

## **The Week That Was (March 6, 2010)** **Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)**

#####

Fred Singer will be returning from his lecture tour on March 8 and, no doubt, he will require time to catch up on his emails. For high-priority mail, send a copy to [ken@haapala.com](mailto:ken@haapala.com).

**Donations:** We have been asked if we accept donations – we assure you most willingly! Please make your check out to SEPP and mail to 1600 S Eads St., # 712-S, Arlington, VA 22202

#####

### **Quote of the Week**

*"We can't control nature."* US President. Barack Obama during comments about the earthquake in Chile, 2/27/2010. [H/t Denis Beller]

\*\*\*\*\*

### **THIS WEEK:**

This week was marked by a divergence of news, though much concerned with ClimateGate. "News You Can Use" starts with Bill Gray's excellent rebuttal to an op-ed by MIT's Kerry Emanuel. These are more complete than the comments by Richard Lindzen carried last week. Emanuel starts with the straw man argument that climate changes are proven then goes on to claim humans are the cause using, among other things, predictions from General Circulation Models (GCMs) to justify his claims. Among other major points, Gray argues that GCMs are probably our worst (not best) guide to the future.

The Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Commons, UK, is holding an inquiry on Climategate. Filings, in the form of Memorandums, are being posted on the referenced web site and make interesting reading for those who follow this issue. The one by the Institute of Physics is reproduced in full and the one by Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen, editor of the journal that published the article rebutting the "hockey stick," is referred to directly.

The push-back from the climate alarmists has begun. Former Vice President Gore had a long op-ed in the New York Times referred to below. This is followed by several rebuttals.

Predictably, some defenders of catastrophic warming, such as the UK Met Office, are intensifying their claims. It now claims it is 95% likely that man is the cause of warming, up from 90%. Others are dismissing the importance of ClimateGate and similar revelations, arguing that scientists advocating AGW should communicate better with the public and governments partake in these communications. An article in the Washington Times reveals plans for an advertising campaign by the AGW scientists as if the billions of US dollars spent by governments and environmental groups had no effect on the public. The reproduced article "Treason Is A Matter of Dates" by Walter Russell Mead is one of the more balanced on the subject that we saw this week.

We then refer to a series of four articles on the problems with the IPCC and the UN Environmental Program and efforts to correct the problems. Also, we refer to an article discussing the Global Warming winners.

This is followed by articles on the confusion of the future of Cap-and-Trade in Washington (nothing new here). Four articles regarding this season's weather in the Northern Hemisphere and six articles on issues regarding energy, particularly electrical generation follow.

We conclude with three disparate articles, one a long overdue article on NOAA's failure to properly maintain US climate monitoring stations. A second illustrates why it is unlikely that India will embrace

cap-and-trade – the government appears to recognize the hardship cap-and-trade will place on the people in dire need. And the final article is an alarmist one on methane in the far north.

**SEPP Amplification:** Last week we referred to an alarmist article on Arctic ice melt carried by the Winnipeg Free Press, dated Feb 6, 2010, quoting Professor David Barber of the University of Manitoba and giving the impression that the article was based on a recently concluded voyage by the research ship / icebreaker *Amundsen*. Reader Paul Pekarek alertly pointed out there were no dates mentioned in the article, that the *Amundsen* is probably now on icebreaker duty on the St. Lawrence River, and that the quotes were very similar to those from BBC correspondent David Shukman after a voyage of the *Amundsen* during the International Polar Year (IPY) 2007-2008.

A check of the Canadian Coast Guard web sites confirmed that the normal winter duty of the *Amundsen* is icebreaking on the St. Lawrence, that it was on special duty in the west Arctic during the IPY, and that its total complement is 10 officers, 26 enlisted men, and 26 additional berths – hardly enough to hold 300 scientists as the article implied. Apparently, it takes years for the news to reach Manitoba.

Mr. Pekarek also described Russian experiences in the winter Arctic ice that make the experience on the *Amundsen* two years ago hardly unusual.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARTICLES:** [For the numbered articles below please see the attached pdf.]

### **1. Memorandum submitted by the Institute of Physics**

To the Science and Technology Committee of the House of Commons Parliament.UK on ClimateGate Mar 5, 2010

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc3902.htm>

### **2. Treason Is A Matter Of Dates**

By Walter Russell Mead, American Interest, March 3, 2010

<http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/03/03/treason-is-a-matter-of-dates/>

[SEPP Comment: A reasoned counter to claims by some journalists that climate scientists are being unfairly attacked emphasizing the failure of journalists to be skeptics when given press releases of imminent climate doom.]

### **3. Scientists plot to hit back at critics**

By Stephen Dian, Washington Times, Mar 5, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/05/scientists-plot-to-hit-back-at-critics/>

[SEPP Comment: The claim by Stephen Scheiner that scientists cannot compete with energy companies is particularly rich. His university, Stanford, received \$100 million from Exxon Mobil for its Global Climate and Energy Project. Total US Government spending on global warming far exceeds \$20 Billion]

### **4. Junk Science Begets Junk Lawsuits**

By Maureen Martin, IBD Editorials, Mar 3, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=522957>

[SEPP Comment: Is one to argue that Global Warming forced the people of New Orleans to build much of the city below sea level? Hurricanes caused severe floods as early as 1915.]

### **5. Geologic Carbon Storage Can NEVER Work, says new US study**

By Peter Glower, Canada Free Press, Feb 25, 2010 [H/t Geoff Smith]

<http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/20372>

## **6. Obama's Nuclear Power Breakthrough**

By William Tucker, WSJ, Feb 27, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703787304575075413484405770.html#mod=to\\_days\\_us\\_opinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703787304575075413484405770.html#mod=to_days_us_opinion)

[Addressing myths regarding nuclear power.]

## **7. Lysenkoism and James Hansen**

By Bob Carter, Quadrant, Mar 3, 2010

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2010/03/hansenist-climate-alarmism>

\*\*\*\*\*

## **NEWS YOU CAN USE:**

### **Comments by Bill Gray, Professor Emeritus, Colorado State University on Kerry Emanuels' Boston Globe (15 February 2010) Op/Ed piece titled "Climate Changes Are Proven Fact."**

By Bill Gray, ICECAP, Mar 4, 2010

[http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Gray\\_Rebuttal\\_to\\_Emanuel.pdf](http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Gray_Rebuttal_to_Emanuel.pdf)

[May require opening manually, or first opening Icecap's web site [www.icecap.us](http://www.icecap.us)]

### **Disclosure of Climate Data from the Climatic Research Unit**

Parliament.UK, Mar 5, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/contents.htm>

[Memoranda filed during the inquiry by House of Commons, UK, Science and Technology Committee on ClimateGate]

### **Memorandum to the Science and Technology Committee on ClimateGate.**

By Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen, Parliament.UK, Mar 3, 2010

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc2602.htm>

[SEPP Comment: Revealing memorandum from the editor of *Energy & Environment* who dared to published McIntyre's and McKittrick's critique of Mann's "hockey stick" outraging certain climate scientists.]

### **University 'tried to mislead MPs on climate change e-mails'**

By Ben Webster, The Times, Feb 27, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7043566.ece>

### **We Can't Wish Away Climate Change**

By Al Gore, New York Times, Feb 28, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/opinion/28gore.html?emc=eta1>

### **Maybe Gore Still Needs to Thaw**

By Jay Richards, The American, Mar 1, 2010

<http://blog.american.com/?p=10896>

[A reasoned critique.]

### **A Blizzard of Lies From Al Gore**

IBD Editorials, Mar 1, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=522575>

### **Al's latest global-warming whopper**

By Alan Reynolds, New York Post, Mar 2, 2010

[http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/al\\_latest\\_global\\_warming\\_whopper\\_TolFbG2ccT5XPtKtXoOx0L](http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/al_latest_global_warming_whopper_TolFbG2ccT5XPtKtXoOx0L)

### **Gore still hot on his doomsday rhetoric**

By Jeff Jacoby, Boston Globe, Mar 3, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

[http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial\\_opinion/oped/articles/2010/03/03/gore\\_still\\_hot\\_on\\_his\\_doomsday\\_rhetoric/](http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2010/03/03/gore_still_hot_on_his_doomsday_rhetoric/)

### **95 per cent chance that Man is to blame for global warming, say scientists**

By Ben Webster, Environment Editor, The Times, Mar 5, 2010, [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7050341.ece#cid=OTC-RSS&attr=3392178>  
[SEPP Comment: Is the current warming in the tropics from an El Nino caused by humans? IPCC's 2007 reports claim the only natural warming influence is a small change in solar irradiance.]

### **Scientists Taking Steps to Defend Work on Climate**

By John Border, NYT, Mar 2, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/03/science/earth/03climate.html?th&emc=th>

### **Getting global warming right**

Editorial, Los Angeles Times, Mar 3, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/editorials/la-ed-ipcc3-2010mar03.0.6601995.story>

### **Government should defend climate science**

By Timothy Wirth, San Francisco Chronicle, Mar 5, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/03/05/EDANICATOR.DTL>

[SEPP Comment: When he was a US Senator, Timothy Wirth staged the dramatic "sweatbox" testimony of James Hansen in 1988]

### **A perfect storm is brewing for the IPCC**

#### **The emerging errors of the IPCC's 2007 report are not incidental but fundamental**

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Feb 27, 2010 [H/t Brad Veek]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7332803/A-perfect-storm-is-brewing-for-the-IPCC.html>

### **Scientist admits leaked emails were 'pretty awful'**

By Steve Connor and Michael McCarthy, The Independent, UK, Mar 2, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/scientist-admits-leaked-emails-were-pretty-awful-1914295.html>

### **Independent Board to Review Work of Top Climate Panel**

From Reuters, NYT, Feb 27, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/27/science/earth/27climate.html?emc=eta1>

## **Climate Group Plans Review**

By Jeffrey Ball, WSJ, Mar 1 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704089904575093922862906324.html#mod=todays\\_us\\_page\\_one](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704089904575093922862906324.html#mod=todays_us_page_one)

## **Global warming winners - There are big profits in climate hysteria**

Washington Times Editorial, Mar 3, 2010

[http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/03/global-warmings-biggest-winners/?utm\\_source=newsletter&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=newsletter\\_must-read-stories-today](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/03/global-warmings-biggest-winners/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today)

## **Senators to propose abandoning cap-and-trade**

By Juliet Eilperin and Steven Mufson, Washington Post, Feb 27, 2010

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/26/AR2010022606084.html>

## **Lawmakers Offer Bills to Suspend EPA Rules**

By Siobhan Hughes, WSJ, Mar 4, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704187204575101741972210942.html?mod=WSJ\\_Energy\\_leftHeadlines](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704187204575101741972210942.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines)

## **Winter One of the Coldest and Snowiest Where Most People Live**

By Joseph D'Alea, CCM, ICECAP.US

[http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Winter\\_One\\_of\\_the\\_Coldest\\_and\\_Snowiest\\_Where\\_Most\\_People\\_Live.pdf](http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Winter_One_of_the_Coldest_and_Snowiest_Where_Most_People_Live.pdf)

“Near the end of meteorological winter, the northern hemispheric snowcover reached the highest level of the entire record, extending back to 1967, beating out the legendary 1978.” Records started in 1967

## **Coldest winter for more than 30 years but Met Office defends its long range forecast**

By Fiona Macrae, Daily Mail, Mar 2, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1254675/Weather.html>

## **Dozens of ships freed from Baltic Sea ice**

BBC News, Mar 3, 2010 [H/t Mark Duchamp]

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/8550687.stm>

## **Depth of two-day snowfall remains blanketed in mystery**

By Frank D. Roylance, Baltimore Sun, Feb 20, 2010, [H/t ICECAP.US]

[http://mobile.baltimoresun.com/inf/infomo;JSESSIONID=3BA6F40B52A3A89FF089.52?view=webarticle&feed:a=balt\\_sun\\_1min&feed:c=maryland&feed:i=52336561&nopaging=1](http://mobile.baltimoresun.com/inf/infomo;JSESSIONID=3BA6F40B52A3A89FF089.52?view=webarticle&feed:a=balt_sun_1min&feed:c=maryland&feed:i=52336561&nopaging=1)

[Problems in measuring snow fall – is it a record? An alarmist would write: The snow was so deep we couldn't measure it!]

## **Carbon Caps Through the Backdoor, Environmentalists pressure the insurance industry**

By Kimberley Strassel, WSJ, Mar 4 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703862704575100004067589846.html>

[SEPP Comment: Green efforts to manipulate the economy]

### **As Clock Ticks, Nuclear Plant Searches for Leak**

By Matthew Wald, New York Times, Feb, 26 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/27/us/27nuke.html?th&emc=th>

[Desperate efforts to find a tritium leak at Vermont's nuclear plant providing one-third of the state's electricity after the state Senate voted to not renew its operating permit.]

### **Easy, Cheap 'Green' Energy? Just the Reverse!**

By Kenneth Green, Master Resource, Feb 26, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/02/your-green-future-not-cheap-not-easy/>

### **Obama's Nuclear Power Breakthrough**

By William Tucker, WSJ, Feb 27, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703787304575075413484405770.html#mod=todays\\_us\\_opinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703787304575075413484405770.html#mod=todays_us_opinion)

[Addressing myths regarding nuclear power.]

### **The Brewing Tempest Over Wind Power**

By Robert Bryce, WSJ, Mar 2, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704240004575085631551312608.html#mod=todays\\_us\\_opinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704240004575085631551312608.html#mod=todays_us_opinion)

### **The Newest Hybrid Model**

By Jad Mouawad, NYT, Mar 4, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/05/business/05solar.html?th=&adxnnl=1&emc=th&adxnnlx=1267803196-BukyT5htatBjTs2bOzBZSw>

[An interesting concept of using solar as a supplement to make steam to drive turbines at a gas fired electrical utility.]

### **U.S. Climate Data compromised by Sensors' Proximity to Heat Sources, Critics Say**

By Joseph Abrams, FOXNews, Feb 26, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.foxnews.com/scitech/2010/02/26/climate-data-compromised-by-heat-sources/>

[SEPP Comment: A long overdue report on the work of Anthony Watts and his team on NOAA's failure to properly maintain US climate monitoring stations.]

### **Why India is Turning to Coal**

By. Frank Clemente, Energy Facts Weekly, Mar 4, 2010 [H/t Marlo Lewis]

<http://www.energy-facts.org/>

[SEPP Comment: Insightful article why countries such as India do not play the game of carbon control.]

### **Methane frozen beneath Arctic seabed destabilising, scientists warn**

By Frank Pope, Times Online, Mar 5, 2010

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7050312.ece>

[SEPP Comment: Atmospheric methane levels appear to have stopped rising for reasons unknown. If Arctic methane is now unstable what occurred during the Holocene Climate Optimum when the upper latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere were significantly warmer?]

\*\*\*\*\*

**BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:**

**Darwin Foes Add Warming to Targets**

By Leslie Kaufman, NYT, Mar 3, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/04/science/earth/04climate.html?pagewanted=all>

[Attempts to equate critics of AGW claims with creationists.]

**Fighting Chance**

Editorial, NYT, Mar 2, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/03/opinion/03wed4.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: Another effort to create hurdles to the development of energy sources in the West. Attributing significant reductions in the population of sage grouse to energy and residential development in the sparsely settled, sparsely developed Western Plains is absurd.]

**U.S. Data Since 1895 Fail To show Warming Trend**

By Philip Shabecoff, NYT, Jan 26, 1989 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.nytimes.com/1989/01/26/us/us-data-since-1895-fail-to-show-warming-trend.html?pagewanted=1>

[Note the date of publication]

***When Challenged, Use Dire Declarations!***

**Very Scary Things**

By Paul Krugman, NYT Blogs, Mar 2, 2010 [H/t Eric Gottshall]

<http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/03/02/very-scary-things/>

“Meanwhile, I know from [Joe Romm](#) that serious climate modelers have marked up their estimates lately, and are predicting a rise of more than 5 degrees under business as usual.

Yikes”

#####

**1. Memorandum submitted by the Institute of Physics**

To the Science and Technology Committee of the House of Commons Parliament.UK on ClimateGate Mar 5, 2010

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc3902.htm>

*Memorandum submitted by the Institute of Physics (CRU 39)*

**The disclosure of climate data from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia**

The Institute of Physics is a scientific charity devoted to increasing the practice, understanding and application of physics. It has a worldwide membership of over 36,000 and is a leading communicator of physics-related science to all audiences, from specialists through to government and the general public. Its publishing company, IOP Publishing, is a world leader in scientific publishing and the electronic dissemination of physics.

The Institute is pleased to submit its views to inform the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee's inquiry, 'The disclosure of climate data from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia'.

The submission details our response to the questions listed in the call for evidence, which was prepared with input from the Institute's Science Board, and its Energy Sub-group.

**What are the implications of the disclosures for the integrity of scientific research?**

1. The Institute is concerned that, unless the disclosed e-mails are proved to be forgeries or adaptations, worrying implications arise for the integrity of scientific research in this field and for the credibility of the scientific method as practised in this context.

2. The CRU e-mails as published on the internet provide *prima facie* evidence of determined and co-ordinated refusals to comply with honourable scientific traditions and freedom of information law. The principle that scientists should be willing to expose their ideas and results to independent testing and replication by others, which requires the open exchange of data, procedures and materials, is vital. The lack of compliance has been confirmed by the findings of the Information Commissioner. This extends well beyond the CRU itself - most of the e-mails were exchanged with researchers in a number of other international institutions who are also involved in the formulation of the IPCC's conclusions on climate change.

3. It is important to recognise that there are two completely different categories of data set that are involved in the CRU e-mail exchanges:

- those compiled from direct instrumental measurements of land and ocean surface temperatures such as the CRU, GISS and NOAA data sets; and
- historic temperature reconstructions from measurements of 'proxies', for example, tree-rings.

4. The second category relating to proxy reconstructions are the basis for the conclusion that 20th century warming is unprecedented. Published reconstructions may represent only a part of the raw data available and may be sensitive to the choices made and the statistical techniques used. Different choices, omissions or statistical processes may lead to different conclusions. This possibility was evidently the reason behind some of the (rejected) requests for further information.

5. The e-mails reveal doubts as to the reliability of some of the reconstructions and raise questions as to the way in which they have been represented; for example, the apparent suppression, in graphics widely used by the IPCC, of proxy results for recent decades that do not agree with contemporary instrumental temperature measurements.

6. There is also reason for concern at the intolerance to challenge displayed in the

e-mails. This impedes the process of scientific 'self correction', which is vital to the integrity of the scientific process as a whole, and not just to the research itself. In that context, those CRU e-mails relating to the peer-review process suggest a need for a review of its adequacy and objectivity as practised in this field and its potential vulnerability to bias or manipulation.

7. Fundamentally, we consider it should be inappropriate for the verification of the integrity of the scientific process to depend on appeals to Freedom of Information legislation. Nevertheless, the right to such appeals has been shown to be necessary. The e-mails illustrate the possibility of networks of like-minded researchers effectively excluding newcomers. Requiring data to be electronically accessible to all, at the time of publication, would remove this possibility.

8. As a step towards restoring confidence in the scientific process and to provide greater transparency in future, the editorial boards of scientific journals should work towards setting down requirements for open electronic data archiving by authors, to coincide with publication. Expert input (from journal boards) would be needed to determine the category of data that would be archived. Much 'raw' data requires calibration and processing through interpretive codes at various levels.

9. Where the nature of the study precludes direct replication by experiment, as in the case of time-dependent field measurements, it is important that the requirements include access to all the original raw data and its provenance, together with the criteria used for, and effects of, any subsequent selections, omissions or adjustments. The details of any statistical procedures, necessary for the independent testing and replication, should also be included. In parallel, consideration should be given to the requirements for minimum disclosure in relation to computer modelling.

**Are the terms of reference and scope of the Independent Review announced on 3 December 2009 by UEA adequate?**

10. The scope of the UEA review is, not inappropriately, restricted to the allegations of scientific malpractice and evasion of the Freedom of Information Act at the CRU. However, most of the e-mails were exchanged with researchers in a number of other leading institutions involved in the formulation of the IPCC's conclusions on climate change. In so far as those scientists were complicit in the alleged scientific malpractices, there is need for a wider inquiry into the integrity of the scientific process in this field.

11. The first of the review's terms of reference is limited to: "*...manipulation or suppression of data which is at odds with acceptable scientific practice...*" The term 'acceptable' is not defined and might better be replaced with 'objective'.

12. The second of the review's terms of reference should extend beyond reviewing the CRU's policies and practices to whether these have been breached by individuals, particularly in respect of other kinds of departure from objective scientific practice, for example, manipulation of the publication and peer review system or allowing pre-formed conclusions to override scientific objectivity.

**How independent are the other two international data sets?**

13. Published data sets are compiled from a range of sources and are subject to processing and adjustments of various kinds. Differences in judgements and methodologies used in such processing may result in different final data sets even if they are based on the same raw data. Apart from any communality of sources, account must be taken of differences in processing between the published data sets and any data sets on which they draw.

*The Institute of Physics February 2010*

\*\*\*\*\*

**2. Treason Is A Matter Of Dates**

By Walter Russell Mead, American Interest, March 3, 2010

<http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/03/03/treason-is-a-matter-of-dates/>

[SEPP Comment: A reasoned counter to claims by some journalists that climate scientists are being unfairly attacked emphasizing the failure of journalists to be skeptics when given press releases of imminent climate doom.]

This observation, famously made by Talleyrand at the Congress of Vienna as the powers debated the fate of the turncoat King of Saxony, reminded the crowned heads of Europe that all of them had at one time or another worked with Napoleon. Talleyrand himself had served the emperor as foreign minister and trusted ally before switching to the other side as Napoleon's power waned — and his megalomania grew.

These days, it's *The New York Times* that is redefining treason. Three weeks ago, anyone who pointed at the lack of public confidence in climate science was aiding and abetting those horrible climate 'deniers.' Treason against Planet Earth! You had to be some kind of dread 'right wing blogger' or talk radio host to

point out that blunders and arrogance had undermined the credibility of climate scientists and ended any short term chance of serious global agreement on urgent measures to stop global warming.

But a [story this morning](#) by John Broder gently lets *Times* readers know that something has gone badly wrong.

WASHINGTON — For months, climate scientists have taken a vicious beating in the media and on the Internet, accused of hiding data, covering up errors and suppressing alternate views. Their response until now has been largely to assert the legitimacy of the vast body of climate science and to mock their critics as cranks and know-nothings.

But the volume of criticism and the depth of doubt have only grown, and many scientists now realize they are facing a crisis of public confidence and have to fight back. Tentatively and grudgingly, they are beginning to engage their critics, admit mistakes, open up their data and reshape the way they conduct their work.

Admit mistakes? Open up their data? Change the way the work? You mean there was something wrong with the way climate science was operating last year? Is the *Times* telling us that the climate scientists—on the basis of whose work the whole world is debating complex and far-reaching changes in its economic structure and political governance—were using slipshod and careless procedures that need to be fixed?

Gosh, one has to ask, if these terrible things were going on for such a long time, why didn't the *New York Times* notice this earlier on? Why didn't the *New York Times* break this important story back when it was news, rather than lamely sweeping up at the end of the parade? Could it be that a climate of politically-correct group-think inhibited the editors and reporters at the country's newspaper of record from recognizing a one of the major stories of the decade? Could the environmental writers at the *Times* be just a teensy bit too close to their sources?

The *Times* seems to have forgotten the most important aspect of the news business. For years now 'skeptic' has been a dirty word at the *Times* when the subject of climate change comes up. Excuse me, but reporters are *supposed* to be skeptics. They are *supposed* to be cynical, hard bitten people who trust their mothers — but cut the cards. They are *supposed* to think that scientists are probably too much in love with their data, that issue advocates have hidden agendas, that high-toned rhetoric is often a cover for naked self interest, that bloviating politicians have cynical motives and that heroes, even Nobel Prize laureates, have feet of clay. That is their job; it is why we respect them and why we pay attention to what they write.

Reporters are not supposed to be wide-eyed gee-whiz college kids believing everything they hear and using the news columns of the paper to promote a social agenda. They are wet blankets, not cheerleaders, Eeyores, not Piglets and they can safely leave all the advocacy and flag-waving to the editorial writers and the op-ed pages.

This is not just a question of liberal bias. The same wide-eyed gee-whiz culture shaped much of the reporting on the run-up to the Iraq War. Maybe the word we are looking for when trying to describe what's wrong with the mainstream press isn't 'liberal' — maybe the term is something like 'credulous' or 'naive.' The gradual substitution of 'professional journalists' for the old hard boiled hacks may have given us a generation of journalists who are used to trusting reputable authority. They honestly think that people with good credentials and good manners don't lie.

Today's journalists are much too well-bred and well-connected to stand there in the crowd shouting "The emperor has no clothes!" They've worked with the tailors, they have had long background interviews

with the tailors, they've been present for some of the fittings. Of course the emperor's new clothes are fantastic; only those rude and uncouth 'clothing deniers' still have any doubts.

Meanwhile, over on the aforementioned op-ed pages, our old friend [Al Gore is still crying a river of denial](#), blaming everyone but himself for the abject failure of the world to accept his views without checking the facts for themselves. If the *New York Times* and its peers had come at this story with more skepticism and rigor from the beginning, climate scientists would have realized long ago that if they hope to convince a skeptical world they need to be ultra-careful, ultra-cautious and even ultra-conservative in their public statements and recommendations. They would have understood long ago that because their science is important, they have to do it more carefully and more publicly than other people. That may be harsh and it may be 'unfair' in some sense, but when you are dealing with the interests of billions of people you have to expect a little bit of scrutiny — though not, apparently, from the *New York Times*.

The very idea that critics would have to use the Freedom of Information Act to pry back-up data from a scientist on a matter of great public importance is insane. That data should have been out there years ago, without anyone having to ask. If it's considered 'normal' in climate science for researchers to keep their raw data under lock and key, and refuse to subject it to skeptical and hostile review, then climate science isn't science.

The *Times* and its peers in the mainstream press need to ask themselves why something this obvious, this important, this newsworthy passed them by. If they don't figure that out and make some wrenching changes, they will continue to watch helplessly as their credibility and readership inexorably shrink.

The meltdown that worries me most in this whole dismal story isn't the meltdown of the Himalayan glaciers. It's the evident meltdown of basic journalistic standards among a whole generation of reporters and editors that keeps me up late at night; I don't just worry about what they missed on this story, or on the Iraq story—I wonder what else they are missing every day.

John Broder's story this morning is good as far as it goes, but it looks more and more as if our greatest newspaper has been so wholly conquered by the spirit of enlightened upper-middle-class progressivism that it has lost the ability to view its own assumptions with the necessary skepticism. That is terrible news; the world is changing rapidly in ways that simply don't fit the thought templates that upper-middle-class baby boomers developed over the last twenty years. Increasingly, the mental map that shapes the way the *Times* looks at the world simply fails to match what is happening out there, yet the *Times* seems less able than ever to see that.

Before you can report an inconvenient truth you have to be able to recognize it; this is the test that the *Times'* coverage of the 'climategate' story has failed.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **3. Scientists plot to hit back at critics**

By Stephen Dian, *Washington Times*, Mar 5, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/05/scientists-plot-to-hit-back-at-critics/>

[SEPP Comment: The claim by Stephen Scheiner that scientists cannot compete with energy companies is particularly rich. His university, Stanford, received \$100 million from Exxon Mobil for its Global Climate and Energy Project. Total US Government spending on global warming far exceeds \$20 Billion]

Undaunted by a rash of scandals over the science underpinning climate change, top climate researchers are plotting to respond with what one scientist involved said needs to be "an outlandishly aggressively partisan approach" to gut the credibility of skeptics.

In private e-mails obtained by The Washington Times, climate scientists at the National Academy of Sciences say they are tired of "being treated like political pawns" and need to fight back in kind. Their

strategy includes forming a nonprofit group to organize researchers and use their donations to challenge critics by running a back-page ad in the New York Times.

"Most of our colleagues don't seem to grasp that we're not in a gentlepersons' debate, we're in a street fight against well-funded, merciless enemies who play by entirely different rules," Paul R. Ehrlich, a Stanford University researcher, said in one of the e-mails.

Some scientists question the tactic and say they should focus instead on perfecting their science, but the researchers who are organizing the effort say the political battle is eroding confidence in their work.

"This was an outpouring of angry frustration on the part of normally very staid scientists who said, 'God, can't we have a civil dialogue here and discuss the truth without spinning everything,'" said Stephen H. Schneider, a Stanford professor and senior fellow at the Woods Institute for the Environment who was part of the e-mail discussion but wants the scientists to take a slightly different approach.

The scientists have been under siege since late last year when e-mails leaked from a British climate research institute seemed to show top researchers talking about skewing data to push predetermined outcomes. Meanwhile, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the authoritative body on the matter, has suffered defections of members after it had to retract claims that Himalayan glaciers will melt over the next 25 years.

Last month, President Obama announced that he would create a U.S. agency to arbitrate research on climate change.

Sen. James M. Inhofe, Oklahoma Republican and a chief skeptic of global-warming claims, is considering asking the Justice Department to investigate whether climate scientists who receive taxpayer-funded grants falsified data. He lists 17 people he said have been key players in the controversy.

That news has enraged scientists. Mr. Schneider said Mr. Inhofe is showing "McCarthyesque" behavior in the mold of the Cold War-era senator who was accused of stifling political debate through accusations of communism.

In a phone interview, Mr. Schneider, who is one of the key players Mr. Inhofe cites, said he disagrees with trying to engage in an ad battle. He said the scientists will never be able to compete with energy companies.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **4. Junk Science Begets Junk Lawsuits**

By Maureen Martin, IBD Editorials, Mar 3, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=522957>

[SEPP Comment: Is one to argue that Global Warming forced the people of New Orleans to build much of the city below sea level? Hurricanes caused severe floods as early as 1915.]

It's said that the most dangerous place in the world is between a politician and a camera. The same could be said about getting between trial lawyers and the courtroom.

The rush to the courts is under way, triggered by two recent rulings allowing global warming claims to go forward against energy defendants for their emissions of carbon dioxide. A third such ruling may be coming soon, even though it becomes more obvious every day that man-made global warming is a myth and such lawsuits are frivolous.

But plaintiffs' lawyers love these suits because the financial stakes — and their contingent fees — are potentially enormous.

- In the first case, plaintiffs want defendant utility plants ordered to reduce their carbon dioxide emissions in a wide area of the Northeast. The New York federal appellate court ruled in September 2009 that this regulation-by-judge case could go forward, even though the Environmental Protection Agency is considering such regulations as well.
- In the second case, plaintiffs allege that global warming caused by utilities' carbon dioxide emissions increased the ferocity of Hurricane Katrina. The class action seeks payment of all property damages in the storm area. The federal appellate court in New Orleans ruled in October that this case could go forward.
- In the third case, in San Francisco, an Alaskan Indian tribe alleges that its village will be destroyed by rising sea levels as glaciers melt due to global warming. The village seeks reimbursement of relocation costs from the energy and power company defendants. The trial court dismissed the case, but reversal is expected.

These cases are troubling. They are complex and expensive to defend, the potential damages are enormous, and the costs of any recoveries will be passed on to consumers if the plaintiffs win.

Carbon dioxide is an important greenhouse gas. These gases form a stratospheric layer that helps trap heat in the Earth's atmosphere and warms the globe. They keep all of us from freezing.

Carbon dioxide enters the atmosphere from a variety of natural and man-made sources. Still, the total amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is just over 300 parts per million. Emissions from any source, anywhere in the world, distribute themselves fairly evenly around the globe.

And that is the big problem for global warming litigation. Plaintiffs must link gases from the named defendants to the exact global warming causing harm. They can't do this. But the bigger problem is the continuing disintegration of the science underlying global warming alarmism.

Recent revelations concede that no statistically significant global warming occurred in the past 15 years. Data supposedly proving an increase in global temperatures have been revealed to have been manipulated or falsified, and contrary data squelched. Temperature measurements from monitoring stations in the Arctic and Russia have been deleted. Hurricanes have decreased in frequency and ferocity. The glaciers are not melting.

But most significantly, a key alarmist scientist admitted it was possible that global temperatures in medieval times were warmer than today — a situation which would totally discredit the claim that global warming is caused by human activity.

The "science" grows demonstrably more bogus every day. Federal judges have the power right now to get rid of cases based on flimsy evidence. They can ban "junk science" like that involved in the New York, New Orleans and Alaska cases, and fine plaintiffs for bringing frivolous litigation.

Judges should not hesitate to use these tools to get rid of these cases promptly. The defendants, their shareholders and all of us who buy electricity and gasoline will be better off.

*Martin, an attorney, is senior fellow for legal affairs at the Heartland Institute.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **5. Geologic Carbon Storage Can NEVER Work, says new US study**

By Peter Glower, Canada Free Press, Feb 25, 2010 [H/t Geoff Smith]  
<http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/20372>

If world leaders – still reeling from the fiasco of the Copenhagen Summit in the global war against carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions – were hoping to find technological ‘solace’ on their return, the news could not be worse. Central to hopes for the future management of carbon dioxide emissions are theories associated with carbon capture and sequestration (CCS). That is, collecting and storing the carbon emitted from burning fossil fuels underground, mainly beneath the ocean floor. However, a new US [study](#) just published exposes the concept of subsea CO<sub>2</sub> management as “overwhelming in both physical needs and costs” and the entire strategy for geological sequestration per se as “profoundly non-feasible”.

It is the capture of carbon from electric [power](#) stations that has long been a subject of “considerable interest” in the war against carbon emissions. While the new report acknowledges the cost of carbon capture “may prove feasible” (though at a higher cost than previously thought), it has been the “common assumption that the cost of carbon sequestration is much less than the cost of capture”. It is this last assumption that the study demolishes

Published in the peer-reviewed Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, the study posits a series of analogies, including how water is currently injected into underground oil basins to maintain pressure and [enhance](#) extraction and production. This apparently “reassuring analogy” done through what the authors’ term “steady state” processes – where e.g., oil is produced while another, e.g. water is injected into the reservoir, something in wide use called water-flooding – is highly misleading when applied to CO<sub>2</sub> injection for sequestration, an ‘unsteady state’ process. With CO<sub>2</sub>, says the report, the injected amount can only increase the reservoir pressure in a closed system. It would thus be necessary to maintain CO<sub>2</sub> inflow pressure for the entire life of a typical commercial power plant. At just 50MW production that will be all but impossible.

### **“Volume required for CO<sub>2</sub> storage has been severely underestimated”**

Assessing the math and science of previous studies, the report goes on to show how the “volume required for CO<sub>2</sub> storage has been severely underestimated.” In short, the sheer size of the underground areas required for storage, if the very real dangers of “pressure build up” and “significant leakage” (as all current CCS experiments have experienced, including the North Sea ‘Sleipner’ project) are to be avoided, are enormous. The report maintains that an average 500MW power station produces around 3 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. The study goes on to show that the “extent of the reservoir” space required for a successful process would be “the size of a small US state”. In essence, the prospects for geological sequestration anywhere in the world look to be impossible. “The findings of this work,” the summary concludes, “suggest that it is not a practical means to provide any substantive reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, although it has been repeatedly presented as such by others.”

In October 2009, as part of President Obama’s stimulus package, the US invested \$1.4 billion in 12 CCS demonstration projects. In December 2009, the US announced a further \$979 million is to be invested in 3 further such projects. The same month the EU pledged over \$1.4 billion towards building 12 CCS similar projects by 2015. The UK is also proposing to fund and bring online 4 CCS demonstration projects by 2020. While the International [Energy](#) Agency maintains the world needs 100s more CCS units and thousands more by 2050, significantly the UN has not added CCS projects to its preferred Clean Development Mechanism list. The UN cites its reason as the need to investigate the danger of seepage from storage sites, and liability if seepage occurs, a key factor calculated in the new study.

A major element in the granting of future and refurbishing licenses for electricity generating power plants will be the need for site constructors to include a CCS component on site each costing \$1 billion. It is a cost that will have to be funded by taxpayers, the only prospective risk-bearer for this immensely

complicated and unproven technology. The risky nature of CCS may also be the reason that major construction firms like Germany's RWE in regard to two of the UK's four CCS projects have dropped out of the bidding process entirely.

### **Over-inflated claims for CCS have become the last refuge of the energy scoundrel**

Michael Economides, co-author of the report, states, "For many of us who realize only too plainly the very real dangers and difficulties associated with sequestration, over-inflated claims for CCS have become the last refuge of the energy scoundrel". Economides adds, "For them we can literally bury the problem and, for some of my colleagues we can even do some good via CO2-enhanced oil recovery. It is our view that neither will ever happen."

If the governments investing in unproven CCS technology were looking for a new insignia of 'blessing' that reflected their faith in the CCS process, the study authors might be inclined to suggest St Jude – the patron saint of lost causes. After the fiasco in Copenhagen, the war on carbon increasingly resembles one.

"Sequestering carbon dioxide in a closed underground volume", is authored by professors Christine Ehlig-Economides, Department of Petroleum Engineering at Texas A& M University, and Michael J. Economides, Department of Chemical Engineering at Houston University. The full report can be [downloaded here](#).

*Peter C Glover is a British political and energy analyst. He is currently co-writing Energy and Climate Wars: How naive politicians, green ideologues and media elites are undermining the truth about energy and climate to be published by Continuum in 2010.*

\*\*\*\*\*

### **6. Obama's Nuclear Power Breakthrough**

By William Tucker, WSJ, Feb 27, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703787304575075413484405770.html#mod=todays\\_us\\_opinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703787304575075413484405770.html#mod=todays_us_opinion)

[Addressing myths regarding nuclear power.]

President Obama's announcement last week that the federal government will support new nuclear reactors through loan guarantees has reinvigorated the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Sierra Club, Ralph Nader's Public Citizen and other opponents of nuclear energy. Their objections to this proven technology—which already generates about 20% of our electricity—have barely changed since the 1970s. But most of their arguments have either been proven wrong or become outdated. Here's a rundown:

- *Nuclear isn't safe.* The 1979 Three Mile Island accident—in which a faulty cooling valve led to a meltdown without injuring anyone—occurred when computer technology had barely penetrated the U.S. industry. In the 1970s, each reactor was an island unto itself. Industry officials barely communicated. The valve that failed at Three Mile Island had failed nine times previously, yet nobody said a thing about it.

Today, thanks to the Price-Anderson Act, first adopted in 1957 and amended several times since, each of America's 104 reactors is now on the hook for \$100 million in damages for an accident at another reactor (\$10 billion coverage in all). You can bet they talk to each other. Accidental "scrams" and safety outages have been reduced to nearly zero. Our entire fleet is up and running 90% of the time. That's why, even though nuclear constitutes only 11% of generating capacity, it provides 20% of electricity.

- *Nuclear is too expensive.* Building a 1,500-megawatt reactor will cost around \$5 billion, which seems expensive until you compare it to everything else. The equivalent capacity in wind power would easily

cost \$4 billion because you have to build 4,000 windmills at \$1 million apiece plus hundreds of miles of transmission lines and an almost equal capacity of natural gas generators to back them up when the wind doesn't blow.

Building zero-emissions coal plants that capture the carbon dioxide and bury it underground will probably cost more, but nobody really knows because it's never been done. Only natural gas is cheaper to build, but that's because 95% of the cost is in the fuel. (With nuclear it's only 26%.) Natural gas prices fluctuate. Would anyone care to predict what the price of natural gas will be in 25 years?

- *A hijacked jet liner crashing into a reactor would cause a nuclear holocaust.* Go to YouTube and search "plane crashing into wall." You'll see a video of an F-4 fighter jet hitting a concrete containment wall at 500 miles per hour. The plane simply disappears. The wall barely budes. Nuclear opponents argue that a jumbo jet would have a greater impact, but the laws of physics say it would be about the same. A jet is a hollow metal tube. Even at the speed of a bullet (700 mph) it could not penetrate a concrete containment wall.

- *We haven't figured out what to do with the waste.* Basically, there is no such thing as nuclear waste. The reason we have the controversy over the Yucca Mountain storage facility is because we gave up fuel reprocessing in the 1970s. Reprocessing reduces the volume of spent fuel—already remarkably small—by 97%. The French reprocess and store all their high-level waste from 30 years of producing 70% of their electricity beneath the floor of one room in their La Hague plant.

- *We can't reprocess because that will lead to nuclear proliferation.* The conceit of the 1970s was that if we isolated plutonium in an American reprocessing plant, some foreign terrorist would steal it to make a bomb. Half a dozen countries have since built nuclear bombs, none of them with stolen American plutonium. North Korea built its own reactor. Iran has been enriching uranium. France, Japan and Russia all reprocess and no one has stolen their plutonium. Reprocessing American fuel has nothing to do with nuclear proliferation.

- *The nuclear revival is being forced on America by the powerful nuclear industry.* There is no American "nuclear industry." Westinghouse is now owned by Toshiba. Areva is French. GE partners with Hitachi but is running in last place. Only three of the 33 proposed American reactors are GE designs. The biggest new international competitor is South Korea, which just won a \$20 billion contract to build four reactors in the United Arab Emirates. China is building four Westinghouse AP1000 reactors, even though its design has not yet been approved by our Nuclear Regulatory Commission. When the first new reactors are built here, 70% of the parts will come from abroad.

We've essentially fallen 10 years behind the rest of the world in nuclear technology, but the Obama administration's decision to support nuclear will finally get the ball rolling. Within a decade we may very well catch up with the rest of the world in developing the energy technology of the 21st century.

*Mr. Tucker is author of "Terrestrial Energy: How Nuclear Power Will Lead the Green Revolution and End America's Energy Odyssey," published in October by Bartleby Press.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **7. Lysenkoism and James Hansen**

By Bob Carter, Quadrant, Mar 3, 2010

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2010/03/hansenist-climate-alarmism>

[Bob Carter is an Australian]

**Is Hansenism more dangerous than Lysenkoism?**

On June 23, 1988, a young and previously unknown NASA computer modeller, James Hansen, appeared before a United States Congressional hearing on climate change. On that occasion, Dr. Hansen used a graph to convince his listeners that late 20th century warming was taking place at an accelerated rate, which, it being a scorching summer's day in Washington, a glance out of the window appeared to confirm.

He wrote later in justification, in the Washington Post (February 11, 1989), that *"the evidence for an increasing greenhouse effect is now sufficiently strong that it would have been irresponsible if I had not attempted to alert political leaders"*.

Hansen's testimony was taken up as a lead news story, and within days the great majority of the American public believed that a climate apocalypse was at hand, and the global warming hare was off and running. Thereby, Dr. Hansen became transformed into the climate media star who is shortly going to wow the ingenues in the Adelaide Festival audience.

Fifteen years later, in the Scientific American in March, 2004, Hansen came to write that *"Emphasis on extreme scenarios may have been appropriate at one time, when the public and decision-makers were relatively unaware of the global warming issue. Now, however, the need is for demonstrably objective climate forcing scenarios consistent with what is realistic"*.

This conversion to honesty came too late, however, for in the intervening years thousands of other climate scientists had meanwhile climbed onto the Hansenist funding gravy-train. Currently, global warming alarmism is fuelled by an estimated worldwide expenditure on related research and greenhouse bureaucracy of more than US\$10 billion annually.

Scientists and bureaucrats being only too human, the power of such sums of money to corrupt not only the politics of greenhouse, but even the scientific process itself, should not be underestimated. In recognition of these events, the term Hansenism is now sometimes used to describe the climate hysteria which had, until recently, gripped western media sources and political, business and public opinion in a deadly grasp.

Histories of science contain an account of the ideological control of Soviet biology during the mid-20th century by plant scientist Trofim Lysenko, who by 1940 had risen to be Director of the influential Institute of Genetics of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Lysenko and his supporters rejected the "dangerous Western concepts" of Mendelian genetics and Darwinian evolution. They preferred the Lamarckian view of the inheritance of acquired characteristics; for instance, that cows could be trained to give more milk and their offspring would then inherit this trait.

Whilst this was not an unreasonable hypothesis to erect in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, by the 1930s the idea had been tested in many ways and was known to be wrong. Requiring its application to agricultural and allied biological research in the USSR was disastrous, not least in the vicious persecution of scientists that took place, and the legacy of this sad episode still disadvantages Soviet biology today.

Lysenkoism grew from four main roots:

- a necessity to demonstrate the practical relevance of science to the needs of society;
- the amassing of evidence to show the "correctness" of the concept as a substitute for causal proof;
- noble cause corruption, whereby data are manipulated to support a cause which is seen as a higher truth; and
- ideological zeal, such that dissidents are silenced as "enemies of the truth".

The first of these roots has been strongly represented in Australian government attitudes to the funding of science as far back as the 1980s. The remaining three roots exemplify closely the techniques that are currently used by global warming alarmists in pursuit of their aims – as recently exposed for all to see by the Climategate and IPCCgate scandals.

Lysenkoism damaged mainly Soviet science and society, whereas Hansenism has now been exerting its pernicious influence worldwide for more than twenty years. The climate alarmism involved has long been undermining the precious public trust from which science draws its traditional influence and sustenance, and now Climategate has opened up new sinkholes all over the place.

Hansenist climate alarmism has also damaged the standing of many leading science journals and science organizations, which have replaced their formerly careful editorial and organizational balance with environmental alarmism and naked global warming advocacy.

Future historians of science are likely to judge the 1988-2009 frenzy of climate change alarmism as even more damaging than Lysenkoism, because of the distrust that collapse of the global warming paradigm has already inculcated about using science to inform modern policy making.

Instead of exercising the leadership that is desperately needed to correct this, and to restore public faith in science and scientists, public utterances from Australia's senior research advisors show that they have so far lost the plot that they are no longer even in the theatre.

Thus we have Megan Clark, CEO of CSIRO, boasting on Brisbane ABC 612 radio that “*there are 40 CSIRO scientists on the IPCC panel*”, as if this were something to be proud of. Meanwhile, the Chairman of Universities Australia, [Peter Coaldrake](#), describes the Climategate scandal as “*this tabloid decimation of science*”. Next, [Margaret Sheil](#), CEO of the Australian Research Council, has said she is deeply concerned about the backlash generated by emails from the East Anglia Climate Research Unit [and] the criticisms of Rajendra Kuma Pachauri, head of the IPCC. Finally, Chief Scientist Penny Sackett has, so far as I can determine, remained silent since her “me too” February 9<sup>th</sup> [comment](#) in support of an anodyne statement of blessing for climate sceptics issued by the U.K.'s chief scientist, [John Beddington](#). How much influence the views of these independent scientists have had on Dr. Beddington can be judged from reading the [apocalyptic study](#) that he has just released regarding the effects of imaginary future climate change in Britain (*Land Use Futures: Making the Most of Land in the 21st Century*). This study is described in a letter by Dr. Gerrit van der Lingen in today's *Christchurch Press* as:

*A group of 300 ivory tower scientists, economists and planners in the UK, led by the British Government's scientific advisor, have come up with a new apocalypse scenario, still based on the belief in catastrophic man-made global warming (February 27-28). They probably felt they had to do this because Climategate and the revelations of serious errors in the IPCC report have fatally exposed the man-made-global-warming scam. Their vision lacks any scientific credibility and totally ignores human nature. Their action is nothing more than a rear-guard action.*

*Moreover, Copenhagen has shown that the balance of world power has shifted to the so-called BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China). Western countries, including New Zealand and Australia were totally side-lined in Copenhagen. It is now extremely unlikely that an international climate agreement will ever be reached. Thanks to the BRIC countries, we can now all heave a sigh of relief.*

Breathtakingly, in the light of all this, our Australian research managers' expressed concern remains that the revelations of Climategate and IPCCgate have caused a public re-examination of the science of global warming, with a consequent shift in public opinion. Apparently they have nary a thought for the deep

scientific malaise and malfeasance that has now been exposed for the whole lay world to see – part of which is being investigated currently in a British parliamentary [committee investigation](#).

On the heels of revelations about meteorological data tampering overseas, irregularities have also been discovered in the way that Australian temperature data have been manipulated. And, across the Tasman, NIWAgate is developing apace, as the N.Z. National Institute of Water & Atmosphere battles to provide a parliamentary accounting for its historic temperature archive, which may yet prove to include the “dog ate my homework” excuse for the apparent absence of some records.

Yet no comment at all has been offered on any of this - and related matters of science ethics, procedures and policy - by Australia’s science leaders.

It is crystal clear that there is only one way to restore public confidence in climate policy and research in Australia, and that is for an independent and authoritative investigation to be carried out into the matter before an experienced judge assisted by scientifically expert counsellors.

As Senator Fielding’s four scientific advisors – all of whom are experienced and independent climate scientists – have recommended in their [due diligence report](#) (item 7) on the advice being provided to Climate Minister Wong by her department:

*Parliament should defer consideration of the CPRS bill and institute a fully independent Royal Commission of enquiry into the evidence for and against a dangerous human influence on climate. We add ..... that the scientific community is now so polarised on the controversial issue of dangerous global warming that proper due diligence on the matter can only be achieved where competent scientific witnesses are cross-examined under oath and under strict rules of evidence”.*

*Bob Carter is a geologist and environmental scientist who studies ancient climate change.*

#####