

## The Week That Was (July 11, 2009) brought to you by SEPP

### Quote of the Week:

*"The causes of climate change are as yet not well enough explored. To think that such change can be stopped by mankind through a political agreement is pure nonsense"* From interview of former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, after the G8-Summit in Heiligendamm [*Bild*, June 4, 2007; p.3]:

\*\*\*\*\*

### **THIS WEEK**

COP-15 in CPH is unlikely to come up with a meaningful treaty to succeed the Kyoto Protocol (which was never ratified by the US and is due to expire in 2012). This week's G-8 meeting gave it only lukewarm 'lip-service' support. China and India are refusing to make any concessions on targets to limit CO2 emissions. Australia seems to be ready for a vote against emission trading.

And the US Senate may not even pass the Waxman-Markey 'tax & rationing' bill this fall. The leading Senate committee responsible for developing the climate change legislation has delayed by at least a month its crafting of a bill, leaving less time for Congress to fulfill Obama's desire to enact a law this year.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/07/09/AR2009070901998.html>

"We'll do it as soon as we get back" in September from a month-long break, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Chairman [Barbara Boxer](#) announced.

The upcoming elections in Virginia in Nov 2009 will provide a popular referendum on how a state that's gone from Republican to Democrat in the past few years feels about climate hype emanating from the White House vs economy and jobs.

We are not slackening in our efforts to educate the public, the media -- and through them, we hope, the politicians -- about the results of NIPCC that demonstrate the lack of any scientific evidence for AGW.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **SEPP Science Editorial #21-2009 (7/11/09)**

#### **Geo-Engineering (Part 3): Overcoming the Next Ice Age**

The most interesting application for climate geo-engineering might be to overcome the next ice age. Milankovich astronomical theory and also the experience of the last 2 million years suggest that the current interglacial period (Holocene) will soon come to an end and that the earth will soon enter into another glaciation. Alarms of an imminent ice age have been raised from time to time, for example in the 1970s after a prolonged period of climate cooling, and even more recently as the climate cooled slightly in the past few years. One needs to distinguish, however, between a Little Ice Age that may be part of a more-or-less regular 1,500-year cycle (and likely related to solar activity) and a true ice age that relates to a change in solar irradiance brought about by changes in earth's orbit, axis inclination and precession.

Not everyone agrees that such a Milankovich glaciation is imminent. For example, Andre Berger et al believe it might be as much as 40,000 years away. In any case, everyone agrees that a glaciation would bring about unprecedented hardship to the world, including crop failures, starvation – and wipe out much of the earth's human population.

The accepted mechanism for the initiation for a glaciation is the survival of a snow field at high northern latitudes during the summer, with feedback (due to increased albedo and cooling) enlarging the snow and ice area gradually over the years to cover much of the Northern Hemisphere. This effect may be the 'Achilles heel' of glaciation. Can it be stopped before it spreads?

The geo-engineering task would consist of three phases: (1) a more detailed studied of the Milankovich glaciation mechanism; (2) setting up a protocol for satellite search for surviving snowfields; (3) field experiments with soot dispersal to decrease the albedo and cause the disappearance of snowfields so they absorb solar radiation instead of reflecting it.

1. A search of climate literature suggests that the sensitive region for initiation of an ice age is in the vicinity of 56 deg North latitude, which would place it into Canada, Scandinavia, or Siberia. The coldest

areas in these regions are likely to be at the higher altitudes, which narrows the search to particular locations. Since the initiation mechanism depends on the survival of high-albedo snowfields throughout the whole summer, one can search existing data sources for such locations and define others where the duration of a high-albedo snowfield might extend well into the summer before melting. It may turn out that the initiation mechanism is more complicated and depends on being “kicked-off” by a century or even a decades-long period (like a Little Ice Age) -- or perhaps even by a major volcanic eruption like the one that led to the very cold summer of 1816 – that promotes the survival of the initiating snowfield.

2. Once the likely locations are defined, one can set up a protocol whereby weather satellites can routinely observe and track the albedo in these regions, locate snow fields that survive during the summer and expand from year to year -- and alert decision makers on the possibility of an ice-age initiation. This task seems fairly routine and could be initiated with existing resources.
3. Finally one would like to demonstrate the feasibility of artificially melting and removing a snowfield. This task would investigate the technical resources needed and define the details and costs of such an operation. One possibility that comes to mind will be to use “crop-duster” planes to distribute soot material over the snow field and observe the rate of melting, comparing it to what would be expected from theory. Such field experiments could be usefully conducted while the other parts of the project are proceeding.

The end result would be to demonstrate a reliable means of overcoming the initiation of a future ice age. The geo-engineering operation of removing the high-albedo snow fields might have to be done year after year until the astronomical conditions change sufficiently so that the sun itself could operate to remove the possibility of an ice age.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **1. Obama Broadens Push for Climate Change Pact -- AP**

### **2. The G-8 Economic Suicide Pact – IBD**

### **3. World leaders tell the Earth's temperature not to rise – WSJ**

### **4. A Lesson on Warming for Obama – NYT**

### **5. NASA Scientist Hansen Blasts Obama's 'Counterfeit' Climate Bill – ClimateDepot**

### **6. Green Jackets, Brown Shirts – IBD**

### **7. Goldman Sachs to be carbon regulator? -- GreenHellBlog**

### **8. Open Letter to Congress**

### **9. Peak Oil May Solve the Climate Change Problem without Regulation**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **NEWS YOU CAN USE**

- 1) [Gallup survey found global warming ranked dead last in the U.S. among ENVIRONMENTAL issues](#) – March 2009
- 2) [Gallup Poll Editor: Gore has 'Failed' -- 'The public is just not that concerned' about global warming](#) – May 2009
- 3) [Zobgy Poll: Only 30% of Americans support cap-and-trade -- 57% oppose](#) – April 2009
- 4) ["Gallup Poll: Record-High 41% of Americans Now Say Global Warming is Exaggerated" - March 11, 2009](#)
- 5) [Rasmussen Poll found Only 34% Now Blame Humans for Global Warming - 'Lowest finding yet' -- 'reversal from a year ago!'](#)  
H/t ClimateDepot.com

=====

Survey Shows Gap Between Scientists and the Public. By Cornelia Dean, NYT, July 10, 2009  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/10/science/10survey.html?\\_r=1&hp](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/10/science/10survey.html?_r=1&hp)

**SEPP response to Ms. Dean:** You report the factual results of the Pew survey well and correctly; but why do you feel a need to editorialize? You say, “there is little doubt that human activity is altering the chemistry of the atmosphere in ways that threaten global climate.” How do you know that this is so? Don’t you know that 31,000 scientists are on record and disagree with that statement? Have you read – or even heard of – the NIPCC report prepared by some 30 independent climate scientists from 16 nations? Are you aware that thermometers on the ground, on weather balloons, and in weather satellites all agree that there has been no global warming for more than 10 years – in spite of rising CO2 levels from human activity?

\*\*\*\*\*

Read Gov. **Haley Barbour’s** Senate testimony on the cost of the Waxman-Markey Cap & Tax Bill  
<http://www.governorbarbour.com/images/GovernorBarbourSenateTestimony7.7.09.pdf>

\*\*\*\*\*

**Pickens Calls Off Plans For Vast Texas Wind Farm**

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/07/07/AR2009070702455.html>

\*\*\*\*\*

There has been concern that speculators may ‘hoard’ the freely-traded emission permits in order to drive up the price. But Congress has left itself the option to ease the cap (“soft-cap”) when permit prices become ‘too high’ --i.e, when politically expedient. It would discourage ‘hoarding’ but also legitimate hedging. However, the practical effect is continued ‘full employment for lobbyists’

\*\*\*\*\*

A voice of reason from the **CarbonSense Coalition** (Australia) [Viv Forbes, chm]:

[Australian PM] Kevin Rudd wants to stimulate the climate conscience of the under-developed world with bribes of \$122 billion PER YEAR stolen from western taxpayers and consumers (*The Australian* 8 July).

Naturally the UN approves. Having failed so spectacularly to combat terrorism, genocide and dictatorship they now see a job they can do - handling the climate change slush fund. At best, this money will subsidise our competitors in India, China, Russia, Brazil and South Africa to modernise their factories and power stations. More likely, it will evaporate in a carbon credit scam, feed the climate change industry, or disappear into some Swiss bank account.

\*\*\*\*\*

**BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE**

News from the **G-8 meeting:** Michael Froman, Mr. Obama’s deputy national security adviser and chief Group of 8 negotiator, ... said it would signal important progress heading toward a [United Nations](#) conference in Copenhagen in December to craft a worldwide climate change treaty. “Our view is that it represents a significant step forward in terms of adding political momentum on the key issues to be dealt with in the U.N. process. But there is still a lot of work to be done, and these are difficult issues and the negotiators will be meeting going forward to try and resolve them.” **SEPP comment: Yeah, sure**

\*\*\*\*\*

[Group of 8 Agrees On a Ceiling for Temperature Rise](#), July 8 -- The world’s leading industrial nations tentatively agreed Wednesday to try to prevent global temperatures from rising above a fixed level, after a more far-reaching proposal to slash production of greenhouse gases fizzled, according to U.S. and European negotiators. **SEPP says: And why not? If King Canute can command the tides to stop rising...**

#####

**1. OBAMA BROADENS PUSH FOR CLIMATE CHANGE PACT**

<http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2009/07/09/world/AP-Obama.html>

L'AQUILA, Italy (AP) July 9, 2009 -- Rallying rich and surging nations alike, President Barack Obama wants the world’s top polluters to keep driving toward a deal to halt global warming. Nearing six months on the job, Obama has some momentum: a new agreement among developed and emerging nations to cap

rising global temperatures, plus good will from his peers for repositioning the U.S. as an aggressive player in the debate.

Yet when Obama helps lead a gathering of the world's major economies here Thursday, he will run smack into the same old problem: Neither the wealthy nor the developing countries think the other side is doing enough. And only when the pollution emitters work together on a binding plan will a climate strategy work, experts say.

Even victory came with a setback on Wednesday. The G-8 nations set a goal of cutting all greenhouse gas emissions in half by 2050, but developing nations refused to go along.

Confronting global warming ... is a dominant theme again at this year's G-8 summit of Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia and the United States. Obama will take part in discussions all day on climate and a host of economic issues, and the number of countries represented at the table will just keep growing. First, the traditional industrialized powers will expand their forum to other strategic economies: Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa, plus a special invitee, Egypt.

And Obama later will help lead a forum of major economies that also includes Australia, Indonesia and South Korea. Together, including the U.S., the represented countries account for about 80 percent of the emissions of the heat-trapping gases blamed for global warming.

The results this week will be a pivotal marker of what could happen in talks in December in Copenhagen, when the United Nations tries to conclude a new worldwide climate deal.

The two blocs -- the richest countries and the fastest growing ones -- did strike an important agreement Wednesday. Their unified position now is that global temperature should be kept from rising by more than 3.6 degrees (2 degrees Celsius). That's the point at which the Earth's climate system would fall into perilous instability, according to the United Nations' chief panel on climate change.

The U.S. and the other G-8 nations set a new goal of reducing their greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent or more by 2050, part of their global goal of a 50 percent cut. But the emerging countries are refusing to commit to specific reduction targets. They are upset that the industrialized G-8 has not been forthcoming on either midterm emissions reductions -- well before 2050 -- or pledges of financing and transferring technology to the developing world. And they worry that major reductions could hamper their economies.

Obama began his agenda Thursday by meeting with Brazil's president, Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, who has called on rich nations to bear more of the cost of fighting global warming. Silva greeted the president by presenting him with a gold Brazilian soccer jersey with the number 5 on it.

The Silva meeting is a late add. It comes during the slot when Obama was to have met with Chinese President Hu Jintao, who returned home to deal with an outbreak of ethnic violence. Hu's departure is seen by analysts as weakening the chances that the U.S. and other G-8 countries can advance climate talks at this summit with China and a few of its close peers.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **2. THE G-8 ECONOMIC SUICIDE PACT**

*By INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY, July 09, 2009*

Channeling King Canute, G-8 leaders agree to wreck the world's economy, and ours, by pledging to prevent temperatures from rising more than 4 degrees [F] by 2050. What if the Earth has other plans?

Canute was the legendary king whose sycophantic followers praised his power and wisdom. He was The One of his time. He once stood on the shore and commanded the waves to halt. As the story goes, he was exercising his ego when in fact he was giving his followers a dose of reality — the power of man over nature is finite and inconsequential.

We were reminded of this as members of the G-8 met in Italy on Wednesday to agree in principle to cut their emissions of greenhouse gases by 80% by 2050. The aim is to hammer out a successor to the failed Kyoto Protocol that expires in 2012. In December, the U.N. is convening a meeting in Copenhagen to forge a binding consensus on reduction targets.

The announced goal, which President Obama has signed on to, is to keep the earth's average temperature from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius (or 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit). That should not be a problem. While the warm-mongers tout 1998 as a record warm year, no year since has been as warm -- as the earth has, in fact, cooled during an unusually quiet solar cycle. Last August was the first month in nearly a century in which the sun was completely devoid of sunspots, an indicator of solar activity. While the earth's

temperature charts nicely with the solar cycles over time, it correlates not at all with rising CO2 levels. In fact, the earth has been cooling even as these levels rise, and the earth is no warmer than it was in 1979.

Since Al Gore released his feature-length cartoon "An Inconvenient Truth" in October 2006, the Earth has cooled about 0.74 F, almost the same amount that the U.N.'s climate panel, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, claims was gained in the entire 20th century.

Steven Hayward of the American Enterprise Institute has actually sat down and crunched the numbers to find out what an 80% reduction actually means. An 80% reduction from 1990 levels means that in 2050 we cannot emit more than 1 billion tons of CO2. The last time U.S. emissions were that low, Hayward estimates from historical energy data, was in 1910.

We have pointed out that Kyoto-like accords are recipes for global poverty and that capping emissions is capping economic growth. An analysis by the Heritage Foundation of the more modest Waxman-Markey bill projects that by 2035 it would reduce aggregate gross domestic product by \$7.4 trillion. In an average year, 844,000 jobs would be destroyed with peak years seeing unemployment rise by almost 2 million.

According to an analysis by Chip Knappenberger, administrator of the World Climate Report, the reduction of U.S. CO2 emissions to 80% below 2005 levels by 2050 — the goal of Waxman-Markey — would reduce global temperature in 2050 by an insignificant 0.05 C.

China and India quite sensibly are refusing to participate in this nonsense. "Without participation from China and India, anything we do here at home would impose burdensome costs on consumers in the form of higher electricity, gas and food prices, all for no climate gain," says Oklahoma Sen. James Inhofe.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **3. KING CANUTE AT THE G-8: WORLD LEADERS TELL THE EARTH'S TEMPERATURE NOT TO RISE**

*WSJ editorial*, July 10, 2009 <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124691243941002053.html>

When King Canute of lore wanted to teach his citizens a lesson, he set his throne by the seashore and commanded the tides to roll out. Canute's spirit was back in business this week at the G-8 summit in Italy, where the assembled leaders declared that the world's temperature shall not rise: "We recognize the scientific view that the increase in global average temperature above pre-industrial levels ought not to exceed 2 degrees [Celsius]," or 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit, said the summit declaration.

As for how they will achieve this climate-defying feat, well, the leaders were somewhat less definitive: "we will work . . . to identify a global goal for substantially reducing global emissions by 2050."

Translation: Since the heads of the world's leading economies couldn't agree on an actual policy on climate change, they opted instead to command the clouds, the seas and all of the Earth to cool. Or maybe they were finally admitting that this whole climate business is getting too expensive, so let's just throw out a goal that everyone knows is beyond the reach of kings, much less democratic leaders.

The politics of climate change have always been long on apocalyptic rhetoric but short on policy realism. But a global economic crisis does have a way of shearing away illusions about the price people and their leaders, elected or otherwise, are willing to pay in higher taxes, higher prices and economic competitiveness to perhaps make a fractional dent on the temperature.

Concerns about high costs and lost jobs have already threatened or killed carbon-emissions control schemes in enviro-conscious Australia and New Zealand. German Chancellor Angela Merkel, another sunshine environmentalist, insisted on exemptions for German industry, including cement and steel, from last year's EU climate deal, which pledged to reduce carbon emissions by 20% from 1990 levels by 2020. Italy engineered its own escape clause, requiring the EU to renegotiate its climate policy after a U.N. climate change summit in Copenhagen later this year. That probably kills the European deal, since China (the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases), India and other developing countries showed this week that they are unlikely to agree to any draconian emissions cuts.

European politicians have been wondrously adept at signing on to climate pacts, like the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, which they have no real intention of honoring even as they enjoy taking the political credit. But really binding agreements are becoming harder to reach this time around, thanks to mounting opposition from businesses and labor unions.

Philippe Varin, chief executive of Corus, Europe's second-largest steel producer, told the *London Independent* in December that the cost of carbon credits and new technologies needed to reduce emissions would destroy European steel production, forcing manufacturers overseas. Poland's Jaroslaw Grzesik of the Solidarity trade union estimated last month that the EU's climate policy would cost 800,000 European jobs. The London-based Open Europe think tank has estimated the climate package would cost European economies over a trillion dollars in the coming decade.

Meanwhile, the supposed economic benefits of "green technologies" are evaporating. In Germany, government subsidies for installing solar panels -- and, it was presumed, thereby creating domestic manufacturing jobs -- backfired when it turned out that it was cheaper to make solar panels in China. A recent paper from Spanish economist Gabriel Calzada Álvarez noted that since Spain started investing in a "green jobs" policy nine years ago, the country has lost 110,500 jobs in other parts of the economy. That amounts to 2.2 jobs lost for every green job created.

European leaders still do pray to the climate gods, and they would love to see the U.S. burden its own industries with the kind of cap-and-tax bill just approved by the House. But even Senate Democrats are getting wise to the political risks they run for tying the economy down with regulatory schemes that America's competitors in Europe and Asia will either flout or ignore.

In the legend of Canute, the king, after failing to stop the rising tide, told the assembled crowd: "Let all men know how empty and worthless is the power of kings, for there is none worthy of the name, but He whom heaven, earth and sea obey by eternal laws." If a medieval monarch could draw the right conclusion, how hard can it be for his sophisticated 21st-century successors?

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **4. A LESSON ON WARMING**

*July 10, 2009 NYT Editorial*

President Obama had hoped to emerge from this week's Group of 8 summit meeting in Italy with a tentative agreement uniting rich and developing nations in a common fight against global warming. Instead he got a lesson on how divided the world remains on the issue — and how hard he will have to work to pull off an agreement.

Mr. Obama was clearly eager to restore America's leadership role. He convened a special side meeting of 17 nations — the G-8 plus China, India and seven other developing nations — that together emit 80 percent of the world's greenhouse gases.

Before the leaders gathered, their negotiators had already settled on a draft communiqué, committing to a 50 percent cut in worldwide greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. The industrial countries would cut theirs by 80 percent, and the developing countries would make "significant" if unquantified cuts. But on Wednesday, things fell apart. The developing nations flatly refused to commit to the 50 % goal by 2050.

It was not immediately clear why they balked. Some repeated an old demand: that the United States and the other industrialized nations — which bear responsibility for the buildup of greenhouse gases since the beginning of the industrial revolution — should do more and do it faster. Otherwise, the developing nations would be left with an unfair share of the burden while their economies were expanding rapidly.

What is clear is that Mr. Obama and the other leaders of the developed world have yet to come up with the right mixture of pressure and incentives to get the developing countries to commit. The 17 nations did agree to an "aspirational" goal of preventing global temperatures from rising more than 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit. But with global climate talks in Copenhagen only five months away, aspirational goals won't carry things very far.

If there is any chance of pulling this off, the developed countries are going to have to take away all excuses from China, India and other developing nations. The Europeans have already committed to deep cuts in their emissions. The United States is doing a lot better under Mr. Obama, but it is still lagging.

The House's climate change bill requires emissions reductions of only 17 percent from 2005 levels by 2020. (The Europeans have pledged themselves to a 20 percent reduction from a much earlier base line, which will require much more aggressive cuts.) We know that getting the Senate to do as well as the House won't be easy. But Mr. Obama will have to press them to do even better.

Mr. Obama should also continue to talk to the Chinese, who are now the world's leading emitters of greenhouse gases. A host of top administration officials, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton included, have made the pilgrimage to Beijing.

The Europeans are concerned that Mr. Obama and the Chinese will cut a less ambitious side deal and undercut a worldwide agreement. There is no evidence to support those suspicions. Mr. Obama, like the Europeans, says he wants a strong deal to bring down emissions. Without China's participation, the fight against global warming is essentially lost.

=====

*SEPP says:* The NYT wraps it up but misses the point about the cause of warming. It's the Sun, stupid!  
\*\*\*\*\*

## **5. NASA SCIENTIST HANSEN BLASTS OBAMA'S 'COUNTERFEIT' CLIMATE BILL – CALLS IT 'A MONSTROUS ABSURDITY...LESS THAN WORTHLESS!'**

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-james-hansen/g-8-failure-reflects-us-f\\_b\\_228597.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-james-hansen/g-8-failure-reflects-us-f_b_228597.html)

By [Marc Morano](#) *Climate Depot* July 09, 2009 –

<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/1875/NASA-Warming-Scientist-Hansen-Blasts-Obamas-Counterfeit-Climate-Bill--Calls-it-a-monstrous-absurdityIts-less-than-worthless>

**Excerpt** of NASA scientist James Hansen's critique of the President Obama supported Waxman-Markey global warming cap-and-trade bill that passed the House and is now under consideration in the U.S. Senate. Hansen's full critique [appeared on July 9, 2009 in The Huffington Post](#). Hansen is director of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, but he writes on this policy-related topic as a private citizen.

**It didn't take long for the counterfeit climate bill known as Waxman-Markey to push back against President Obama's agenda.** As the president was arriving in Italy for his first Group of Eight summit, the New York Times was reporting that efforts to close ranks on global warming between the G-8 and the emerging economies had already tanked. [...]

This requires nothing less than an energy revolution based on efficiency and carbon-free energy sources. Alas, we won't get there with **the Waxman-Markey bill, a monstrous absurdity hatched in Washington after energetic insemination by special interests.**

For all its "green" aura, Waxman-Markey locks in fossil fuel business-as-usual and garlands it with a Ponzi-like "cap-and-trade" scheme. [...]

**The fact is that the climate course set by Waxman-Markey is a disaster course. Their bill is an astoundingly inefficient way to get a tiny reduction of emissions. It's less than worthless,** because it will delay by at least a decade starting on a path that is fundamentally sound from the standpoints of both economics and climate preservation.

Here are a few of the bill's egregious flaws:

- It guts the Clean Air Act, removing EPA's ability to regulate CO2 emissions from power plants.
- It sets meager targets -- 2020 emissions are to be a paltry 13% less than this year's level -- and sabotages even these by permitting fictitious "offsets," by which other nations are paid to preserve forests - while logging and food production will simply move elsewhere to meet market demand.
- Its cap-and-trade system, reports former U.S. Undersecretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs Robert Shapiro, "has no provisions to prevent insider trading by utilities and energy companies or a financial meltdown from speculators trading frantically in the permits and their derivatives."
- It fails to set predictable prices for carbon, without which, Shapiro notes, "businesses and households

won't be able to calculate whether developing and using less carbon-intensive energy and technologies makes economic sense," thus ensuring that millions of carbon-critical decisions fall short. [...] **To read**

=====

### **Climate Depot Editorial Note:**

Even the strongest proponents of man-made global warming fears [NASA's James Hansen](#) and UK's James Lovelock -- are now ridiculing the Congressional cap-and-trade approach as [ineffectual](#) and [verging on a gigantic scam](#). Adding to that, Green Party presidential nominee Ralph Nader has also [voiced opposition to this bill, saying](#), "I'm really astonished... I mean, it's not going to work. It's too complex. It's too easily manipulated politically."

Former progressive Democrat Presidential candidate and Congressman Dennis Kucinich [also opposed the bill, warning](#): "It might make the problem [of global warming] worse." (Also, there were opposing editorials in unexpected places: See: ['Too big, too fast' Obama' hometown paper - Chicago Tribune - rejects climate bill!](#) ['House members should vote no'](#) & [Washington Post: 'We think it's too soon to settle for something that falls so far short of ideal'](#) & [Denver Post: Climate bill's 'goals exist in fantasy...Not 'way to go about it'](#) )

\*\*\*\*\*

## **6. GREEN JACKETS, BROWN SHIRTS**

By *INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY*, July 07, 2009

<http://www.ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=331861272808101#>

Cap And Trade: Al Gore has likened his crusade against global warming to the world's struggle against Nazis. He said this while speaking in a country that is organizing a team of environmental storm troopers.

Gore didn't come right out and call global warming skeptics Nazis while addressing an audience at Oxford University in England. But then, he didn't have to. By simply violating Godwin's Law — which essentially says that an argument dies the moment someone makes a comparison to Nazis — in the way he did, Gore labeled anyone who opposes his agenda a fascist.

While the former vice president was delivering his sermon, the British were busy creating a para-police squad that will enforce government-imposed carbon dioxide emissions limits. Take a good look, because the formation of this team could well be a preview of what we'll get if the Democrats' climate change bill becomes law.

So far, the cap-and-trade global warming legislation — known as the Waxman-Markey bill — has been passed only in the House. The Senate still has to take it up, and then a conference committee would write a version that both chambers would agree to vote on should the Senate approve legislation that has differences.

Any bill passed will of course have to be signed by President Obama. But the only question there is not whether he'll sign it but whether he'll turn the event into a circus bigger than Michael Jackson's memorial.

What comes next is the legalized extortion of the American people. Some analysts estimate that this scheme to save us from ourselves could by 2030 cost each American family as much \$4,300 a year and destroy 2.5 million jobs. That's even counting the "green" jobs the bill's supporters claim it will create.

In return for that sacrifice, people living in our world a century from now will experience a global temperature that is projected to be one-tenth to two-tenths of one degree Celsius cooler than it would have been without the legislation.

While the loss of economic liberty is chilling enough, how much more freedom will be lost if Washington follows London's lead and establishes a cap-and-trade police force?

The United Kingdom's Carbon Reduction Commitment, which applies to nonenergy-intensive businesses, goes into effect next year. Ahead of that, the government's Environment Agency is establishing a squad of 50 auditors that will be charged with catching companies that exceed their CO2 emissions limits.

If news reports from Britain are to be believed, this will not be a collegial staff of ordinary green-eyeshade auditors riding desks. This group will be armed with warrants and have the power to search private grounds, snoop through energy bills, carbon-trading records and receipts from suppliers, and seize evidence.

The auditors will be granted the authority to spy on businesses without their knowledge as well as to show up at a company's doorstep for what is likely to be an intimidating visit if, the London Times reports, the company's numbers "do not add up."

It's not clear if the auditors — who are to wear green jackets — will be able to charge private businesses that overstep their carbon output allocations with criminal offenses. But no one should be surprised if they do.

This sort of crackpot scheme is yet another case of foolishness that makes it seem like the world has gone mad. It hasn't. Still, enough pockets of hysteria and second-rate thinking are out there, especially in places of influence, to cause us concern.

When we see benign behavior, such as emitting CO2, become an offense worthy of the attention of a national government, we know we are in a dangerous era. We hope enough rationality remains in the Senate to keep this madness from spreading to the U.S.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **7. GOLDMAN SACHS TO BE CARBON REGULATOR?**

*GreenHellBlog, July 8, 2009*

<http://greenhellblog.com/2009/07/08/goldman-sachs-to-be-carbon-regulator/>

Sens. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) and Olympia Snowe (RINO-ME) have introduced a bill to make the Commodity Futures Trading Commission the sole regulator of the carbon market created by cap-and-trade legislation. So does this mean that freebooting Goldman Sachs could be the de facto regulator of the carbon market?

Consider that:

- \* The current chairman of the CFTC is Gary Gensler, formerly of Goldman Sachs.
- \* Goldman Sachs is a part owner of the exchanges where carbon allowances would be traded.
- \* Goldman Sachs has spent millions of dollars lobbying for cap-and-trade legislation in anticipation of making billions of dollars at the expense taxpayers and consumers.
- \* Goldman has a special exemption from the CFTC to exceed the trading limits normally placed on commodity speculators. Not only was this exemption secret for 17 years, the CFTC recently had to ask Goldman for permission to release the letter to Congress!
- \* Goldman Sachs employees are heavy contributors to the Democratic Party giving it over \$4.4. million in the last election. Barack Obama received more than \$997,000, Feinstein received \$24,250, and Snowe received \$17,000 from Goldman. All-in-all, this could result in a pretty decent return-on-investment for Goldman.

As the global warming bubble inflates and then bursts, will Goldman Sachs self-regulate all the way to the bank... making record profits at the expense and misery of taxpayers and consumers?

Can you tell the difference between the CFTC and Goldman Sachs?

\*\*\*\*\*

## **8. REPRINT OF A JULY 1, 2009 OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS BY A TEAM OF SENIOR SCIENTISTS.**

[http://www.openletter-globalwarming.info/Site/open\\_letter.html](http://www.openletter-globalwarming.info/Site/open_letter.html)

**OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:**

## **YOU ARE BEING DECEIVED ABOUT GLOBAL WARMING**

You have recently received an Open Letter from the Woods Hole Research Center, exhorting you to act quickly to avoid global disaster. The letter purports to be from independent scientists, but that Center is the former den of the President's science advisor, John Holdren, and is far from independent. This is the same science advisor who has given us predictions of almost certain thermonuclear war or eco-catastrophe by the year 2000, and many other forecasts of doom that somehow never seem to arrive on time.

### **The facts are:**

The sky is not falling; the Earth has been cooling for ten years, without help. The present cooling was NOT predicted by the alarmists' computer models, and has come as an embarrassment to them.

The finest meteorologists in the world cannot predict the weather two weeks in advance, let alone the climate for the rest of the century. Can Al Gore? Can John Holdren? We are flooded with claims that the evidence is clear, that the debate is closed, that we must act immediately, etc, but in fact

### **THERE IS NO SUCH EVIDENCE; IT DOESN'T EXIST.**

The proposed legislation would cripple the US economy, putting us at a disadvantage compared to our competitors. For such drastic action, it is only prudent to demand genuine proof that it is needed, not guesswork, and not false claims about the state of the science.

### **DEMAND PROOF, NOT CONSENSUS**

Finally, climate alarmism pays well. Many alarmists are profiting from their activism. There are billions of dollars floating around for the taking, and being taken.

#### **Robert H. Austin**

Professor of Physics  
Princeton University  
Fellow APS, AAAS  
American Association of Arts and Science Member National Academy of Sciences

#### **William Happer**

Cyrus Fogg Brackett Professor of Physics  
Princeton University  
Fellow APS, AAAS  
Member National Academy of Sciences

#### **S. Fred Singer**

Professor of Environmental Sciences Emeritus, University of Virginia  
First Director of the National Weather Satellite Service  
Fellow APS, AAAS, AGU

#### **Roger W. Cohen**

Manager, Strategic Planning and Programs, ExxonMobil Corporation (retired)  
Fellow APS

#### **Harold W. Lewis**

Professor of Physics Emeritus  
University of California at Santa Barbara  
Fellow APS, AAAS; Chairman, APS Reactor Safety Study

#### **Laurence I. Gould**

Professor of Physics

University of Hartford  
Chairman (2004), New England Section of APS

**Richard Lindzen**

Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Fellow American Academy of Arts and Sciences, AGU, AAAS, and AMS  
Member Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters  
Member National Academy of Sciences

\*\*\*\*\*

**9. PEAK OIL MAY SOLVE THE CLIMATE CHANGE PROBLEM WITHOUT REGULATION**

<http://www.aspousa.org/index.php/2009/07/peak-oil-may-solve-the-climate-change-problem-without-regulation/>

*By James W. Bunger, Ph.D. ASPO-USA, July 6, 2009*

Although the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change takes a very bullish view of global fossil fuel reserves and resources, climate scientist Jim Hansen and Cal Tech's David Rutledge have demonstrated that peaks in oil, gas, and/or coal production might help limit future global warming. This week's commentary examines whether the effect of such peaks combined with an increase in natural sequestration might obviate the need for climate policy. The notion that climate change could be self-limiting is highly controversial, and deserves further study. The views expressed here are those of the author, not ASPO-USA.

The House of Representatives recently passed legislation that would cap carbon emissions. The Administration strongly supports such controls. The EPA has ruled that CO2 endangers public health and welfare. Many studies postulate severe global consequences if CO2 concentrations are not constrained.

Most climate change models assume that future CO2 emissions will grow exponentially over this century. Intuitively, anyone who recognizes the practical limitations on fossil energy supply knows emissions will not rise exponentially for another century, as portrayed by the IPCC and the US Global Climate Change Research Program (ref-1). The forecast growth rate in energy consumption-1.4% per year-is not very large, but compounded over a century it would suggest that by 2100 we would be consuming three times more energy than we consume today. In the meantime, we will have consumed about 15 trillion barrels-of-oil-equivalent.

That is an astounding number considering we only have about 13 trillion barrels-equivalent in oil, gas, coal, oil sands, heavy oil and oil shale combined. And only a portion of this total, perhaps no more than one-third, can ultimately be recovered under reasonable economic conditions. This disparity between IPCC projections and fossil-fuel reality, is sufficient to call into question the conclusions of the climate change models, as future CO2 concentrations are the principal input to the model that drives all the outputs.

The fact is, oil is peaking about now, gas will probably peak within a decade, and coal within a couple of decades. Unconventional tar sands and oil shale will likely make up only a few million barrels per day when global energy peaks. Unconventionals can take away some of the pain on the tail, but realistically these resources can't do much to change the timing of the peak.

Unrealistic expectations of future fossil energy supply are but one glaring error in the climate change science. A second is the systematic underreporting of the beneficial impact higher CO2 concentrations have on photosynthesis. It has been known for decades that there is a large difference between what we emit and what shows up in the atmosphere (compare emissions compiled in ref-2 with atmospheric CO2 concentrations in ref-3). This 'missing carbon'-which ends up in oceans and plants-has been growing. Forty years ago humans emitted about 13.6 billion tonnes of CO2, of which about 5.5 billion tonne went 'missing'. In 2008 we emitted about 34.2 billion tonne, of which 18.8 billion went 'missing'. A prime suspect for this missing mass is the fertilization effect that CO2 has on photosynthesis rates.

The 'missing mass' is growing at its own exponential pace. In this case the exponent for the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration effect on 'missing mass' is about 1.01 percent (using pre-industrial concentrations of 280 ppmv as the baseline). The fact that that the reaction order is higher than first order (1) strongly implies that biokinetics dominate the mechanism.

Summing all the years of biosequestration we conclude there is 23% more living mass on earth today than there was 40 years ago. Because this is a global effect that is dominated by natural vegetation and the oceans, domestic agricultural technology can only account for a small fraction of this increased plant growth; the balance is a natural response. As an aside, we may come to appreciate the positive effects that higher CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations have on our food supply.

For projecting future atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, we used this biokinetic model to compute the rate of biosequestration on removing CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere. For estimating oil and gas emissions we used Campbell's ASPO curve (ref-4) and for coal emissions we used the Energy Watch Group 2007 Coal Report (ref-5). Combining peak fossil energy production with the exponential growth in biomass due to increased CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations we arrive at the curve shown below.

[Your browser may not support display of this image.]

The resulting curve shows that peak fossil energy will soon begin to limit emissions, and that the maximum CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations of about 412 ppmv, occurring about 25 years from now, will be far below the threshold of 450 ppmv cited by climate change experts as the upper acceptable limit (ref 1). Further, the graph shows how the slope of the IPCC curve does not agree, even at present, with the slope of the observed curve; a consequence of IPCC's failure to recognize the magnitude of the biokinetic rate and reaction order. From this exercise we conclude that, because it is global in scope, geologic and economic limitations to fossil energy production may naturally limit the extent of future climate change, but without the bureaucracy and economic distortions that will result from a cap-and-trade scheme.

Imposing regulations on carbon emissions will only exacerbate what will already be a painful adjustment to supply limitations. Rather than making the problem worse through regulation, political effort should be better spent on improving efficiency of energy use, and helping to ensure we have adequate domestic supply of fuels when the world-wide competition for dwindling supply begins in earnest. That time is not long from now.

*James Bunger holds a Ph.D. in Fuels Engineering, and has served on the research faculty of the University of Utah, State Science Advisor for Utah and Chairman of the Petroleum Division of the American Chemical Society. He consults in the field of unconventional oil resources. <jim@jwba.com >*

### **References**

1. Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States, Thomas R. Karl, Jerry M. Melillo, and Thomas C. Peterson, (eds.). Cambridge University Press, 2009. (use orange line from graph on page 23 and reference to 450 ppmv threshold on pages 23 and 24.)
2. BP energy statistics 2008 <http://www.bp.com/productlanding.do?categoryId=6929&contentId=7044622>
3. Mauna Loa CO<sub>2</sub> data from NOAA [http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends/co2\\_data\\_mlo.html](http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends/co2_data_mlo.html)
4. C. J. Campbell, The Association For The Study Of Peak Oil And Gas "ASPO" Newsletter No. 100 - April 2009 [http://www.aspo-ireland.org/contentFiles/newsletterPDFs/newsletter100\\_200904.pdf](http://www.aspo-ireland.org/contentFiles/newsletterPDFs/newsletter100_200904.pdf)
5. The Energy Watch Group [http://www.energywatchgroup.org/fileadmin/global/pdf/EWG\\_Report\\_Coal\\_10-07-2007ms.pdf](http://www.energywatchgroup.org/fileadmin/global/pdf/EWG_Report_Coal_10-07-2007ms.pdf)