

The Week That Was: 2011-1-08 (January 8, 2011)

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

The Science and Environmental Policy Project

PLEASE NOTE: The complete TWTW, including the articles, can be downloaded in an easily printable form at the SEPP web site: www.sepp.org, which has been reactivated.

Fred Singer is traveling in Southern California. This week his stops include Newport Beach, and Scripps Oceanographic Institute in San Diego. For possible lectures open to the public, please contact Ken@Haapala.com.

Quote of the Week:

“A man should look for what is, and not for what he thinks should be.” Albert Einstein [H/t Stanley Hubbard]

Number of the Week: 10

THIS WEEK:

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

The cold, snowy December in Northern Europe and Eastern US continues to prompt many citizens to question official pronouncements of mild winters and global warming. Of course, weather is not climate; however, warming alarmists continue to offer increasingly spurious explanations of this cold and snow. Such claims include that reduced sea ice in the Arctic from global warming is causing increasing early snow in Siberia, which, in turn, reflects sunlight to outer space causing cooling and increasing snow elsewhere. As of yet, the claimants fail to produce physical evidence of an association between reduced levels of sea ice and increased snow.

Perhaps the claims offered in defense of the British Met Office (Meteorological) are the most imaginative. Parts of the British Isles experienced one of the coldest Decembers since measurements began. For example, measurements began at the Armagh Observatory in Ireland in 1795, during the Little Ice Age. Yet, 2010 is the second coldest December, exceeded only by 1878. The Met failed to predict such a cold winter.

Julia Slingo, Senior Scientist at the Met, stated in an interview published in *Nature*, that the Met's supercomputer is too slow and Met needs a bigger, faster one. This claim contains the dubious assumption that the mathematical relationships built into the Met's computer models accurately describe the appropriate physical relationships. If they do not, then a faster computer will only arrive at the wrong results faster.

The blog “Autonomous Mind” queried meteorologists Joe Bastardi (US) and Piers Corbyn (UK), both of whom correctly predicted the cold, what supercomputing technology do they employ? Both responded that they do not use supercomputers but rely more on history to better understand the physical natural drivers of climate rather than human influences such as carbon dioxide. Corbyn stated his computer is a rather antiquated, personal one and that his model is more attuned to natural solar influence while Bastardi's is more earth based.

According to a report in the *Daily Mail*, the Met correctly predicted the cold winter and told the appropriate politicians, but not the public. This prompts the question does the Met work for politicians or the public taxpayers? Further, the claim creates the suspicion that the politicians withheld the information from the public in preparation for the Cancun conference on global warming.

Benny Peiser of the Global Warming Policy Forum has called on the House of Commons Transport Select Committee to investigate this affair. If the extreme cold continues, more is sure to follow. Please see Article # 2 and the Articles under Extreme Weather.

A private organization, including residents of Virginia, has filed a request under the Freedom of Information Act to the University of Virginia for documents relating to the work of Michael Mann while he was at the University. The University is vigorously opposing a similar demand by Virginia Attorney General Cuccinelli, citing, among other things, a “chilling effect” on academic freedom by an Attorney General filing such a demand. The University appeared ready to release similar documents by Patrick Michaels, who is a critic of climate alarmism, when it received a request from Greenpeace. Will the University honor the private request, or will it claim freedom of information has a “chilling effect” on academic freedom? See Article under Oh Mann!

The US EPA is demanding guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions for the construction of major new facilities that emit greenhouse gases for every state but Texas. Texas refused to submit and the EPA declared it will take over the state’s permitting process. Texas claimed EPA has no legal basis for such power. In responding to a request from Texas, D.C. Circuit of Appeals issued a stay on the EPA demands pending judicial review. Please see Article #4 and articles under “EPA ...”

Roy Spencer reports that based on satellite measurements, as publically published by the University of Alabama, Huntsville, the average global temperature for 2010 was insignificantly cooler, not statistically different than, 1998, the hottest year in the satellite record. Please see, www.drroyspencer.com. In spite of increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide, there appears to be no trend from 1998 and 2010. Both 1998 and 2010 included El Niños.

Several readers have challenged us to explain why TWTW has stated that subsidization of wind farms will not stimulate the US economy. To do so requires an explanation of a major confusion in popular economics textbooks in the mid- to late-20th Century.

Many textbooks illustrated how increased government expenditures could ripple through the economy increasing prosperity and having a greater positive economic influence than the actual amount of the increase in expenditures. This was called the Keynesian multiplier. Frequently, the texts asserted, usually with equations, that if government increases its tax revenues and its expenditures by equal amounts, government would grow the economy by the same amount. This was called the balanced budget multiplier. If the balanced budget multiplier concept was accurate, the Soviet Union would have had the most powerful economy on the planet, which it clearly did not.

Among the many incorrect assumptions in these concepts are: 1) all multipliers are the same, 2) government spending and taxing policies do not change incentives for people to work hard and productively, and 3) government can spend money more efficiently than private enterprise. [The last assumption is incorrect not because those making private decisions are necessarily mentally superior to those making government decisions, but because private enterprise has mechanisms for weeding out bad ideas quickly by losses and, if persistent, bankruptcy, which government does not have.]

The first assumption stated above, that all multipliers are the same, is false. For example, one category of a government multiplier is the US Interstate Highway System, which was paid for by gasoline taxes, created many jobs. More importantly, it enhanced the productivity of the nation by providing a time saving, efficient transportation system, thus resulting in an increase in economic activity far beyond its cost. [One small example is that affordable, fresh produce is readily available in northern areas during the winter today, while 40 years ago it was not, except for the major cities.]

A second category of a government multiplier is a bridge to nowhere that may provide jobs during the construction period, but it will not enhance the economic productivity of the nation. The moneys would be better used elsewhere, either for private or public purposes. A third category of a government multiplier would be a poorly built bridge to nowhere that requires intense maintenance and, perhaps, a back-up bridge. It may provide jobs but would be an economic drain on the nation.

Until commercial scale, inexpensive electrical storage is available, wind farms fall in the last category.

Wind farms require expensive subsidies to be built; because nature controls their output, wind farms require expensive back-up (duplication); since they generally are in remote locations, wind farms require expensive additions to the electrical grid; and since the electricity from wind farms is more expensive than electricity from alternative sources such as nuclear, coal, or natural gas, they require the consumers to pay a premium on this electricity through mandates or feed-in tariffs. Wind farms are a drain on the economy and, although they may provide some jobs, provide a benefit far below the actual costs. Government policies requiring subsidies and higher electricity rates will reduce national prosperity.

The need for subsidies is reinforced by the American Wind Energy Association which claimed, during the extension of US tax rates last month that without a continuation of a cash subsidy, rather than just a tax credit subsidy, employment in the wind industry would fall by about 20%. The need for back-up is illustrated by the fact that in spite of heavy investment in wind, Germany has failed to close one coal fired power plant. The expense of the expanded grid is illustrated by Federal Energy Regulatory Commission demanding that utilities that do not use wind power help pay for the grid necessary to deliver wind generated electricity from the Mid-West to the East. The increases in electricity rates due to wind power are reported in many articles such as the one in the Oregonian referenced below.

One can see the results of failed government policies on wind farm by driving through parts of Southern California, east of Los Angeles, such as near Palm Springs, and seeing hundreds if not thousands of acres of wind farms that were shut down after the last wind mania passed. A similar fate will occur when consumers begin receiving escalating utility rates.

Please see Article # 3 below, articles referenced under Blowing in the Wind below, and Articles #7 & 8 in last week's TWTW.

Number of the Week – 10: “This is the number of years since Dr. David Viner [Climatic Research Unit at University of East Anglia] announced via the *Independent* that snowfalls are [now just a thing of the past](#), though to be fair he did hedge his bet.” From John Brignell, Number Watch
<http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/2010%20December.htm>

#####

SEPP Science Editorial #2011-2

By S. Fred Singer, Chairman, Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP)

“Clean” Energy and “Sustainable” Energy

The concern about global warming, --oops, “climate change,” oops, “climate disruption” -- has brought with it the use of phrases that need to be better defined.

The term “clean energy” is one that bothers me most. No energy source is truly clean. Even hydroelectric energy requires the construction of dams, which affect sedimentation and cause other hydrological and ecological problems. Nuclear energy may be considered as clean until you become concerned about the mining of uranium and the disposal of spent fuel.

But these days, the term “clean energy” is most often applied to coal-burning electricity generation. Conventionally, this had meant the removal of pollutants at the smoke stack after burning the coal in a boiler. These pollutants include the “criterion pollutants” defined in the Clean Air Act (CAA), principally sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and particulates. By law, all coal-burning plants must satisfy the emission criteria set up by the CAA.

But because of the concern about global warming, however misplaced, “clean energy” is now assumed to exclude sources that emit CO₂. But CO₂ is clean by any existing standard: it is non-toxic, non-irritating, a colorless, transparent gas that exists naturally in the atmosphere -- and indeed in the human body. The term “clean energy” should have nothing to do with CO₂. One should fight, therefore, against the misuse of this term until the legal issues are fully settled – which may not be for many years to come.

“Sustainable” is another term that has become popular -- and in a sense, meaningless. We are asked to use energy in a sustainable way, when in fact the fossil fuels used to create energy are depleted and cannot be recovered (like for example, metal resources, especially silver and gold). Fossil fuels are not renewable, at least on a human time scale.

While solar energy and wind energy are “sustainable” and while ethanol and biofuels are counted as “renewable”, none of these are economic—unfortunately—or likely to become a major source of energy in the near future. Biofuels, like ethanol, have many problems attached to them, as even environmentalists now admit. Hydrogen is not an energy source by itself; it has to be manufactured.

Nuclear energy occupies a curious position. It is quasi-sustainable, in the sense that we know how to derive electric power from nuclear reactors for many thousands of years. It is also renewable, in the sense that we know how to create fissionable material, i.e., nuclear fuel, from non-fissionable elements. Since nuclear energy is also reliable, economic, and fully available, it is likely to become the sustainable energy source of choice as fossil fuels become depleted.

#####

ARTICLES:

For the numbered articles below please see: www.sepp.org.

1. Combet’s hot air tax

By Bob Carter, Quadrant Online, Jan 3, 2011

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/01/bob-carter>

2 Did UK Government Keep Cold Winter Warning Secret In Run-Up To UN Climate Conference?

By Benny Peiser, GWPF, Jan 6, 2011 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.thegwgf.org/uk-news/2162-did-uk-government-keep-cold-winter-warning-secret-in-run-up-to-un-climate-conference.html>

3. Wind Farms DO NOT Provide Large Economic and Job Benefits (quite the opposite)

By Glenn Schleed, Master Resource, Jan 5, 2011

<http://www.masterresource.org/2011/01/false-wind-claims/>

4. The EPA’s War on Texas

Editorial, WSJ, Jan 4, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203513204576047753548981910.html?mod=ITP_opinion_2

5. Obama’s Oil War

Editorial, IBD, Jan 5, 2011

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/558879/201101052046/Obamas-Oil-War.htm>

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Challenging the Orthodoxy

2010 – Where does it fit in the warmest year list?

By Don Easterbrook, Icecap, Dec 27, 2010

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

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

[SEPP Comment: Using the high resolution ice core from GRIP-2 taken in Greenland, Easterbrook estimates that over the past 10,500 years, 9,100 years were warmer than the recent hottest year be it 1934, 1998, or 2010. So much for the hottest year controversy!]

Martinez picks former astronaut, global warming denier to head energy, natural resources department

By Matthew Reichbach, New Mexico Independent, Jan 6, 2011 [H/t Russell Cook]

<http://newmexicoindependent.com/68510/martinez-picks-former-astronaut-global-warming-denier-to-head-emnrd>

[SEPP admits a bias. Harrison Schmitt has been a guest science editorialist on several TWTWs. Schmitt has a Ph.D. in geology from Harvard and understands the earth's climate history. Perhaps this is the reason the article fails to identify him as a climate scientist.]

Martinez axes all Environmental Improvement Board members

By Matthew Reichbach, New Mexico Independent, Jan 5, 2011 [Ht/ Russell Cook]

<http://newmexicoindependent.com/68492/martinez-axes-all-environmental-improvement-board-members>

[SEPP Comment: In the last days of the previous administration the Board approved cap-an-trade for New Mexico. "Unfortunately, the majority of EIB members have made it clear that they are more interested in advancing political ideology than implementing common-sense policies that balance economic growth with responsible stewardship in New Mexico," Martinez wrote.]

2010: The Year that Climate Alarmism Melted

By Robert Michaels, Master Resource, 2011

<http://www.masterresource.org/2011/01/2010-climate-alarmism-melted/>

97% Cooked Stats

By Lawrence Solomon, Financial Post, Jan 3, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/01/03/lawrence-solomon-97-cooked-stats/#ixzz1A5px63Ax>

Defenders of the Orthodoxy

Carbon Taxes Are the Answer to Stalled Climate Negotiations, Expert Says

Science Daily, Jan 5, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/01/110105194840.htm>

USCAP to go into self-induced coma

Steve Milloy, Green Hell Blog, Jan 7, 2011

<http://greenhellblog.com/2011/01/07/uscap-to-go-into-self-induced-coma/>

Extreme Weather

December 2010 – A December To Remember, Part I

By Joe D'Aleo, ICECAP, Jan 6, 2010

[http://icecap.us/images/uploads/DECEMBER_2010 - Europe and Asia.pdf](http://icecap.us/images/uploads/DECEMBER_2010_-_Europe_and_Asia.pdf)

Freak weather could have been predicted

UK Met Office is being held back by a lack of computing power, says its chief scientist Julia Slingo

By Nicola Jones, Nature, Dec 30, 2010

<http://www.nature.com/news/2010/101230/full/news.2010.685.html>

Bastardi and Corbyn reply

Autonomous Mind, Jan 2, 2010 [H/t Anne Debeil]

<http://autonomousmind.wordpress.com/2011/01/02/bastardi-and-corbyn-reply/>

Met Office knew big freeze was coming but hushed it up

By Rachel Quigley, Mail, UK, Jan 4, 2011

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1343863/Met-Office-knew-Decembers-big-freeze-coming-hushed-up.html>

A 'Bulge' in Atmospheric Pressure Gives Us a Super-Cold Winter Amid Global Warming

By Christa Marshall and Tiffany Steckers, Climate Wire, NYT, Jan 5, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2011/01/05/05climatewire-a-bulge-in-atmospheric-pressure-gives-us-a-s-70646.html?pagewanted=1>

BP Oil Spill and Aftermath

Obama's \$5-a-gallon gas just ahead

Editorial, Washington Examiner, Jan 6, 2011

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/editorials/2011/01/obamas-5-gallon-gas-just-ahead>

Failure in the Gulf

Editorial, NYT, Jan 6, 2011

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/07/opinion/07fri1.html?_r=1&nl=todaysheadlines&emc=tha211

Drilling Is Stalled Even After Ban Is Lifted

By Ben Casselman and Daniel Gilbert, WSJ, Jan 3, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204204004576050451696859780.html?mod=ITP_pageone_0

[The article may be behind a paywall.]

Microbes Mopped Up After Spill

Bacteria Swiftly Devoured Methane Unleashed Into the Gulf of Mexico, Study Says

By Robert Lee Hotz, WSJ, Jan 7, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703730704576065942040672186.html?mod=WSJ_business_whatsNews

[The article may be behind a paywall.]

More Hurdles for Drilling

By Jeffrey Folks, American Thinker, Jan 7, 2011

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/01/more_hurdles_for_drilling.html

EPA and other Regulators On the March

Driving US families into fuel poverty

By Niger Innis, Rev Sameul Rodriguez and Amy Frederick, Canada Free Press, Jan 2, 2011 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/31694>

EPA's Texas Power Grab

By Paul Driessen and Willie Soon, Townhall, Jan 1, 2011

http://townhall.com/columnists/PaulDriessen/2011/01/01/epas_texas_power_grab

EPA GHG Rules Take Effect – Everywhere But in the Lone Star State

Power News, Jan 5, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/EPA-GHG-Rules-Take-Effect-Everywhere-But-in-the-Lone-Star-State_3330.html

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

Will Trading System Encourage Emissions?

By Nils Klawitter, Der Spiegel, Dec 30, 2010 [H/t Anne Debeil]

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/business/0,1518,736801,00.html>

Energy Issues

China has seen the future, and it is coal

By George Will, Washington Post, Dec 30, [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/12/29/AR2010122902899.html> 2010

Cowlitz County OKs permits for Longview, Wash., terminal that would export coal to Asia

By Scott Learn, The Oregonian, Nov 23, 2010

http://www.oregonlive.com/environment/index.ssf/2010/11/cowlitz_county_approves_permit.html

Texas Welcomes Nuclear Discards

By Ana Campoy, WSJ, Jan 5, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703808704576062162594317064.html?mod=TP_pageone_1

[The article may be behind a paywall.]

Whistling in the Wind

Wind farms becalmed just when needed the most

Wind farms in Britain generated practically no electricity during the recent cold spell, raising fresh concerns about whether they could be relied upon to meet the country's energy needs.

By Louis Gray, Telegraph, UK, Jan 1, 2011 [H/t Brad at Prescott]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/energy/windpower/8234616/Wind-farms-becalmed-just-when-needed-the-most.html>

Manufacturers group opposes wind-power pact

By Alex Kuffner R.I. Commerce Digest, Providence Journal, Dec 22, 2010 [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

http://www.projo.com/business/content/COMMERCE_DIGEST_22_12-22-10_7QLJPG_v13.323fe87.html

[SEPP Comment: Amazing, manufacturers recognize that paying substantially higher rates for wind generated electricity does not create prosperity or profits.]

Rates set to jump for Pacific Power, PBE customers in January

By Ted Sickinger, The Oregonian, Dec 17, 2010 [H/t John Droz, Jr.]
http://www.oregonlive.com/business/index.ssf/2010/12/rates_set_to_jump_for_pacific.html

Comb report says Texas overpays in tax breaks to wind farms based on job creation

Laylan Copelin, Austin American Statesman, Dec 20, 2010 [H/t John Droz Jr.]
http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/bus/industries/energy/stories/DN-taxbreaks_20tex.ART.State.Edition1.7e0102.html
[Texas Comptroller Susan Comb]

Wind Development Threatens Iconic American Birds

By Kelly Fuller, Press Release, American Bird Conservancy, Dec 29, 2010 [H/t John Droz, Jr.]
<http://www.abcbirds.org/newsandreports/releases/101229.html>

China wind turbines turn as Europe cuts hit

By Andrew Ward, Financial Times, Jan 5, 2011 [H/t Mark Duchamp]
<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/4b2ab342-18ef-11e0-9c12-00144feab49a.html#axzz1AMPr6Yo9>
[SEPP Comment: This article fails to mention that China is curtailing construction of wind farms and that China is making enormous investments in coal, hydro, and nuclear generation of electricity. China got what it wanted, the latest Western technology for Chinese manufacturers to be able to sell wind turbines in the West. It would be interesting to find an analysis of how much Chinese wind power is on the grid as compared with off the grid.]

Oh, Mann!

Yes, Virginia, you do have to produce those ‘Global Warming’ documents

By Christopher Horner, David Schnare, and Robert Marshal, Washington Examiner, Jan 5, 2011 [H/t A.J. Meyer]
<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/op-eds/2011/01/yes-virginia-you-do-have-produce-those-global-warming-documents>

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

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

Atmospheric Blocking and Extreme Weather Events

Reference: Kreienkamp, F., Spekat, A. and Enke, W. 2010. Stationarity of Atmospheric Waves and Blocking over Europe - Based on a Reanalysis Dataset and Two Climate Scenarios. *Theory of Applied Climatology* **102**: 205-212.
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jan/5jan2011a2.html>

Past Rapid Warming Event Increased Plant Diversity and Promoted Speciation

Reference: Jaramillo, C., Ochoa, D., Contreras, L., Pagani, M., Carvajal-Ortiz, H., Pratt, L.M., Krishnan, S., Cardona, A., Romero, M., Quiroz, L., Rodriguez, G., Rueda, M.J., de la Parra, F., Morn, S., Green, W., Bayona, G., Montes, C., Quintero, O., Ramirez, R., Mora, G., Schouten, S., Bermudez, H., Navarrete, R., Parra, F., Alvarn, M., Osorno, J., Crowley, J.L., Valencia, V. and Vervoort, J. 2010. Effects of rapid global warming at the Paleocene-Eocene boundary on neotropical vegetation. *Science* **330**: 957-961.
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jan/5jan2011a4.html>

Most of Antarctica is Not Warming, New Study Reveals

Reference: O'Donnell, R., Lewis, N., McIntyre, S. and Condon, J. 2011. Improved methods for PCA-based reconstructions: case study using the Steig *et al.* (2009) Antarctic temperature reconstruction. *Journal of Climate* doi: 10.1175/2010JCLI3656.1.
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jan/5jan2011a6.html>

Cold Periods Caused Population Crashes in China Over the Past Millennium

Reference: Lee, H.F. and Zhang, D.D. 2010. Changes in climate and secular population cycles in China, 1000 CE to 1911. *Climate Research* **42**: 235-246.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jan/6jan2011a1.html>

[“Over the study interval of 911 years, it was found that nomad migrations, rebellions, wars, epidemics, floods, and droughts were all higher in cold periods. All of these factors tended to act to disrupt population growth or cause mortality. Overall, 5 of 6 population contractions, with losses of 11.4 to 49.4% of peak population, were associated with a cooling climate. The 6th cool period evinced a great reduction in growth rate during a cool phase, but not a collapse. None of the population contractions were associated with a warming climate.”]

Natural Variability, Not CO₂, Accounts for Late 20th Century Warming

Reference: DelSole, T., Tippet, M.K., Shukla, J. 2010. A significant component of unforced multidecadal variability in the recent acceleration of global warming. *Journal of Climate* doi: 10.1175/2010JCLI3659.1.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jan/6jan2011a5.html>

Other Scientific Issues

A Banner Day For Junk Science

Editorial, IBD, Jan 6, 2011

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=559080&p=1>

Longstanding Mystery of Sun’s Hot Outer Atmosphere Solved

Answer lies in jets of plasma

Press Release 11-003, National Science Foundation [H/t WUWT]

http://nsf.gov/news/news_images.jsp?cntn_id=118338&org=NSF

NOAA-led Research Team Takes Measure of the Variability of the Atmosphere’s Self-Cleaning Capacity

Press Release, NOAA, Jan 6, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

http://www.noanews.noaa.gov/stories2011/20110106_atmosphericcleaning.html

Have scientists discovered how to create downpours in the desert?

Daily Mail Reporter, Mail Online, Jan 3, 2011 [H/t Brad at Prescott]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1343470/Have-scientists-discovered-create-downpours-desert.html>

Other Issues that May Be Of Interest

Two myths: Global warming and U.S. manufacturing’s decline

By Walter Williams, Washington Examiner, Jan 5, 2011

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columnists/2011/01/walter-williams-two-myths-global-warming-and-us-manufacturings-decline>

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

40,000 ‘devil’ crabs wash up on Kent coast after dying from hypothermia in freezing sea

By Daily Mail Reporter, Mail Online, Jan 5, 2011

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1344242/40-000-devil-crabs-washed-British-beach-freezing-conditions-hypothermia.html>

[SEPP Comment: In the article a person suggests that due to global warming the crabs were caught out in the cold.]

Man could create new mass extinction

Editorial, Telegraph, UK, Dec 31, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/science/dinosaurs/8234135/Man-could-create-new-mass-extinction.html>

First US Commercial Tidal Power Plant Proposed for New York City's East River

By Trey Taylor, Renewable Energy, Jan 3, 2011 [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

<http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/partner/ocean-renewable-energy-coalition-4809/news/article/2011/01/first-us-commercial-tidal-power-plant-proposed-for-new-york-citys-east-river>

#####

ARTICLES:

1. Combet's hot air tax

By Bob Carter, Quadrant Online, AU, Jan 3, 2011

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/01/bob-carter>

No seasonal break for the climate commissars

Following the failure of the UN's Cancun talkfest, Climate Minister Greg Combet, displaying what Paul Keating would doubtless term remarkable intransigence, commented that it was still "very important from the government's point of view that a market mechanism is adopted" to put a price on carbon dioxide.

Scrabbling to regain similar lost ground, EU Commissioner for Climate Action (a real, and not satirical, title) Connie Hedegaard has now started to spin up the outcome of the Cancun conference as being a great success ("Cancun deal puts climate action back on track", *The Australian*, Dec. 27).

According to Ms. Hedegaard, the major Cancun achievements were an agreement to limit future global temperature increase to 2 deg. C (a policy ambition that represents an astonishing mixture of scientific ignorance and political hubris), and the agreement of a package of climate-related financial aid to third world countries that is forecast as attaining \$100 billion annually by 2020; to believe that this money will be well spent, or even provided at all, represents the triumph of UN hope over likely reality.

Ms. Hedegaard was the former Minister for the Environment who approved the conditions under which Danish financial traders were able to rip-off the European carbon dioxide trading market of an amount estimated by the auditor general to be 38 billion kroner. In 2007, she allowed a Danish carbon dioxide registry to be set up with lax rules, amongst other things removing the requirement for trader identification. One result of this was that more than 1100 of 1256 traders registered in Denmark (almost 90%) were set up with fraudulent intent, and have subsequently been delisted as their crimes became apparent.

Ms. Hedegaard, therefore, is scarcely the type of public official whose advice Australia should be seeking, and that she and Mr. Combet are hand-in-glove in their attitudes regarding the still entirely hypothetical "dangerous global warming" is a matter for concern.

Mr Combet's continued, and unrealistic, support for the introduction of a carbon dioxide tax or trading system was announced on Dec. 21st, together with the results of the third meeting of the Prime Minister's Multi-Party Committee on Climate Change (MCCC).

As part of its last pre-Christmas pantomime performance, the MCCC enunciated eleven key principles to be applied in deciding the details of their planned new, economically damaging and futile carbon dioxide tax.

Here are those eleven principles, along with some comments regarding the value of each.

Environmental effectiveness. The reality is that cutting Australia's carbon dioxide emissions, even altogether, will confer no measurable environmental benefit. Computer models suggest that a cut in emissions of, say, 20% by 2050 will (hypothetically) prevent warming by less than one-thousandth of a degree. By definition, then, a carbon dioxide tax is ineffective.

Economic efficiency. No economic need, let alone efficiency, is sensibly met by taxing an environmentally beneficial trace gas.

Budget neutrality. Whose budget? The imposition of a tax of, say, \$30/tonne will impose on every Australian household increased costs estimated at more than \$2,000 per year.

Competitiveness of Australian industries. The introduction of a carbon dioxide tax is intended to, and will, significantly increase the cost of energy generation. Obviously, the resultant increase in business costs will reduce the competitiveness of Australian industry against overseas counterparts in countries (most) that have no similar tax.

Energy security. In fact, energy security is sharply compromised by the very policies that the committee is espousing. Which are to continue to discriminate against coal, uranium and hydropower as energy sources, thereby taking out of play three of the only four currently practical sources of baseload power generation. Restricting the nation's options in this way leaves only gas and oil for baseload generation, reduces energy security dramatically and is irresponsible.

Investment certainty. Industry frequently calls for policy certainty regarding future investment in power generation. Terry McCrann was amongst the first to point out that such certainty would be most easily and cost-effectively assured by declaring a carbon dioxide tax of \$0/tonne.

Fairness for households. The committee must surely be kidding. Any form of carbon dioxide taxation will inescapably cause increased costs for households, especially those of poorer socio-economic status. Mark well, the most disadvantaged Australians are going to pay, and that quite irrespective of any subsidy measures that the government may trumpet.

Flexibility to changing international circumstances. International circumstances have indeed changed recently, and the failure of nations to reach a global climate agreement at either the Copenhagen or Cancun conferences has been greeted in Australia with zero flexibility. Our policymakers and climate alarm lobbyists, now led by an unoriginal Mr Combet, have simply reiterated their earlier, failed policies of taxing carbon dioxide. The most important circumstance to be aware of now, of course, is that once such a tax is introduced it will be almost impossible to remove - despite its being unnecessary, inefficient and ultimately futile.

Administrative simplicity. Dream on. Remember, a Canberra-based committee is designing this unnecessary new tax.

Accountability. Of whom, and for what? If blame is to be sheeted home for the faulty scientific advice that has led to the current global warming policy fiasco, then CSIRO, BOM, the Department of Climate Change and major university climate research groups would be good places to start to look for culprits.

Support for Australia's international objectives. Australian objectives presumably should not include economic and political stupidity in the face of the collapsed talkfests at Copenhagen and Cancun. The idea that overseas nations will discriminate against Australia unless we implement anti-carbon dioxide

measures is well worn out, and has anyway always been a juvenile argument. Nations take hard decisions in accordance with their sovereign economic interests, irrespective of Green lobby group dreaming.

The irony is that the eleven principles adopted by the MCCC, to the degree that they are not mere persiflage, add up to a strong argument for NOT introducing a levy on carbon dioxide emissions, i.e., the principles indicate a course of action precisely the opposite of what the government currently intends.

This obvious conclusion escapes not only the government, but also our national newspaper which editorialised recently (December 30th):

Blaming Julia Gillard's [intended] carbon legislation [for recent increases in the price of power] will come easily to consumers -- even if putting a price on carbon is inevitable and logical. A price mechanism is the cheapest way to end uncertainty and reduce pollution ...

Meanwhile, from the UK has just come the news that, with a December temperature average of -1 deg. C, England has already had its second coldest winter since records begin in 1659 – and, if January and February continue to be cold, England may yet achieve its coldest winter in the last 1,000 years.

The effective response from the British Meteorological Office (BMO) was for Director Julia Sligo to demand more funding to purchase bigger computers, saying:

It's quite clear that if we could run our models at a higher resolution we could do a much better job — tomorrow — in terms of our seasonal and decadal predictions. It's so frustrating. We keep saying we need four times the computing power. We're talking just 10 or 20 million a year — dollars or pounds — which is tiny compared to the damage done by disasters.

The delusion that pouring more funds into ever more powerful computers will “solve” the climate prediction problem is chimerical, and simply represents an infinite regress for continuing (indeed, increased) funding for the very scientists who have led us astray so badly by their naïve over-reliance on unvalidated computer models in the first place.

To the degree that statements such as those made by BMO’s Dr. Sligo represent the views of the professional meteorological community, that community has now moved beyond parody and demands to be ridiculed. Can it really be the case that amidst the hurricane of Green spin about global warming, not a single bureaucrat or government politician in Canberra has retained a functioning bullshit detector?

Remarkably, in enunciating their “eleven principles”, the Canberra MCCC managed to evade entirely any mention of the underpinning scientific justification for introducing a tax on carbon dioxide. That is, of course, because there is none (which is doubtless why only one, tame, scientist was included as a member of the committee in the first place).

As the government will discover from its focus groups over the next few months, no matter how hard Mr. Combet tries to spin it as beneficial, they will introduce a carbon dioxide tax at their considerable electoral peril.

For where global warming alarmism is concerned, the good news is that the bullshit detectors of the Australian electorate are both alive and activated.

Bob Carter is a geologist at James Cook University and author of Climate: the Counter Consensus

2 Did UK Government Keep Cold Winter Warning Secret In Run-Up To UN Climate Conference?

By Benny Peiser, GWPF, Jan 6, 2011 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/uk-news/2162-did-uk-government-keep-cold-winter-warning-secret-in-run-up-to-un-climate-conference.html>

London, 6 January: The Global Warming Policy Foundation has called on the House of Commons Transport Select Committee to set up a parliamentary inquiry into the winter advice the Government received by the Met Office and the renewed failure of both the Government and local authorities to prepare the UK transport system for the third severe winter in a row.

In a letter to the Chair of the Transport Committee, Louise Ellman, MP, the GWPF stresses that "Lessons have to be learned well in advance of the start of next year's winter so that we are much better prepared if it is severe again."

In recent days, the Met Office has stated that it apparently warned the Cabinet Office in late October that the start of the winter would be exceptionally cold. It would appear that the extreme weather warning was kept secret from the public.

According to media reports, the Cabinet Office has been unwilling to confirm whether or not it failed to pass on the Met Office warning to local and road authorities, airports and water companies.

"Not only is the lack of Government preparedness a cause for concern, but we wonder whether there may be another reason for keeping the cold warning under wraps, a motive that the Met Office and the Cabinet Office may have shared: Not to undermine the then forthcoming UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun," said Dr Benny Peiser, the GWPF director.

It will be important to establish whether the Met Office consulted with government officials about their Cancun strategy and what effect this may have had on the handling of the 'secret' cold winter warning.

In light of the renewed failure to prepare the UK and its transport system for a prolonged and harsh winter, the GWPF has listed 19 questions that need to be addressed in order to avoid future debacles.

The full letter is attached below.

Louise Ellman, MP
Chair, Transport Select Committee
House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA
5 January 2011

Dear Mrs Ellman

Transport System's Winter Fiasco

I am writing to you on behalf of the Global Warming Policy Foundation regarding the transport system's ill-preparedness in face of this year's record cold winter.

The GWPF is calling on the Transport Committee to set up a parliamentary inquiry into the winter advice the Government received by the Met Office and the renewed failure of both the Government and local authorities to prepare the UK transport system for the third severe winter in a row.

This year's winter fiasco has severely damaged the British economy – and its international reputation - as a result of the country's ill-preparedness.

It would appear that the Met Office provided the government with contradictory winter advice and we need to find out what went wrong. Lessons have to be learned well in advance of the start of next year's winter so that we are much better prepared if it is severe again.

Last summer, the Department of Transport carried out a study of the resilience of Britain's transport infrastructure in the light of the two previous severe winters.

When the Quarmby Report (The Resilience of England's Transport Systems in Winter) was published in late October, it entirely relied on the Met Office's assurance that the chance of a severe winter and heavy snow would be relatively small and that the effect of climate change had further reduced the probability of severe winters in the UK; see also [Transport chaos not an annual issue, say official report. Investment in more equipment may not be economical given rarity of British snow, says RAC Foundation chairman](#)

In recent days, the Met Office has stated that it apparently changed its original advice in October and actually warned the Cabinet Office that the start of winter would be exceptionally cold. It would appear that the Met Office's cold warning was kept secret from the public.

According to media reports, the Cabinet Office has been unwilling to confirm whether or not it failed to pass on the Met Office warning to local and road authorities, airports and water companies.

Not only is the lack of Government preparedness a cause for concern, but we wonder whether there may be another reason for keeping the cold warning under wraps, a motive that the Met Office and the Cabinet Office may have shared: Not to undermine the then forthcoming UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun.

Throughout October and November, the Met Office repeatedly pushed and published their key message in the run-up to the UN climate summit – that 2010 would probably turn out to be the hottest year on record, culminating in these Cancun-timed media reports: [Cancun climate change summit: 2010 was hottest year on record.](#)

The Met Office was represented at the UN Climate Summit in Cancun by key scientists who briefed news media about their key message; see [Scientific evidence is Met Office focus at Cancun](#)

It will be important to establish whether the Met Office consulted with government officials about the UK's Cancun strategy and what effect this may have had on the handling of the 'secret' cold winter warning.

The transport minister Philip Hammond has asked the government's chief scientific adviser whether the last three cold winters may signal a 'step change' in weather in the UK.

The Met Office appears to deny this possibility. In its submission to the Quarmby Report, the Met Office claims that the chances of a harsh winter are receding steadily. Yet, the Met Office models were contradicted by Sir David King, the former government's chief scientific adviser, who has publicly warned that the government should plan for more cold winters in the next few years.

It is evident that Sir David King has serious doubts about the reliability of the Met Office's computer models. This manifest contradiction is further undermining the credibility of the Met Office which makes it all the more important to properly investigate the underlying problem of its erroneous winter projections and government advice over the last three years.

In light of the renewed failure to prepare the UK and its transport system for a prolonged and harsh winter, the following questions need to be addressed in order to avoid future debacles:

1. Why did the Met Office publish on its website estimates in late October showing a 60 per cent to 80 per cent chance of warmer-than-average temperatures this winter? What was the scientific basis of this probabilistic estimate?
2. Why did the Met Office provide the government with a secret forecast about an exceptionally cold start of the winter, at the same time it was publishing an opposite forecast to the public?
3. Did the government conspire to keep the Met Office forecast secret in the run-up to the Cancun climate summit?
4. Did the Cabinet Office fail to take appropriate action in response to the forecast and inform the relevant authorities to prepare the country, to keep the highways clear, to prepare airports?
5. Why did the government let its Winter Fuel Allowance budget be used up with only a fraction of the winter gone?
6. On what scientific basis did the Met Office tell the Cabinet Office that there were early indications of an exceptionally cold start to winter?
7. Why did the Met Office confirm to the news media on 27 October that its probability map showed significant warming in the months ahead?
8. Has the late October prediction by the Met Office that this winter would be mild affected planning for this winter? If so, what is the best estimate of how much this has cost the country?
9. In 2009, the Met Office predicted a 65% chance that the winter of 2009/10 would be milder than normal. Has the Met Office subsequently explained what went wrong with its computer modelling?
10. What is the statistical and scientific basis for the Met Office's estimate of a 1-in-20 chance of a severe winter?
11. Has the Met Office changed its view, or its calculations, following the harsh winters of 2008, 2009 and 2010?
12. Is the Met Office right to be confident that the severe winters of the last three years are not related?
13. Which severe weather alerts were issued by the Met Office and when?
14. Although the Met Office stopped sending its 3-month forecasts to the media, it would appear that this service is still available to paying customers, the Government and Local Authorities for winter planning. What was their advice, in September/October, for the start of winter 2010?
15. Has the Met Office been the subject of any complaints from its paying customers regarding the quality of its advice?
16. Is it appropriate that the chairman of the Met Office is a member, or a former member of climate pressure groups or carbon trading groups?

17. Should senior Met Office staff (technically employed by the MoD) make public comments advocating political action they see necessary to tackle climate change?

18. Has the government evaluated different meteorological service providers and has it ensured that it is using the most accurate forecaster?

19. What plans has the government to privatise the Met Office?

In view of the high level of public interest in this matter, we shall be releasing the text of this letter to the press.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,
Dr Benny Peiser

3. Wind Farms DO NOT Provide Large Economic and Job Benefits (quite the opposite)

By Glenn Schleed, Master Resource, Jan 5, 2011

<http://www.masterresource.org/2011/01/false-wind-claims/>

One would think that by now Obama Administration officials would admit that “wind farms” do not provide large economic and job benefits. However, recent Administration statements suggest the delusion continues and, perhaps, that officials do not understand why their expectations are unrealistic.

False expectations may be due to the infamous “JEDI” model (Jobs and Economic Development Impact model) developed for DOE’s National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) by a wind industry consultant-lobbyist. Unfortunately, this “model” (paid for with our tax dollars) has been widely promoted by NREL and DOE and outputs from the model are used by “wind farm” developers to mislead the public, media, and government officials.

Economic models often produce false or misleading outputs because (a) the model itself is faulty, and/or (b) unrealistic assumptions are “fed into” to model, with the result that the models overstate national, state, and/or local job and other economic benefits.

In the case of wind energy models, basic flaws and faulty assumptions often include one or more of the following:

1. Ignoring the fact that much of the capital cost of “wind farms” is for equipment purchased elsewhere, often imported from other countries. Some wind energy advocates claim that wind turbines are “manufactured” in the US when, in fact, they are merely assembled in the US using imported parts and components. About 75% of the capital cost of “wind farms” is for turbines, turbine parts and components, towers and blades – so a large share of the “wind farm” cost is for imports. These add to the outflow of wealth from the US and provide no economic or job benefits in the US.
2. Assuming that employment during project construction results in new jobs for local workers — when most “wind farm” construction jobs are short term (6 months or less) and the overwhelming share of them are filled by specialized workers who are brought in temporarily.
3. Assuming that the very few permanent “wind farm” jobs are new jobs filled by local workers – when, in fact, these few permanent jobs are often filled by people brought in for short periods. Some “wind

farm” owners contracts with suppliers of wind turbines and other equipment for maintenance work with the result that no “new” jobs for local workers are added.

4. Assuming that temporary workers who are brought in for short periods live and spend their pay checks — and pay taxes — locally when, in fact, these workers spend most of their wages where they and their families have permanent residences — where the workers spend most of their weekends and where they pay nearly all of their taxes.

5. Assuming that the *full purchase price* of the goods and services purchased locally (often minimal in any case) has a local economic benefit. In fact, only the local *value added* may have a local economic benefit. This truth is illustrated by the purchase of a gallon of gasoline — let’s say for \$3.00. Only the wages of the service station employees, the dealer’s margin, and the taxes paid locally or to the state may have a local or state economic benefit. Economic benefits associated with the share of the \$3.00 that pays for the crude oil (much of it imported), refining, wholesaling, and transportation generally flows elsewhere.

6. Assuming that land rental payments to land owners for allowing wind turbines all have local economic benefit. In fact, these payments will have little or no local economic benefit when the payments are to absentee landowners OR if the money is *spent* or *invested* elsewhere or is used to pay income taxes that flow to Washington DC or state capitals.

7. Using “input-output” models that spit out “indirect” job and other economic benefits that, in effect, magnify (a) all of the overestimates identified above, and (b) use unproven formula and data to calculate alleged “multiplier” effects.

8. Ignoring the environmental and economic COSTS imposed by “wind farm” development, which include (a) environmental, ecological, and economic costs associated with the production of the equipment, and constructing and operating the “wind farm” (e.g., site and road clearing, (b) wildlife habitat destruction, noise, bird and bat kills and interference with migration and refuges, (c) scenic impairment, (d) neighboring property value impairment, and (e) infrastructure costs.

9. Ignoring the fact that electricity produced from wind turbines, has less real value than electricity from reliable generating units — because that output is intermittent, volatile and unreliable. Also, the electricity is most likely to be produced at night in colder months, not on hot weekday late afternoons in July and August when demand is high and the economic value of electricity is high.

10. Ignoring the “backup power” costs; i.e., the added cost resulting from having to keep reliable generating units immediately available (often running at less than peak efficiency) to keep electric grids in balance when those grids have to accept intermittent, volatile and unreliable output from “wind farms.”

11. Ignoring the fact that electricity from “wind farms” in remote areas generally results in high unit costs of transmission due to (a) the need to add transmission capacity, (b) the environmental, scenic and property value costs associated with transmission lines, (c) the electric transmission “line losses” (i.e., electricity produced by generating units but lost during transmission and never reaches customers or serves a useful purpose), and (d) inefficient use of transmission capacity because “wind farms” output is intermittent and unpredictable and seldom at the capacity of the transmission line that must be built to serve the “wind farm.”

12. Ignoring the fact that the higher true cost of the electricity from wind is passed along to ordinary electric customers and taxpayers via electric bills and tax bills which means that people who bear the

costs have less money to spend on other needs (food, clothing, shelter, education, medical care — or hundreds of other things normally purchased in local stores), thus *reducing* the jobs associated with that spending and undermining local economies that would benefit from supplying these needs.

13. *Perhaps most important, ignoring the fact that the investment dollars going to “renewable” energy sources would otherwise be available for investment for other purposes that would produce greater economic benefits.* “Wind farms” have very high capital costs and relatively low operating costs compared to generating units using traditional energy sources. They also create far fewer jobs, particularly long-term jobs, and far fewer local economic benefits. “Wind farms” are simply a poor choice if the goals are to create jobs, add local economic benefits, or hold down electric bills.

Is it too much to ask for the new Congress to realistically view windpower and dispense with false hopes and promises?

4. The EPA’s War on Texas

Editorial, WSJ, Jan 4, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203513204576047753548981910.html?mod=ITP_opinion_2

The Environmental Protection Agency's carbon regulation putsch continues, but apparently abusing the clean-air laws of the 1970s to achieve goals Congress rejected isn't enough. Late last week, the EPA made an unprecedented move to punish Texas for being the one state with the temerity to challenge its methods. To wit, the EPA violated every tenet of administrative procedure to strip Texas of its authority to issue the air permits that are necessary for large power and industrial projects. This is the first time in the history of the Clean Air Act that the EPA has abrogated state control, and the decision will create gale-force headwinds for growth in a state that is the U.S. energy capital. Anyone who claims that carbon regulation is no big deal and that the EPA is merely following the law will need to defend this takeover.

Since December 2009, the EPA has issued four major greenhouse gas rule-makings, and 13 states have tried to resist the rush. The Clean Air Act stipulates that pollution control is "the primary responsibility of states and local government," and while the national office sets overall priorities, states have considerable leeway in their "implementation plans." When EPA's instructions change, states typically have three years to revise these plans before sending them to Washington for approval.

This summer, the 13 states requested the full three years for the costly and time-consuming revision process, until the EPA threatened economic retaliation with a de facto construction moratorium. If these states didn't immediately submit new implementation plans to specification, the agency warned, starting in 2011 projects "will be unable to receive a federally approved permit authorizing construction or modification." All states but Texas stood down, even as Texas continued to file lawsuits challenging the carbon power grab.

Two weeks ago, EPA air regulation chief Gina McCarthy sent the Texas environmental department a letter asserting that the agency had "no choice" but to seize control of permitting. She noted "statements in the media" by Texas officials and their "legal challenges to EPA's greenhouse gas rules," but she cited no legal basis.

And no wonder. The best the EPA could offer up as a legal excuse for voiding Texas's permitting authority last Thursday was that EPA had erred in originally approving the state's implementation plan—*in 1992*, or three Presidents ago.

The error that escaped EPA's notice for 18 years was that the Texas plan did not address "all pollutants newly subject to regulation . . . among them GHGs [greenhouse gases]." In other words, back then Texas hadn't complied with regulations that *didn't exist and wouldn't be promulgated for another 18 years*.

The takeover was sufficiently egregious that the D.C. circuit court of appeals issued an emergency stay on Thursday suspending the rules pending judicial review. One particular item in need of legal scrutiny is that the permitting takeover is an "interim final rule" that is not open to the normal—and Clean Air Act-mandated—process of public notice and comment. So much for transparency in government.

The EPA claims its takeover is a matter of great urgency, but Texas is being pre-emptively punished for not obeying rules that don't exist today because the EPA hasn't finalized them. "Now, at this early stage, there's no specifics to tell you about the rules in terms of what we're announcing today, other than they will be done and we'll move—take steps moving forward in 2011," Mrs. McCarthy told reporters on a conference call last week about the agency's "performance standards" for oil refineries, power plants, cement manufacturers and other such CO₂-heavy facilities.

"It's way too early in the game right now to be talking about what we think the standards are going to look like," she added helpfully. "Today's announcement is just the fact we're going to move to those standards."

This and other permitting uncertainties have brought major projects in the U.S. to a standstill. The Texas takeover in particular is pure political revenge and an effort to intimidate other states from joining the Texan lawsuits. The reason states are supposed to run the clean-air process is that local regulators have the staff, capacity and expertise that Washington lacks. When the carbon rules eventually are issued, that means the takeover will extend the current moratorium even longer in Texas.

The EPA concedes that some 167 current projects will be affected, and many more in the future. Our guess is that all of them will be delayed for years and many will simply die. This is precisely the goal of a politically driven bureaucracy that wants to impose by illegal diktat the anticarbon, anti-fossil fuel agenda that the Obama Administration has been unable to pass by democratic consent.

5. Obama's Oil War

Editorial, IBD, Jan 5, 2011

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/558879/201101052046/Obamas-Oil-War.htm>

Energy Policy: Oil prices are surging to levels that will soon crimp economic growth. And what's our government doing about it? Just making it worse.

Since President Obama took office in January 2009, the price of oil has rocketed 117% to \$90.41 a barrel and gasoline has jumped 67% to \$3.07 a gallon. In the 34 industrialized nations, oil imports have surged 34% in the last year to \$790 billion. The U.S. alone has seen a \$72 billion jump.

All this imperils a fragile recovery from the financial crisis. "Oil prices are entering a dangerous zone for the global economy," says Fatih Birol, chief economist at the International Energy Agency.

Given the clear threat, it's economically irrational to sit on our hands and fail to develop our own energy resources. At least 130 billion barrels of oil and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas lie offshore, and hundreds of billions of barrels more are locked in shale deposits in the Northeast and West. Yet our policy remains leaving this wealth alone.

More than mere incompetence is at work here. It's becoming more and more obvious that Obama's energy policy is meant to raise prices by making fossil fuels harder to produce and use. Indeed, the White House

has followed a deliberate policy of attacking Americans' use of energy, turning it into something of a moral crusade.

In just two years, as Steve Everley of the American Solutions blog has noted, the Obama administration has:

- Virtually shut down oil drilling in the Gulf. Yes, the six-month moratorium announced during the BP oil spill ended in November. But regulators have made it nearly impossible for oil firms to restart operations and have slapped strict new rules on drilling even in shallow waters.
- Put hundreds of billions of barrels of offshore oil and gas off-limits to exploration and production. By executive order, the administration has taken much of the energy-rich Outer Continental Shelf out of play. This, according to the Energy Information Administration, will cut this year's output by 220,000 barrels a day.
- Canceled 77 existing drilling leases in Utah, one of Department of Interior Secretary Ken Salazar's first actions and a move that set the tone for the Obama administration's war on energy.
- Proposed new taxes on energy, including the cap-and-trade fiasco, that have had a chilling effect on new investment in energy. Steven Chu, Obama's energy secretary, has already let the cat out of the bag by saying he wants to see pump prices in the U.S. as high as they are in Europe. Last we checked, that was \$7 a gallon.

America has the oil and natural gas resources to ensure its energy future as we develop reasonable, economically viable alternatives to fossil fuels. And that oil and gas is available right now.

Yet, our government has systematically put those resources out of reach, making us more dependent on unreliable foreign sources. Today we're more, not less, vulnerable to the predations of foreign dictators and tyrants who would do us ill.

Developing our own resources would also go a long way toward boosting the economy. A new study by consultants Wood Mackenzie reckons that 530,000 new, high-paying jobs could be created and \$150 billion in government tax revenue generated over the next four years by boosting oil output by 4 million barrels a day.

Obama's war against fossil fuels is a direct assault on our oil-dependent economy and standard of living. At a minimum, the new Congress should hold hearings on these damaging policies — and overturn them if possible.

#####

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.