The Week That Was (July 25, 2009) brought to you by SEPP

##

NO TWTW ON AUGUST 1

Fred Singer is speaking at the DDP Conference (Aug 1-2) in Denver (Doubletree Hotel, Quebec St)
In Phoenix AZ on Aug 3-5, invited to discuss the Western Climate Initiative with State officials

##

Quote of the Week:

I wrote this book because I'm a scientist. Because I'm offended that science is being perverted in the name of global warming – today's environmental cause célèbre. Because the world seems to have lost its collective mind and substituted political belief for the spirit of scientific inquiry. -- From *the Preface of "Global Warming: False Alarm" by Ralph Alexander, PhD*

****

THIS WEEK

http://spectator.org/archives/2009/07/20/governors-two-bark-back

The Western Climate Initiative (WCI) of the Western Governors Association, a regional cap-and-trade system has been criticized by two of the governors -- Sarah Palin of Alaska and Rick Perry of Texas, both Republicans. Another WGA member, Democrat Gov. Dave Freudenthal of Wyoming, may join them, AP reports via the *Casper Tribune*. Gov. Ritter (Colo) and Schweitzer (Montana) are having second thoughts.

****

The UN's top climate official says that the richest nations will have to put $10bn "on the table" during the Copenhagen climate change summit. Yvo De Boer, who will lead the negotiations, said such a commitment was necessary for their success. He insisted the burden of climate change must be shared and that the money would help developing countries. De Boer, head of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), said the $10bn (£6bn) pledge would be "a good beginning". "(It) will allow developing countries to begin preparing national plans to limit their own emissions, and to adapt to climate change," he told the BBC. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/8163456.stm

The split between rich and poor nations is widening on the charge of '**environmental colonialism**.' India rejected key scientific findings on global warming, while the European Union called for more action by developing states on GH-gas emissions. Jairam **Ramesh**, the Indian environment minister, accused the developed world of needlessly raising alarm over melting Himalayan glaciers. The *Financial Times of India* reports (July 24) Ramesh is 'on a strong wicket' when refusing to accept mitigation obligations… while the US is 'on thin ice.' India should would not sign a treaty permitting trade sanctions [like the Waxman bill], would challenge any attempt at enforcing such sanctions, and if necessary, would exercise its right to retaliate.

But Swedish negotiator Carlgren wants developing countries to adopt more ambitious plans to reduce emissions if they were to receive finance from wealthy nations.

So it's all about money not climate. Surprised?

****

Double Breakthrough: *Nature* publishes Letter by 6 climate skeptics which tells of another breakthrough: A major scientific society has agreed to reconsider its alarmist Statement on Climate Change
http://links.ealert.nature.com/ctt?kn=51&m=33681617&r=MjA1NjE2MDAwNAS2&b=2&j=NTM2ODU3NTkS1&mt=1&rt=0
Nature 460, 457 (23 July 2009) | doi:10.1038/460457b; Published online 22 July 2009

==========

Petitioning for a revised statement on climate change

S. Fred Singer1, Hal Lewis2, Will Happer3, Larry Gould4, Roger Cohen5 & Robert H. Austin3
1. U of Virginia; 2. U of California, Santa Barbara; 3. Princeton U; 4. U of Hartford; 5. Durango, CO

We write in response to your issue discussing "the coming climate crunch", including the Editorial 'Time to act' (*Nature* 458, 10771078; 2009). We feel it is alarmist.

We are among more than 50 current and former members of the American Physical Society (APS) who have signed an open letter to the APS Council this month, calling for a reconsideration of its November 2007 policy statement on climate change (see open letter at http://tinyurl.com/lg266u; APS statement at http://tinyurl.com/56zqxr). The letter proposes an alternative statement, which the signatories believe to be

a more accurate representation of the current scientific evidence. It requests that an objective scientific process be established, devoid of political or financial agendas, to help prevent subversion of the scientific process and the intolerance towards scientific disagreement that pervades the climate issue.

On 1 May 2009, the APS Council decided to review its current statement via a high-level subcommittee of respected senior scientists. We applaud this decision. It is the first such reappraisal by a major scientific professional society that we are aware of, and we hope it will lead to meaningful change that reflects a more balanced view of climate-change issues.

****

SEPP Science Editorial #23-2009 (7/25/09)

Human Heat Input or GH Effect? A false choice

Two recent papers in peer-reviewed journals claim that the direct input of heat into the earth's atmosphere by human energy generation is comparable to solar heating -- and more important than the calculated greenhouse effect from fossil-fuel burning. The paper by Nickolaenko from the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences is published in the *Journal of Geophysical Research* (2009), while the paper by Nordell from the Technical University of Lulea in Northern Sweden is published in the *International Journal of Global Warming*, vol 1, 2009. [***Alas, all this proves is that peer-review doesn't guarantee correctness.]***

These two papers have caused much jubilation among skeptics of AGW – but such jubilation may be premature. Simple considerations show that the ratio of heat input from the sun compared to human energy activity is of the order of 10,000. In other words, one hour of solar input is equivalent to one year of human energy generation and heat dissipation. It is hardly necessary to read beyond the abstract to reach such a conclusion. A simple back-of-the-envelope calculation may be sufficient.

<http://www.inderscience.com/storage/f612811109534712.pdf>
<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/07/090713085248.htm>
Nickolaenko, A. P. (2009), Concept of planetary thermal balance and global warming, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, A04310, doi:10.1029/2008JA013753.
Abstract: The concept of Earth's thermal balance is used to suggest that solar energy absorbed by a planet is equal to the heat radiated from that planet. Such an approach substantially simplifies estimating the anthropogenic warming of the planet. We compare the solar irradiance with the current heat production caused by burning different kinds of fuel. We show that anthropogenic heating is able to cause global warming of 1°C in a century.

Just reading the abstract suggests that the paper is nonsense and involves a huge numerical error.
One can compare human energy generation with solar -- just by rough estimation:
*Heat/sec generated by human activity: ~ 2kW/person x 6*10^9 persons = ~12*10^12 Watt*
Solar heating 240 W/m2 x 4pi(6.4*10^6m)^2 = 10^5*10^12 Watt. Even extreme assumptions for 2050, of 10 billion people consuming 10kW yields = 100*10^12 watt, just 0.1% of solar input*

According to a report in *Global Fuels and Refining Today*, the Swedish findings could have a "devastating impact" on supposed "climate-friendly" solutions, including biofuels combustion and nuclear power, since such schemes cut net CO2 but don't reduce heat emissions. "Our study shows that anthropogenic heat emissions are the main cause (three-fourths) of global warming," researcher Bo Nordell told in an exclusive interview. Given this conclusion, we then asked Nordell: If CO2 sequestration isn't important for stopping global warming, then what if anything can be done to stop it in the next few decades? "More efficient use of fossil energy reduces the global warming – this is also the least expensive method," Nordell said. "It has been shown that 40% to 50% reduction of the energy consumption is feasible in most industries. Replacing fossil fuels with renewable energy also reduces the net heat emissions," especially any renewables (such as solar and wind) that don't release heat to make energy, he said.

The study found that the net heat emissions from the industrial age (from 1880 to 2000) correspond to 74% of the earth's accumulated heat – that is, global warming. "The missing heat (26%) must have other causes, e.g., the greenhouse effect, the natural variations in the climate and/or the underestimation of net heat emissions," "Since net heat emissions account for most of the global warming, there is no or little reason for carbon dioxide sequestration," Nordell concluded.

Asked about the "**urban heat island**" effect on global warming – caused by the expansion of cities during the past 130 years – Nordell said that "in our opinion, heat islands have the same origin – it is mainly a result of heat emission in cities." [***Nordell is correct about UHI***.]

About forty years ago, local heat pollution from power stations was considered to be a big environmental problem -- until it was discovered that fish and other marine biota thrived in the warm region of the cooling water. In my book "*The Changing Global Environment*," published by Reidel Publishing Company in 1975, I actually compared (page 42) solar warming with thermal power generation in the Los Angeles basin. In 1970, this area of 4,000 square miles generated thermal power equivalent to more than 5% of solar energy absorbed at the ground. I estimated then that by the year 2000, this value would rise to 18 percent, based on extrapolated electric power consumption with a doubling time of ten years and other energy at a lower rate. Fig 8 showed the expected heat released by automobiles, by residential-commercial heating, and by electric power generation; the sum being the total thermal power. Even if these estimates are not quite correct, the waste heat loads are large and can certainly lead to changes in local climate.

This released heat forms an important part of the Urban Heat Island Effect. Another part comes from solar heat, stored during the day in concrete and other structures and released during the night, and from reduced evaporation. These effects are of course quite independent from known difficulties of temperature measurements in urban areas, which often suffer from poor placement of observing stations and other problems, as discussed by Anthony Watts. See: *www.**heartland**.org/books/SurfaceStations.html*

****

1. Western Governors are having second thoughts about WCI

2. EPA Whistleblower Exposes Agenda's Fatal Flaw - *Chris Horner*

3. Climate Fixers' Hard Sell – *George Will*

4. UK Energy Policy – *Scientific Alliance*

5. Air and Ocean temperatures –*David Evans*

6. Sea level budget over 2003-2008 – *Global and Planetary Change*

7. "The Climate Caper" – *Book Review by Andrew Bolt*

8. "Global Warming False Alarm" –*Ralph B. Alexander*

****

NEWS YOU CAN USE

The head of the IPCC, **Rajendra Pachauri** says in an interview: "India is in no position to accept caps." Is this just part of a well-coordinated bargaining position in advance of the Copenhagen talks later this year? No. Research conducted by Dr. Pachauri's group at The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) concludes that India needs as much as $11.9 trillion to transition to a "low-carbon economy" over the next 25 years. To put this number into context, it is 10 times India's current GDP.

If policy makers believe Pachauri's TERI analysis, then of course India is not going to commit to reducing emissions, unless the developed countries show up with a multi-trillion-dollar+ blank check. These numbers also help to explain Indian skepticism over Hillary Clinton's claim that following a low-carbon growth path can help grow the Indian economy. *Roger Pielke Jr, 21 July 2009*
<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2009/07/more-from-india-ten-times-gdp.html>

****

Hansen's proposal of a carbon tax paid into the Treasury is certainly a much better alternative to Waxman-Markey -- if one really wanted to limit CO2 emissions – assuming (1) that such a policy is needed; (2) that anthropogenic CO2 increases will make a significant contribution to Global Warming. [The evidence says No, contrary to the IPCC report; see www.nipccreport.org]; and (3) that a warmer climate (such as existed during many periods of earth history) is worse than a colder climate. But a carbon tax, while more effective and less costly, is not as attractive to politicians as the Waxman-Markey bill, which dispenses

multi-billions of goodies and deserves to be called "The Full Employment for Lobbyists Act of 2009."

But even an energy tax has many loopholes that surely will be exploited. Should farmers pay the tax? What about municipalities, police, firemen, hospitals, clergy, etc, etc. The Defense Department? Surely they will exempt "pollution-free" solar and wind energy. But how will enviros react to nuclear energy – which also emits no CO2? One could go on…

The best course of action is to do nothing – and adapt to inevitable naturally-caused climate changes, as mankind has been doing since the dawn of history.

****

The influence of financial gain on the climate-change debate is well described by Joanna Nova:
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_money.pdf
Here is the shorter description (linked to by Drudge):
http://www.transworldnews.com/NewsStory.aspx?id=104031&cat=12

****

http://cowles.econ.yale.edu/P/cd/d16b/d1686.pdf This paper by Yale economist William Nordhaus is great fun. It has been argued by some AGWA economists that calculating mean benefit/cost ratios of various policy options, such a cap-and-trade and carbon taxes, is a distortion of the true economic threat because it neglects the effect of truly extreme but perhaps low-probability events. Here 'mean' means the mid point of IPCC predictions (3.0 deg C for doubling). These typically give mediocre ratios because the policies are economically expensive and the avoided environmental damage is relatively small and in the distant future. These results cannot be allowed to stand. So what happens if the right answer is really 8 deg C for doubling as the upper-end models predict (Never mind that we haven't warmed by 4 degrees C since 1870; never mind the question of what happens if the right answer is really much less than 3 degrees C.). And so a new way of looking at the economic impact of such a true catastrophe is to calculate the relative utilities via model utility functions. And behold! The result is a new theorem, which suggests that it is ok for societies to spend huge amounts of money to avoid such life-ending catastrophes, even if they are low likelihood. Nordhaus shows that if this were true, we would now be spending trillions of dollars to reduce the risk of a collision with a K-T type asteroid. It doesn't happen and it is not necessary.

****

Just in time for the Apollo 40-year anniversary: **Moonwalkers Defy Gore: NASA Astronaut Dr. Buzz Aldrin and Jack Schmitt reject global warming fears: Defy Gore's Claim That Climate Skeptics Are Akin To Those Who Believe Moon Landing was 'Staged' - July 3, 2009**)
http://www.climatedepot.com/a/1792/Another-Moonwalker-Defies-Gore-NASA-Astronaut-Dr-Buzz-Aldrin-rejects-global-warming-fears-Climate-has-been-changing-for-billions-of-years

****

New Lomborg article: "Mr. Gore, Your Solution to Global Warming is Wrong"
http://www.esquire.com/features/new-solutions-to-global-warming-0809

****

Lord Monckton writes on his experience with Physics & Society Feb 2009
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/commentaries/reviewed_or_not.pdf
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/commentaries_essays/reviewed_or_not_reviewed.html

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE

"*I frankly think that this Copenhagen is the last chance for us to deal with this problem. I'm serious. If we don't do anything now, we're going to push the world past what is known as a 2-degree-Celsius threshold, which means that we are committing it to 12 metres of sea level rise, the desertification of southern Europe and many, many other things.*" -- Andrew Weaver, Univ of British Colombia, The Gazette, 20 July 2009
SEPP says: So that's it – his 12 m vs our 18 cm. Or in 5 years: 60cm vs 1cm. I challenge him to a bet.

****

From a letter from my country squire friend in Cornwall, UK:
One wonders why all these "greenie" politicians don't propose a tax on pet owners. My own view of pets is that they represent the surest mechanism yet devised for shovelling in money at one end and harvesting excrement at the other. Whether or not one agrees with this rather bleak assessment, however, one thing is beyond dispute, and that is that 99% of pets are strictly optional adjuncts to anyone's life. From an orthodox AGW perspective these millions/billions of extraneous over/inbred critters exhale CO2, eat vast quantities of nourishment (usually animal-based), which, if warmistas such as Pachauri are to be believed,

generate in their preparation huge quantities of a gas they label as a pollutant.

So, I say again, why no disincentive to pet ownership proposed by these self-proclaimed saviours of the planet? Could it just be that they sense that any such a proposal would have them out in the street at the next election? Perish such a dishonourable thought!

SEPP says: In Washington DC we make exceptions for Portuguese water dogs

****

John (Jack) Jacob **Astor** IV (1864-1912) presented a unique way to stop global change. From the book "When the Astors Owned New York" by Justin Kaplan, Viking, the Penguin group, 2006. page 66 :
In Jack's world of the future, scientists employed by the Terrestrial Axis Straightening Company harnessed apergy to nullify gravity, melt the polar ice cap, and blow up the Aleutian Islands. All this had been done in order "to straighten the axis of the earth, to combine the extreme heat of summer with the intense cold of the winter and produce a uniform temperature for each degree of latitude the year around.*
[*Apergy combines "negative and positive electricity with electricity of the third element or state."]
Congress should look into this idea, the same benign temperature year around and everywhere no global change at all. *H/t to my friendly climatologist Mac Ross (ex-USGS)*

##########

1. WESTERN GOVERNORS ARE HAVING SECOND THOUGHTS

The Western Climate Initiative (WCI) -- *whose goal is a cap-and-trade agreement among member states* (AZ, NM, CA, OR, WA, UT, and MT) -- draws criticism by two of the governors -- Sarah Palin of Alaska and Rick Perry of Texas, both Republicans. Now Democrat Gov. Dave Freudenthal of Wyoming has joined them, AP reports via the Casper Tribune. Colorado Gov. Bill Ritter avoids the question from Oklahoma Sen. James Inhofe (YouTube embedded at Michelle Malkin's site): " *..are you here supporting Waxman-Markey today?*" Ritter won't publicly acknowledge he supports Waxman-Markey. That's because as Inhofe set up his question, Colorado oil-shale deposits would be put off limits by the bill (therefore severe economic consequences for the state, and political consequences for the governor), and he also detailed how W-M would harm farmers in eastern Colorado.

Curiously also, "green" Governor Ritter has failed to take the step of joining his enviro-left colleagues of the Western Governors Association (WGA) as members of the Western Climate Initiative, despite going to great lengths during his term to hone his global warming credentials. After noting Wyoming Democrat Gov. Dave Freudenthal's position yesterday, that now makes two of the party's governors holding their noses over Waxman-Markey. Montana's Gov. Brian Schweitzer says out of one side of his mouth that it's wrongheaded, while out of the other side he defends WCI (and WGA's management of it) to the hilt.

****

2. GLOBAL WARMING'S MISSING LINK: EPA WHISTLEBLOWER EXPOSES AGENDA'S FATAL FLAW

By Chris Horner, July 20, 2009 *http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/2297086/posts*

The Environmental Protection Agency is pushing the greatest regulatory intervention in US history, seeking to declare that carbon dioxide poses an "endangerment" under the Clean Air Act, threatening human health and the environment. To hear the EPA tell it, CO2 – which nonetheless remains indispensible to life on earth and without which plants die, more of which produces higher crop yields, etc. – will kill us all.

This proposal is a cornerstone of the Obama administration's attempt to bring the energy sector of the economy under state control just as it seeks to do with health care, essentially ruining something in order to take it over in the name of cleaning up capitalism's mess. It's an old play, which the statists have run for decades, certain that every now and then it will break for a big gain. But an inconvenient EPA career professional just doing his job assessed the premise and informed his superiors, in the sole substantive report presented in the Agency's internal deliberations, that upon scrutiny CO2 clearly does not drive temperatures or climate but oddly enough, the sun and oceans do. His boss told him to shut up, that nothing good could come to their office by injecting this analysis into the process, as the decision had been made.

One problem with that, of course, is that the decision is not allowed to be made before the process has run its course. That is the entire purpose of an internal debate which, internal documents now prove, was truncated and in fact illusory.

For his troubles, this physics graduate of Cal Tech and MIT PhD economist – which are why he had his job – was subjected to the ritual smear job as unqualified by the thugs running the global warming industry. The nicest thing said about him was "He's not a climate scientist!" shrieked by legions of non-scientists nonetheless cocksure of their own wisdom, insight and informed judgment on the matter.

Left unmentioned were the scientific credentials of the EPA administrator, President Obama, and the 535 members of Congress who are tasked with deciding the issue. "He's just an economist!" the non-scientists' line continued, ignoring that whole physics-degree thing and that, ah, well, the UN's "chief climate scientist" is "just an economist." Again, as the whistleblower Dr. Alan Carlin learned, facts have little weight in this debate. Still, one key truth that Carlin brought to the fore exposes how – assuming that sanity prevails in the Senate and Congress is unable to impose "cap-and-trade" energy rationing – his exposé will carry the day in court.

This is man-made warming theory's missing link. The global warming industry and its political enablers have been getting away with an amazing stunt of backing out from the equation inconvenient things which your lying eyes might tell you. Amid the cries of "warming proceeding even faster than predicted" – an actual, common claim among alarmists, politicians and the media – observations reveal that the recent cooling has brought us to the average of the entire 30-year history of the satellite temperature record.

Climate changes and temperatures go up and down, that's what they do, so it is surely an amusing coincidence of statistics to see no temperature change following a three-decade-long cooling spell that ended with the coldest decade of the century (the 1970s). To see this as "global warming" hysteria hijacks the policymaking process of a major economic power is staggering.

The crux of what Carlin revealed is that the alarmist campaign has, through indignant repetition and an absurdly flawed syllogism, substituted man-made greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as a proxy for temperatures. The disfavored human activity somehow now equates with the weather, a bizarre apples-and-stethoscopes comparison.

To grasp this we need a quick history of the campaign. By the late 1980s "global cooling" had given way to warming as a vehicle for various types to rally the public around their agenda (the Club of Rome admitted this in its 1991 book "The First Global Revolution"). This global warming industry coalesced to demand fealty to a strange premise: Mankind would agree to employ the gentle ministrations of national and, preferably, supranational bureaucrats to keep the earth's temperature from rising more than two degrees Celsius higher than "pre-industrial" temperatures.

Now, "pre-industrial" is code for the most cynical statistical cherry-picking of our time, given the approximation with the end of a geophysical phenomenon known as the Little Ice Age, a miserable, cold and cloudy period of crop failure, infant mortality and disease.

This "two degree solution" didn't last long, thanks to what I can only guess was a nagging fear that the public are aware that temperatures go up and down. It soon gave way to a metric of keeping atmospheric GHG concentrations below a "dangerous" level, though the UN scientists (economists, whatever) tasked with asserting what that level is refused to do so.

This was never about climate anyway but population, lifestyle, energy use and, above all else, control, so such obstacles were ignored and the industry moved right on to a metric even more convenient for them, GHG emissions. This is the tortured path bringing about the oddity of alarmists citing emissions going up faster than predicted as proving that global warming is proceeding faster than predicted, while temperatures are flat and even cooling. To date, it's worked.

EPA's "endangerment finding" is rife with this absurd non sequitor: CO2 concentrations are going up, Man's CO2 is surely behind this, therefore man is causing climate change. In its "finding" the EPA, like the

UN's IPCC, fail to establish the missing link, that CO2 drives climate. Instead, EPA just points to the IPCC, which in turn simply proclaims the relationship, having itself also never having cited any authority establishing (rather than assuming) that CO2 drives temperature or climate, in the past or now.

While never the subject of a US court's scrutiny, this premise for the entire enterprise will by necessity be a principal focus of any challenge to EPA. It seems highly doubtful that EPA could support such a line of, for lack of a better word, reasoning, particularly in light of Carlin's stifled analysis and recent peer-reviewed literature. This will only occur by avoiding the panic-stricken acceptance by industry holdouts of some (they hope) a less-bad deal in the Senate for fear of EPA.

Upon scrutiny, covered industry has no option for long-term survival but to pursue victory. This begins in the Senate, which still lacks the votes to pass climate legislation. Neither peace nor concern is for sale, and industry should not cut a deal. The alarmist industry has never been forced to make its case. The EPA can be forced to make it, and it is unlikely that they can.

****

3. CLIMATE FIXERS' HARD SELL

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/07/22/AR2009072202415.html

by George Will, July 23, 2009

Unfortunately, China's president had to dash home to suppress ethnic riots. Had he stayed in Italy at the recent G-8 summit, he could have continued the Herculean task of disabusing Barack Obama of his amazingly durable belief, shared by the U.S. Congress, that China -- and India, Brazil, Mexico and other developing nations -- will sacrifice their modernization on the altar of climate change. China has a more pressing agenda, and not even suppressing riots tops the list.

China made this clear in June, when its vice premier said, opaquely, that China will "actively" participate in climate change talks on a basis of "common but differentiated responsibility." The meaning of that was made clear three days later, at a climate change conference in Bonn, where a Chinese spokesman reiterated that his country's priority is economic growth: "Given that, it is natural for China to have some increase in its emissions, so it is not possible for China in that context to accept a binding or compulsory target." That was redundant: In January, China announced that its continuing reliance on coal as its primary source of energy will require increasing coal production 30 percent in the next six years.

In Bonn, even thoroughly developed Japan promised only a 2 percent increase of its emission-reduction obligations under the 1997 Kyoto agreement. Japan's decision left Yvo de Boer, the slow learner who is the U.N.'s climate change czar, nonplussed: "For the first time in my two and a half years in this job, I don't know what to say."

Others did. They said: On to Italy! The Financial Times reported, "Officials are now pinning their hopes" on the G-8 summit.

Which has come and gone, the eight having vowed to cut emissions of greenhouse gases 80 percent by 2050, which is 41 years distant. As is 1968, which seems as remote as the Punic Wars, considering that more than half of all living Americans were born after 1966. If you do not want to do anything today, promise to do everything tomorrow, which is always a day away.

Still, sternly declaring that they will brook no nonsense from nature, the eight made a commitment -- but a nonbinding one -- that Earth's temperature shall not rise by more than 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit over "preindustrial levels." That is the goal. Details to follow. Tomorrow.

Explaining such lethargy in the face of a supposed emergency, the G-8's host, Italy's Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, said the eight should not burden themselves as long as "5 billion people continue to behave as they have always behaved." Actually, the problem, for people who think it is a problem, is that the 5 billion in the developing world are behaving in a new way. After centuries of exclusion from economic growth, they are enjoying it, which is tiresome to would-be climate fixers in already prosperous nations.

The fixers say: On to Copenhagen! There, in December, the moveable feast of climate confabulations will continue. By which time China alone, at its current pace, probably will have brought on line 14 more coal-fired generating plants, each of them capable of providing all the electricity needed for a city the size of San Diego. And last Sunday, India told visiting Secretary of State Hillary Clinton that there is "no case" for U.S. pressure on India to reduce carbon emissions.

The costs of weaning the U.S. economy off much of its reliance on carbon are uncertain, but certainly large. The climatic benefits of doing so are uncertain but, given the behavior of those pesky 5 billion, almost certainly small, perhaps minuscule, even immeasurable. Fortunately, skepticism about the evidence that supposedly supports current alarmism about climate change is growing, as is evidence that, whatever the truth about the problem turns out to be, U.S. actions cannot be significantly ameliorative.

When New York Times columnist Tom Friedman called upon "young Americans" to "get a million people on the Washington Mall calling for a price on carbon," another columnist, Mark Steyn, responded: "If you're 29, there has been no global warming for your entire adult life. If you're graduating high school, there has been no global warming since you entered first grade."

Which could explain why the Mall does not reverberate with youthful clamors about carbon. And why, regarding climate change, the U.S. government, rushing to impose unilateral cap-and-trade burdens on the sagging U.S. economy, looks increasingly like someone who bought a closetful of platform shoes and bell-bottom slacks just as disco was dying.

****

4. UK ENERGY POLICY

The Scientific Alliance, 16th July 2009

The UK government has just published a new renewable energy white paper - the Low Carbon Transition Plan - together with three supporting documents: a Low Carbon Industrial Strategy, a Renewable Energy Strategy and a Low Carbon Transport Plan. As a package, these plot the course for the country to reach a number of ambitious goals, including a 34% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 (from a 1990 baseline) and for 15% of energy to come from renewable resources by the same date.

The EU is set on leading the world in decarbonising the economy, and now the UK is staking its claim to take a lead in Europe. The plans are not only ambitious, but also complex. The various parts of the package are inter-related and it will take some time to tease out all the details, so of which may be made deliberately obscure at this stage to give the government more wriggle room later.

But the headlines are clear enough: nuclear is back in favour but new capacity will not be on stream to plug the yawning gap as aging power stations - both nuclear and coal - are decommissioned. Other coal-fired stations are expected to be lost not because they are no longer viable, but because their continued use would breach EU emissions standards. The gap instead will be filled by renewables, with more than 30% of electricity to come from wind, biomass, hydro, wave and tidal generators.

Transport energy will also be 10% from renewables. Included in the mix would be support for electric cars and possible further railway electrification. Neither of these, of course, make much sense if the energy to run them is generated by fossil fuels.

To quote from the Renewable Energy Strategy: "The precise breakdown of the 2020 renewable energy target between technologies will depend on how investors respond to the incentives we put in place." Roughly translated, this means it will how much taxpayers' money will be handed over to make it worthwhile to invest in otherwise uneconomic generating capacity, which in turn will mean that those same taxpayers then receive higher electricity bills.

The report makes it clear that more than two-thirds of the total target could be supplied by off- and on-shore wind farms. That is, consumers and industry would rely for 20% of their energy needs on a high-cost, intermittent source of supply, backed up by a further 10% from other renewables. With the exception of biomass and bio-gas, these would also be intermittent and largely unproven technologies.

And yet, these proposals would "contribute to the security of energy supplies in the UK through reductions in our demand for fossil fuels of around 10%, and gas imports by between 20-30% against our forecast use in 2020." Security of energy supplies in the literal sense, maybe. But energy security per se is a different matter. If the government really does rely on wind power in this way, we are going to see the lights go out on a regular basis, at least during winter. To avoid this will mean keeping more conventional capacity on stream to meet demand as the wind fluctuates, so the real reduction in emissions is likely to be much less than theory might predict.

But of course building the projected 4,000 on-shore and 3,000 off-shore wind turbines by 2020 is a Herculean task. That is pretty much two a day for the next 12 years. For off-shore installations, it is reckoned that there are normally only 60 days a year when such work could be done in the North Sea. That means that at least four of these particular monsters would have to be erected each day to achieve the target.

Additionally, on-shore wind turbine building has often been delayed or halted by vociferous local opposition. The white paper accepts that the planning system must be speeded up and "made more predictable", and proposes setting up an "independent" Infrastructure Planning Commission to "take decisions on nationally significant projects in England and Wales". We all know that the planning system for major infrastructure projects can be interminable, often because of well-orchestrated campaigns by national groups, but effectively overriding the current procedures for something as controversial as wind farms may lead to more opposition than politicians have bargained for.

Given these factors, the likelihood is that neither the targets for renewable energy nor for emissions reductions will be achieved (although the government appears to be ready to buy offsets to achieve the latter, effectively watering it down). This means that, after much heart-searching by the government of the day, we will almost certainly see more investment in gas- and coal-fired power stations to provide energy security.

At the same time, there should of course be greater investment in a range of novel technologies, both for power generation and transport. As these develop, costs will decline and we may see a move away from fossil fuels simply because better alternatives are available which are economically competitive.

This also means looking more broadly and being prepared to innovate rather than simply relying on improving existing technologies. One intriguing possibility is afforded by the discovery of bacteria which can grow on coal to yield methane, one of the results of a prospecting trip by the ever-inventive American scientist Craig Venter. Actually, his team have discovered bacteria which break down coal to give organic acids, hydrogen and carbon dioxide and others which use these as raw materials to make methane.

But tinkering with the genomes of micro-organisms is now so commonplace that engineering a single bacterium to combine the two stages in an efficient way would be a natural next step. This gives the prospect of replacing dirty, dangerous and inefficient coal mining by a process which seeds coal seams with the bacteria and then collects the methane at ground level. BP thinks the concept is sufficiently attractive to warrant working with Venter.

On CLOUD 09?

While politicians are formulating plans to tackle climate change on the assumption that the greenhouse gas hypothesis is correct, scientists at CERN in Geneva are starting a major experiment to test an alternative idea that cosmic rays are important in determining weather patterns because of their influence on cloud formation. The experiment - called CLOUD 09 - will test the ability of high energy particles to initiate cloud formation under a range of conditions.

This will enable two alternative hypotheses to be evaluated. One is that the variable solar wind lets through more high energy cosmic rays when the Sun is in a quiet phase (as now), leading to more cloud and tending to cool the atmosphere. An alternative is that it is solar particles themselves which are the cloud formers. In either case, evidence that the Sun has a greater role to play in climate changes than the IPCC suggests could

have very significant consequences, both for our future climate and for government (and indeed, international) policy.

Euan Mearns says: The global economy is governed by oil supplies, the climate to large extent is governed by solar activity and the effects of ocean currents, and the UK is governed by buffoons.

****

5. AIR AND OCEAN TEMPERATURES

By David Evans *http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/ocean_temps.pdf*

■Air temperatures have been falling for years. Satellites show that 1998 was the warmest recent year and that a cooling trend started in 2002. Even the land-based thermometer data, which is corrupted by artificial heating sources close to 89% of its thermometers and which is heavily "corrected", now shows a cooling trend developing from 2006. ■ The alarmists recently switched to ocean temperature to measure global warming. ■ The alarmists claim the world is still warming, that heat is building up in the oceans, and that the ocean temperature is rising and rising fast. These claims implicitly depend on a time period to say what a "trend" is, because temperatures fluctuate. The alarmists provide the context by showing trends of 20 to 50 years. This is a clever trick to reframe the debate, and essential to their case. ■ Ocean temperatures have only been measured properly from mid 2003, when the Argo network became operational. Over 3,000 Argo floats cover all the world's oceans. They dive down to measure temperatures, then resurface to radio back the information. The previous XBT system did not monitor huge areas of ocean, did not go as deep, and was much less accurate. ■ Ocean temperatures are dropping slightly. The Argo data shows that the oceans have been cooling slightly since mid 2003. Our best data, from satellites and Argo, shows that the air and oceans have not warmed for at least five years. The world is now cooling slightly, so there is no heat accumulating. Some natural cooling force is currently stronger than the warming due to human emissions.

■ Short-term trends contradict the alarmist claims. Our best data, from satellites and Argo, shows that the air and oceans have not warmed for at least five years. The world is now cooling slightly, so there is no heat accumulating. Some natural cooling force is currently stronger than the warming due to human emissions. ■ Long-term trends contradict the alarmist claims. The world has been recovering from the little ice age, warming at a steady trend rate since 1750 with alternate warming and cooling oscillations of about 30 years. The pattern suggests we have just finished the last warming, and have entered a cooling period until about 2030. ■ The latest alarmist claims are a bluff. The alarmist claims only appear credible if trends shorter than 10 years or longer than 50 years are ignored. But it will take time to inform the public and politicians that the alarmist's claims are baseless. With the US climate bill now being debated and the Copenhagen climate conference coming up in December 2009, they only need to make the public believe their schtick for a few months. ■ Problems with alarmist graphs of ocean heat. They omit Argo data by stopping in 2003, or contradict it by showing ocean warming continuing through 2006.

****

6. SEA LEVEL BUDGET OVER 2003-2008:

"A Re-Evaluation From GRACE Space Gravimetry, Satellite Altimetry And Argo"

(*Global and Planetary Change*, Vol 65, pp83-88, January 2009)
http://sccciences.blogs.liberation.fr/home/files/Cazenave_et_al_GPC_2008.pdf

In a definitive paper about sea level change, **Anny Cazenave** et al conclude:
"Over 2003–2008, the GRACE-based ocean mass has increased at an average rate of ~1.9 mm/yr (if we take the upper range of possible GIA corrections as recommended by Peltier, submitted for publication). Such a rate agrees well with the sum of land-ice plus land-water contributions (i.e., GRACE-based ice sheet mass balance estimated in this study, GRACE-based land waters, plus recently published estimates for the current glacier contribution). These results in turn offer constraints on the ocean mass GIA correction, as well as on the glacier melting contribution."

The authors also note that since 2006 the rate of increase seems to have plateaued, an observation since confirmed by others. A rigorous paper [**A. Trupin and J. Wahr** "Orthogonal Stack of Global Tide Gauge

Sea Level Data" pps 111 to 117 in Dennis D McCarthy and William Carter (eds) *Variations in Earth Rotation* Geophysical Monograph 59 American Geophysical Union Vol 9 1990)] found:
"Global averages of tide data, after correcting for the effects of post glacial rebound on individual station records, reveal an increase in sea level over the last 80 years of between 1.1mm/yr and 1.9mm/yr, …. with a preferred value of 1.75mm/yr." The value of ~1.9mm/yr accords with other estimates published around that time.

J. D'Aleo concludes: "The conclusion from these published papers, both rigorous and definitive, is that the rate of increase of the ocean mass has been constant for over 100 years at approximately 1.9mm/yr. If the ocean mass has been increasing at the constant rate of approximately 1.9mm/yr for the last 100 years, its temperature cannot have been increasing at an increasing rate as the IPCC hypothesised. This is because warmer water occupies a greater volume than cooler water, other things being equal. Hence there is no trace of any increased temperature in the total mass of the oceans that could be attributable to AWG as the IPCC hypothesised." ***Fred Singer says***: I have a slightly different view; see my book "Hot Talk Cold Science"
****

7. THE CLIMATE CAPER:

A new book by Garth Paltridge. Foreword by Christopher Monckton
Review by Andrew Bolt
http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/the_climate_caper/

Excerpts from his new book here: http://groups.google.com/group/alt.global-warming/browse_thread/thread/eb7c05187ba5453c/218eabdd739223b1?lnk=raot

Climatologist Dr Garth Paltridge has finally had enough of the hysteria, hype and witchhunting that's fed the great global warming scare. Out today is his new book, The Climate Caper: Paltridge discusses how and why climate scientists have vastly overstated the case for disastrous global warming.

Among other things he explains why forecasts of a much dryer Australia in the future - forecasts which were the basis of the Garnaut economic recommendations which led in turn to the Emissions Trading Scheme now before parliament - are probably nonsense....

He says of climate change research: *"The whole business has hardened over the last couple of decades into a semi-religious crusade in which climate scientists have developed an arrogance about their aims and activity which brooks no argument either with their interpretation of the science or with the way the science is used."*

Much of the book is devoted to examples and discussion of how 'the system' keeps scientific scepticism about forecasts of climatic doom from public view. As for the rest of us, the attitude of a climate scientist can be coloured by politically correct ideas, by a need to be associated with a 'cause', by loyalty to colleagues and by the rise of excessive research competition. These are all powerful forces which amplify a real fear within the research community that an expression of scepticism about the current wisdom on global warming can be disastrous to one's career.

Paltridge is a critic not easily dismissed by our leading promoters of apocalyptic warming, such as mammal expert Tim Flannery, singer Peter Garrett, general practitioner Bob Brown, economist Ross Garnaut, ex diplomat Kevin Rudd and former politican Al Gore, none of whom have any of his expertise in climate science:

Dr Paltridge was a Chief Research Scientist with CSIRO and is a Fellow of the [Australian] Academy of Science. His is a specialist in atmospheric physics and climatology. He took part in the establishment of the World Climate Program in the mid-1970's, and was with the US National Climate Office during 1989 at the time of the emergence of the IPCC. For ten years he was CEO of the Antarctic Cooperative Research Centre studying the role of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean in climate. He is currently an Emeritus Professor at the University of Tasmania. Paltridge was co-author of the classic *Radiative processes in*

meteorology and climatology / by G. W. Paltridge and C. M. R. Platt. Elsevier Scientific Publ. Co., 1976
****

8. GLOBAL WARMING FALSE ALARM:

The Bad Science Behind The UN's Assertion That Man-Made CO2 Causes Global Warming
http://www.amazon.com/Global-Warming-False-Alarm-Assertion/dp/0984098909/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1247682943&sr=1-1
By Ralph B. Alexander. Canterbury Publishing, Paperback 178 pp

Review by Lubos Motl (Cambridge, MA) - You might think that there are already many books about climate change on the market. But Ralph Alexander's book is special and unusually appropriate for both beginners and experts in the field because of its balanced attitude to the problem.

That doesn't mean that Dr Alexander ends up with a "mixed" answer to the basic question. Just like a majority of books on the subject, Dr Alexander makes the readers understand that the global warming alarm is almost completely an artifact of manipulation with the human psychology and with the data. But unlike the case of many other books, you will see that Dr Alexander is actually a mainstream scientist (and an applied scientist in the environmental sector) who cares about the good name and functioning of science. Years ago, he was inclined to believe the "general wisdom" about the problem. His diametrically opposite conclusions are a result of his long research of the problem. And his pride of a scientist has been hurt. Climatology has become an ugly example of a scientific discipline that has largely ceased to be scientific.

Dr Alexander determines that the "ring" and the international character of the IPCC, the climate panel of the United Nations, are the main drivers of the hysteria so the IPCC, its process, and its reports are the main players investigated by this text. He analyzes the history and structure of the IPCC and finds out that this panel is just a particular and heavily funded group of loud partisans and activists that is meant to defend a predetermined conclusion and that doesn't reflect the scientific opinion of the world's scientific community, at least its financially and otherwise unbiased part, and certainly not the available body of data. Lots of numbers about the percentages of the scientist who agree and disagree with various statements are included.

The following chapters are dedicated to the standard topics in this debate: an introduction to the enhanced greenhouse effect and why it cannot account for most of the climate variability; computer models as the main basis underlying the alarm and their flaws; the CO2 and temperature records and reconstructions, their comparisons, and their flaws (including the urban heat effect); cherry-picking in various "concerned" studies; the interactions with politics (in both directions); corruption of the conventional peer review process; the biased IPCC evaluation of the climate sensitivity (warming from CO2 doubling); the lag in the correlation showing that the temperature is a driver, not an effect, of trace gas concentrations; solar, oceanic, cosmic, and other natural drivers that have to be crucial (even though the author honestly says that science doesn't yet understand their precise and separate effects); the high possibility of a cooling in the 21st century.

A significant portion of the text is also concerned with the economic consequences of the alarm; the failures of the cap-and-trade systems in the past, the differences between various countries; and the false hopes in green, luxurious sources of energy.

The book contains many wise stories and analogies from the history, useful data from the present, some jokes, and black-and-white pages that summarize the IPCC claims and their flaws in various sections. Two appendices discuss the feedbacks and the effect of Pacific Decadal Oscillation. And indeed, Dr Alexander had to include some equations, too. The book has a short glossary, 30 pages of technical endnotes (including many references that don't disturb you in the main text), and an index. At any rate, it is quite an amazing piece of work that is fun to read - because of its detailed data, its convincing case, and warm style - and I wholeheartedly recommend you to buy it and read it.

Review by J. Drallos (Michigan) - This book is not one to judge by its cover. Its strongly-worded title and chapter headings might easily lead one to expect a no-holds-barred adversarial work, but it turns out to be quite the opposite. Refreshingly, Dr. Alexander's style is warm and friendly throughout, providing a

comfortable, well-paced and very informative read. In fact, I read the entire book in just two sittings, which for a mostly technical book is quite an achievement. I attribute the ease of reading to the book's fair-minded style and its clear and logical progression of ideas.

Although the book does not demand a high level of scientific background, there is sufficient depth and data from any of the many referenced sources to satisfy even the more scientifically advanced reader.

The basic method of the book is to present the major evidence and lines of reasoning on which the IPCC conclusions are based. Then the evidence is examined for accuracy or systematic bias while the conclusions based on that evidence are examined for logical consistency. The whole idea, essentially, is to hold the IPCC claims accountable to the established rules of Science. Yes, there are rules of Science. Among those rules are that measurements be objective and repeatable, that conclusions logically follow from their premises and that the laws of Physics are the same everywhere and always. These are the main criteria to which the book holds the IPCC accountable. I don't think I'd be spoiling the ending by telling you that the IPCC fails miserably in this accountability.

In a way, the book puts the layman on par with the expert because one needs only a rational mind to understand when certain conclusions cannot be drawn from a given set of premises. Nor does one need to be an expert to see how systematic bias in a measurement can affect its outcome and invalidate the conclusions which are based on it. These principles are the real beauty of the book because they are fundamental to Science and transcend individual expertise. They allow the layman to authoritatively tell the 'expert' when he's wrong and this book clearly lays out the mistakes and missteps that the IPCC has taken.