider the greenhouse gas CO2 as a 'pollutant' under the terms of the Clean Air Act -- provided EPA could demonstrate that CO2 posed a threat to human health and welfare. (CO2 is a colorless gas, non-toxic and non-irritating, and a natural constituent of the atmosphere. In the geological past, CO2 levels have undergone wide variations -- from as low as one half up to twenty times the present level.)

The EPA then issued an Endangerment Finding (EF) in 2009, which was promptly challenged in the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. One of the challenges came from the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) and the Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP). We questioned both the procedure and the validity of the underlying science used by the EPA, as embodied in their TSD (Technical Support Document).

As my CEI colleague Marlo Lewis relates, the EPA's Inspector General (IG) released a report in September 2011, finding that EPA did not meet applicable federal Information (or Data) Quality Act (IQA) standards when developing the TSD. The IG argued that the TSD is a "highly influential scientific assessment," and therefore should have been subjected to the most rigorous form of peer review. EPA fell short of the mark by not publishing the comments of the agency's 12-member peer-review panel, and by placing an EPA employee on the panel, compromising its independence.

EPA claims it met all IQA standards because the TSD, far from being a "highly influential scientific assessment," is not a "scientific assessment" at all. According to EPA, the TSD did not involve any weighing of data, information, or studies. Rather, the TSD simply summarizes assessments of other authorities, principally the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the US National Academy's National Research Council (NRC), and the US Global Change Research Program (USGCRP). [Note that neither NRC and USGCRP are "independent;" both reports are based on the IPCC, whose own Assessment has been compromised by the revelations of the Climategate e-mails.]

But in so saying, EPA may have leapt from the frying pan into the fire, because in the ongoing litigation over EPA's greenhouse gas regulations, a key claim made by the petitioners Coalition for Responsible Regulation is that when EPA developed its TSD and associated EF, it unlawfully outsourced its "judgment" to the IPCC and other non-agency experts.

The Coalition then sent a "request for judicial notice" to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, asking the Court to take cognizance of the IG report and consider its implications for the case. [Marlo Lewis has written an informative and extremely useful [article](#) about this new development at GlobalWarming.Org]

After all of the responses and briefs are filed, the Court may issue a decision around mid-2012.

Faulty EPA Science

The lack of an independent analysis of the science underlying the EF puts the burden right back on the soundness of the science used by the IPCC, which is the main source of the TSD. [The NRC and USGCRP reports draw on the same IPCC data and models, and are not independent.]

But the science is certainly inadequate to support the IPCC conclusion of anthropogenic global warming (AGW).

1. The IPCC's own data contradict its own model results -- as a simple comparison shows. Although the issue had been contentious, with one group claiming a disparity (Douglass, Christy, Pearson, and Singer, published in Int'l Journal of Climatology 2007) and the other group claiming "consistency" (Santer and 16 co-authors, published in IJC 2008), all now concur that "agreement between models and observations...is non-existent" in the crucial location, the upper tropical troposphere, above 5 miles (Thorne et al, published in Journal of Geophysical Research 2011).

2. Further, (non-linear) climate models are subject to chaotic uncertainties; each model run shows a different temperature trend. Hence, the IPCC models cannot be validated against observations. Our NIPCC studies show that at least 10 runs have to be performed and averaged in order to obtain consistent temperature trends. (But about half of the 22 IPCC models had only one or two runs; none had more than five.)

3. Finally, the latest (2007) IPCC Assessment bases its conclusion about AGW on a reported global warming of the past 50 years. It says: "*Most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely [90 to 99% certain] due to the observed increase in greenhouse gas concentrations.*" [Ref: IPCC-AR4 2007, Summary for Policymakers, page 10.]

But the global surface warming reported since 1979 is fake; it does not exist -- as demonstrated by NIPCC in several other data sets: Atmospheric temperatures show no warming trend, as seen both by balloon-borne radiosondes and independent satellite observations.

The reported warming of the sea surface can be traced to instrumental problems. And the available proxy data show no post-1979 warming.

The reason for the reported surface warming, as reported by the IPCC, is still unclear. But it is likely due to a selection of weather stations that favors an increasing fraction of urban stations and airports, which show a local warming trend because of increasing air traffic. It will be interesting to see the reaction of IPCC scientists, once these data are fully published and accepted by the scientific community.

It is unlikely, therefore, that the EPA's TSD will stand. And without the TSD, the Endangerment Finding is toast - and so is regulation of carbon dioxide.

4. A Life in Energy and (Therefore) Politics

The CEO of America's third-largest utility on competing in an electricity market built on political fads and lobbyists.

By Joseph Rago, WSJ, Oct 22, 2011 [H/t Glenn Schleede]

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204618704576641351747987560.html>

"Prostitution, horse racing, gambling and electricity are irresistible to politicians," says John Rowe, the CEO of the Chicago-based utility Exelon.

[SEPP Comment: *In an otherwise frank interview, the CEO of the company that has a large number of nuclear plants and few coal plants cannot help but criticize his coal competitors by citing EPA's dubious health claims on burning coal.*]

"Prostitution, horse racing, gambling and electricity are irresistible to politicians," says John Rowe, the CEO of the Chicago-based utility Exelon.

He'll give you an example of what he means: In 2009, Exelon began work on an urban solar-power project on a blighted field in Chicago's West Pullman neighborhood, in part at the request of then-White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel. "Whatever it is, it's not a scandal," says Mr. Rowe, who explains that his company was promised (and applied for) an Energy Department loan guarantee that it ultimately did not receive.

After the Exelon Solar City station opened in 2010 and Mr. Emanuel was running for Chicago mayor, "he asked if he could have his picture taken at the solar facility and . . . I said, 'Of course,'" Mr. Rowe recalls.

"He says, 'Well, you'll have the employees there?'" Mr. Rowe pauses a beat, mischievously, and holds up one finger. "I said, 'Yes, Rahm, we'll have him there.'"

In a visit to The Wall Street Journal's offices recently, Mr. Rowe was eager to strip the altar of green jobs—and the many other political pieties that distort the energy industry, even a few that he says belong to the Journal editorial page.

"The utility business is a funny business and almost no one in any political authority in either party really believes in orderly markets in electricity," Mr. Rowe says. The Emanuel appeal was merely the latest installment in the "series of political negotiations that never ends" and is the lot of any modern energy company.

Exelon is one of the three largest utilities in the U.S., serving some 13 million retail customers from northern Illinois to southeastern Pennsylvania. "We're the biggest nuclear power plant operator and we are by far the biggest company that actually sells all of its generation in competitive markets. And we are almost the last real champion of competitive markets in the utility industry," says Mr. Rowe, who has run one power company or another since 1984. "I am the old man of the industry," he says, and he plans to retire soon.

"And I was the carbon bandit," Mr. Rowe continues, with his matter-of-fact, seen-it-all candor. "I was the champion of climate regulation in the utility industry, and we are the people who back EPA regulation." The reason for this seeming contradiction—between simultaneously supporting free markets and interventions like an economy-wide CO₂-reduction plan—is that "we're always being asked to do things that are in our view bleeding crazy," as he'll go on to explain.

For starters, the anti-market demands made on Mr. Rowe are bipartisan. The one thing Virginia's Republican Gov. Bob McDonnell and Maryland's Democratic Gov. Martin O'Malley agree on, he says, is the need for more offshore wind. "That is one of the two most expensive ways to procure energy I can think of," Mr. Rowe says. "And unfortunately unlike solar, it tends to come in thousands of megawatts rather than tens, so you can really throw money away on it." Mr. Rowe also mentions that Chris Christie attempted to collaborate with a Democratic legislature on a plan that would have gamed New Jersey's electricity market to favor in-state companies over out-of-state exporters.

This political economy is an artifact of the historical electricity market—which, through most of the 20th century, was not really a market at all. Until recently, almost all consumers bought electricity from a monopoly supplier at rates set by the government, with a guaranteed return for utilities. That model eroded amid deregulation in the 1980s and '90s, and the rise of more efficient wholesale electricity markets and independent generators. Commercial and now even some residential consumers are no longer captive, but the political habits persist.

"There is no such thing as a sort of Garden of Eden energy market in this country—never has been, and we're not gonna live long enough to see one." So the key questions, Mr. Rowe says, boil down to how

open markets are from region to region and, among utilities, "who's pro-market and who really the mercantilists are."

Perhaps one measure of Mr. Rowe's market bona fides is that despite heading a corporation whose generation portfolio is 93% nuclear, he dismisses the industry's so-called "renaissance," the new construction wave that some are rooting for. Republicans in particular like to call him up about nuclear and he says he tells them, "Don't kid yourself that it's economic" at a market price. Building out nuclear capacity would require as much as \$300 billion in federal loan guarantees and other subsidies and he adds, laughing: "There just isn't that much money. The money's gone. The printing press is broken."

Mr. Rowe continues that "Somebody else wants clean coal; it's a non sequitur and it's not economic either. Somebody else wants wind or solar, and meanwhile . . . the market says the only thing that makes sense for a decade, maybe two, is for new generation to be gas-fired. Natural gas is cheaper than everything else," thanks to domestic shale finds via fracking and other factors. "It's likely to stay that way for a long time—but it isn't what politicians want."

On that note, Mr. Rowe would like to take exception to a series of Journal editorials this year and last raking the Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory agenda, including a December 2010 number that scored Exelon and Mr. Rowe for lobbying on behalf of said agenda. The Obama EPA has or is about to issue a cascade of air-pollution regulations that will force a large portion of the country's coal-fired power fleet to retire or utilities to spend billions on upgrades, maybe endangering reliability.

"What we are trying to do," Mr. Rowe argues, "partly out of self-interest and partly to avoid sticking our customers with things that are really expensive, is to push for some sort of orderly environmental framework on the markets." He concedes that "we can make some money" on the EPA rules because Exelon has little coal in its energy mix "and we don't apologize for trying to make money on having cleaner energy."

But given the political reality of energy capital, federal regulation is "a lot better than to have every political party picking its favorite technology, and either subsidizing the hell out of it with government money or asking the utility to subsidize the hell out of it on customers."

But does Mr. Rowe really think the chaotic EPA rule-making process has been orderly? "The current leadership of EPA rightly or wrongly, largely rightly, sees cleaning up the energy fleet as its reason for being," he explains. "It wouldn't shock me at all if in some places they overdo it. It also wouldn't shock me if at some places, they see the criteria pollutants [traditional ones like nitrogen oxides and lead] as a way of substituting for the carbon regulation they wanted to do and didn't get. Both, all of those things are probably true, and yet it's also true that people with the old coal plants are gaming the system."

Mr. Rowe likens these plants to a "'49 Chevy" and explains that "there's been a big game of chicken in the industry because utilities have known these rules were coming for more than a decade" under the Clean Air Act, "and most of the utilities actually spent the money to get their plants somewhere close to compliance. We think about 60% of the coal fleet is. But some just decided to gamble. They just made one very big bet that these rules weren't gonna ever happen."

Mr. Rowe continues that "We object to their continuing to keep the market price down with plants that they're not going to clean up at all. We object to people running the plants just so they can trade shutting them down to some politician for building a new plant somewhere else."

The "real enemy here," Mr. Rowe continues, isn't the EPA. "It's what a whole lot of people who call themselves entrepreneurs, but really are living on their lobbyist, are doing getting legislators around the country to require utilities to buy power from stuff that has no connection with the economics at all."

Under the EPA approach, he says, the market will choose "the technology of choice when it becomes economic." That will almost certainly be gas. As for the possibility of blackouts, Mr. Rowe says that "Nobody wants to create reliability problems, last of all us. I know who hangs on the lamp pole first." Based on Exelon's analysis, the coal retirements can be managed over the interim by ramping up existing gas-fired generation that is running well below capacity in many parts of the country. "The stuff is there to be used," he says, while any local concerns can be handled with deadline extensions to allow time to build new plants.

The practical alternative to the EPA as Mr. Rowe sees it—"both parties continue to see utilities and the electricity industry as a hobby horse for their own particular social policy choice and for the creation of jobs"—will be far more expensive.

One example is state renewable portfolio standards, which force utilities to build or buy certain types of renewable power like the McDonnell-O'Malley offshore windfarm or Emanuel memorial field. Mandated nuclear would be another. Mr. Rowe says that Exelon regularly sees energy proposals where the price per ton of carbon reduction is between \$100 and \$400, while the cap and trade bill that House Democrats passed in summer 2009 came in around \$25.

"If I could rewrite the world," Mr. Rowe says, there would be "some sort of modest pollution tax" including carbon and traditional air pollutants, not command-and-control regulation—"but no one's gonna let me do that." And he doesn't think either option is imminent. He even thinks President Obama "will continue to make concessions on the environmental front, because in truth it's not one of his big priorities. It's [EPA chief] Lisa Jackson's priority, but not the president's. I don't think he will collapse on it. He will hold the line on the hazardous air pollutants, I believe."

Whatever the current political moment, Mr. Rowe believes some kind of carbon control is inevitable: "Even if the Republicans should have a big win in '12, they're going to be faced with these huge revenue-entitlement trade-offs, and while I would love to see Paul Ryan's Medicare plan adopted, that's the most they could imagine doing. And even if they do something like that, they're gonna find they still need revenue." He says it's a matter of basic budget math.

"And so I think whatever we call the broadening of the tax base, the Republicans are going to be forced to look for some other source of revenue." Maybe its a national sales tax, maybe it's a value-added tax, but maybe the GOP "will look at some kind of pollution tax again. But that's five years, at least, away."

In the meantime, Mr. Rowe is optimistic, seeing a "cleaner world" as the U.S. gradually switches from coal to gas. Of course, he adds, "we hate cheap natural gas," which pulls down the wholesale price of nuclear. "It's a curse to us; it's great for America, but it's a curse to Exelon. I mean, Engine Charlie was wrong; not all things that are good for America are good for General Motors, and that's true for Exelon too."

5. The Post-Global Warming World

Moving on from climate virtue.

Editorial, WSJ, Oct 26, 2011 [H/t Anne Debeil]

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204618704576640730949448812.html?mod=ITP_opinion_2

[SEPP Comment: The cost of an idealized climate is high – impossible?]

The United Nations will convene its 17th annual climate-change conference next month in Durban, South Africa, with the purpose of sealing a new carbon-cutting deal to succeed the soon-to-expire 1997 Kyoto Protocol. It promises to be a historic event, if not in the way the organizers might hope.

The chances that a global deal on carbon would ever be reached were always slim, a point brought home by the collapse of the comic 2009 Copenhagen summit. But obituaries are sometimes late to print. Now, at last, the U.S., Russia and Japan have all said they won't agree to any new binding carbon pact, while India and China were never believers in the first place.

That leaves the European Union, which until last month was "the only one still considering signing up in some fashion to a second commitment period," according to Todd Stern, the Obama Administration's climate negotiator. Even that's no longer true. Last week, EU Climate Action Director General Jos Delbeke told reporters that "in reality what may happen is that the Europeans will pronounce themselves politically in favor of the Kyoto Protocol" but won't lock themselves into any new anticarbon pacts unless "other parties join the club." Regarding that likelihood, see above.

That isn't the only reality check Europe is facing on the carbon front. In an internal memo first reported last week by Dow Jones Newswires, the European Commission's energy department observed that "there is a trade-off between climate-change policies and competitiveness." By the EU's own estimate, the cost of meeting its current carbon emissions targets—a cut of at least 20% of 1990 emissions levels by 2020—comes to at least €48 billion (\$67 billion) per year.

For a closer look at the price Europeans pay for their carbon virtue, consider Tata, Europe's second-largest steelmaker. Last month the company warned that "EU carbon legislation threatens to impose huge additional costs on the steel industry," citing this as one reason to close some of its U.K. operations and possibly cut some 1,200 jobs. Yet under the terms of Europe's cap-and-trade scheme, Tata could be paid at least €20 million this year and next for those closures and layoffs.

Europe also seems to be getting wiser, if not yet wise, to the prohibitive costs of being green. In Britain, the government of David Cameron—which entered office last year promising to be the country's "greenest government ever"—has scrapped plans for a carbon-capture-and-storage plant in Scotland, which was set to bust its £1 billion budget. "If there was a completely unlimited resource then we may have been able to surmount the technical problems," Climate Change Secretary Chris Huhne told the BBC.

Then there are those "technical problems." The process of capturing and compressing CO₂ is energy-intensive. Storing the carbon once it's been sequestered is another issue. In Germany, a 30-megawatt carbon-capture pilot plant has been in operation since 2008. Yet plant-operator Vattenfall must truck the sequestered CO₂ more than 150 kilometers daily to store it in the nearest suitable locale. The company also recently suspended its plans for large-scale carbon capture and storage at Janschwalde in Germany. Environmental groups oppose putting carbon underground because they fear living above huge carbon sinks.

And so it goes with every technology that claims to promise greenhouse-gas salvation. Wind power may emit zero carbon, but windmills need up to 90% of their capacity backed up to prevent blackouts—usually with coal and gas plants. Windmills also kill a lot of birds. As for solar power, a new study from the University of Tennessee and Occupational Knowledge International finds that manufacturing the necessary lead batteries threatens to release more than 2.4 million tons of lead pollution by 2022, or one-third of today's total global lead production.

The science on climate change and man's influence on it is far from settled. The question today is whether it makes sense to combat a potential climate threat by imposing economically destructive regulations and sinking billions into failure-prone technologies that have their own environmental costs. The earnest people going to Durban next month may think so. The rest of the world is wearier and wiser.

#####