

The Week That Was 2010-05-29 (May 29, 2010) **Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)**

#####

The FORUM by SEPP and Virginia Scientists and Engineers for Energy and Environment (VA-SEEE) is being rescheduled to TENTATIVELY 5:30 pm on Sunday June 20 in the Auditorium of the Ernst Community Cultural Center of the Annandale Campus of Northern Virginia Community College at 8333 Little River Turnpike, Annandale. Topics will include some of the latest developments in global warming issues. All are welcome. To defray the costs of the auditorium, a donation of \$5.00 per person is suggested. Firm commitments will be announced as soon as possible. (www.vaseee.org)

#####

Quote of the Week

Science is organized scepticism and the consensus must shift in light of the evidence." --- Lord Martin Rees, President of the Royal Society (May 28, 2010)

THIS WEEK:

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

EPA has carefully prepared a trap, but will it trap itself? It has played hard ball in its Endangerment Finding that carbon dioxide emissions “endanger human health and welfare.” But faced with the hard reality that Copenhagen was a failure, public enthusiasm for carbon dioxide controls is falling, and that the Kerry-Lieberman cap and tax bill may not pass, EPA came out with a “tailoring rule” to slowly implement carbon dioxide regulation. First, only those emitting 50,000 tons per year will be regulated. Then the regulations will gradually apply to others. But EPA has no legal authority to make this rule because the law states emissions as low as 250 tons (every large building) must be regulated. Thus, EPA is inventing law.

Scores of environmental lawyers stand ready to collect massive legal fees, courtesy of the taxpayer by suing EPA for not fully enforcing the law. No doubt, EPA will do what it usually does, show some resistance and then roll in favor of the environmental lawyers. Herein is the danger to EPA. If cap and tax is not passed, and EPA enforces stringent regulations, the politicians who support EPA may soon be out of their jobs.

Senator Murkowski has proposed a simple, eight line bill that will remove from EPA the responsibility of regulating carbon dioxide. Under the Murkowski bill the responsibility of regulating carbon dioxide emissions will fall on the peoples’ representatives in Congress – where it should be.

Those representing scientific organizations defending Michael Mann continue to misstate the meaning of “hide the decline.” The issue is how well do tree ring measurement techniques approximate temperature measurements by instruments? Is there a solid correspondence between the results of tree ring techniques and the results of instrument measurements? If the correspondence is solid, than tree ring techniques can be used (with caution) to estimate temperatures when no instrument measurements are available. If the correspondence is poor, then the technique is not valid.

The “Nature trick” to “hide the decline” was not to hide temperature measurements by instruments which showed a rise in temperatures. The trick was to hide the divergence between tree ring techniques and instrument measurements after 1979 by removing “unsuitable” tree ring data. The tree rings indicated a no warming while the instruments showed a warming. Had the

data been fully presented, then the validity of tree rings as a proxy for instrument measurements would have been questioned. The issue is not, as expressed by the Washington Post and others, allowing the public to better understand the research. The issue is misleading the public.

In an editorial attacking Fred Singer for defending Virginia Attorney General Cuccinelli in his demand for Mann's documents, editor-in-chief Rudy Baum of the *Chemical & Engineering News* completely misstates the issue. Please see "This and That On Climate" in the Articles section.

Late news: Rather than comply with the demand by Virginia Attorney General Cuccinelli, the University of Virginia petitioned the local circuit court to set aside the demand. More on this as it develops.

Students of The Great War (WW I) have long wondered what mania compelled leaders of the great nations of Europe, the most prosperous on earth, to such a disastrous, destructive war. What mania compelled generals who repeatedly witnessed that well prepared defenses annihilated troops in a frontal assault, to order their demoralized, depleted armies to another frontal assault -- One. Last. Time.

Perhaps we are witnessing that mania in the leadership of the European Union. Many nations of Europe are still suffering from a prolonged recession. Many are experiencing a financial crisis brought on by fiscal irresponsibility, in part from pursuit of prosperity from green jobs which disappear when subsidies stop.

The leaders of the European Union have noticed that due to the recession, resulting in reduced carbon dioxide emissions, some nations are too close to achieving their goals of a 20% reduction by 2020. Apparently this is too easy, so the goal must be raised to 30% by 2020 to lead others on to victory. Depression anyone? Into the breach, men! One. Last. Time.

Prompted by Fellows who objected to their publication that portrayed that the science of global warming is settled, the Royal Society in England agreed to review their publications in light of the current science. The Society has been an adamant promoter of climate alarmism.

A traditional debate was held on global warming at the Oxford Union. The no-longer-to-be-called skeptics thrashed the alarmists. Please see the first two referenced articles under "Challenging the Orthodoxy." The first reference is to Nigel Lawson's full address, which emphasized that the issue goes beyond the science alone and goes to man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

SEPP Amplification. In last week's TWTW there appeared a few words on the confusion of the role of clouds in climate science. Professor Dick Lindzen kindly provided to us a short comment that underscores the complexity of the issue.

Just for the record, the problem with clouds is that they can vary for reasons other than surface temperature, and, when they do, they cause temperature changes.

However, they can also function as feedbacks to temperature. The real problem is disentangling these things in the data.

SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL #17-2010 (May 29, 2010)

By S. Fred Singer, President, Science and Environmental Policy Project

ClimateGate Reconsidered

An Open Letter to Prof Edward Acton, Vice Chancellor, University of East Anglia, UK

Dear Prof. Acton

After careful study, I have reached the conclusion that the CRU temperature trends published by Prof. Phil Jones of UEA (and used by the IPCC) are spurious and should be corrected. Instead of the major warming that's been claimed between 1979 and 1996 (the crucial period), the actual warming seems to be minor or even close to zero.

This matter is of extreme importance since international policies concerning climate change are based on the Jones analysis –and equivalent analyses in the US.

I base my conclusion on the following evidence:

****Weather satellites are the most reliable source of global temperature observations, with all data analysis and corrections fully transparent. They show essentially a zero rise in atmospheric temperatures during most of the crucial period (1979-1996). And basic atmospheric physics tells us that the temperature trends at the earth's surface must be less, roughly only half of the atmospheric trends.**

****Furthermore, all proxy data I have seen show no significant temperature rise during this same period. Recall that Michael Mann's multi-proxy analysis suddenly stops in 1979.**

As a scientist, I am mainly concerned with the truth of the data and the consequences for future climate change. Of course, as a member of the public, I cannot ignore the policy consequences – nor should any citizen/voter.

It seems to me that it is your responsibility to investigate whether and to what extent Dr. Jones' judgment in the selection and in the correction of the raw data was influenced by any desire to see a particular outcome – namely, a strong warming.

In other words, the selection process (i.e., which data to use and which to reject) involved setting explicit or implicit criteria, based on "judgment." Similarly, deciding on the type and degree of correction (for example, for urban heat island effects or other kinds of contamination) involved setting certain criteria based on the judgment of the analyst.

[Analysts can make different choices in the complex process of choosing input data, adjusting raw station data for known inhomogeneities (such as urbanization effects, changes in instrumentation, site location, and observation time), and gridding procedures.]

On this matter, I confess to certain sympathies for Dr Jones, who has devoted his lifetime career to this important task. Yet the search for scientific truth must be paramount.

I hope you will enlist credible experts to help you and I wish you much success as you undertake this daunting task.

Sincerely,

S. Fred Singer

Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia
Former Director of the US Weather Satellite Service

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

1. The National Academy Lays a \$6-Million Egg

Fred Singer's Letter to the Editor of the Washington Times
(published on-line May 28, 2010)

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/may/28/greenhouse-gases-arent-warming-earth>

2. Response to Washington Post Editorial Insisting on Passing Kerry-Lieberman Cap and Tax.

By Donna Bethell, SEPP Director, May 21, 2010

3. Latest climate climbdown: the Royal Society review its statements on global warming

By Gerald Warner, Telegraph, UK May 28, 2010

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/geraldwarner/100041427/latest-climate-climbdown-the-royal-society-reviews-its-statements-on-global-warming/>

4. The Drill Is Gone

IBD Editorial, May 27, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/535718/201005271857/The-Drill-Is-Gone.aspx>

5. This and That On Climate

By Rudy Baum, Editor in Chief, Chemical & Engineering News, May 17, 2010 [H/t Andrew Kaldor]

<http://pubs.acs.org/cen/email/html/8820editor.html>

6. Vaccines' Safety Confirmed, Wakefield's Validity Denied

By Curtis Porter, American Council on Science and Health, May 26, 2010

ACSH Dispatch [morning@acsh.org]

7. Who Is Really To Blame For this Blowout

By Charles Krauthammer, IBD, May 27 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/535634/201005271815/Who-Is-Really-To-Blame-For-This-Blowout-.aspx>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Defending the Orthodoxy

EU sets toughest targets to fight global warming

By Ben Webster, The Times, May 26, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7136639.ece>

Paris, Berlin signal pause in EU climate efforts

EurActiv.com, May 26, 2010 [H/t CCNet]

<http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-environment/paris-berlin-signal-pause-in-eu-climate-efforts-news-494497>

[SEPP Comment: Perhaps unlike 1914 – 1918, Paris and Berlin have learned that governments can demand only so much from *their* citizens.]

Challenging the Orthodoxy

Nigel Lawson: Oxford Union Address, May 20, 2010

From GWPF, May 25, 2010 [H/t Tom Sheehan]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/opinion-pros-a-cons/1003-nigel-lawson-oxford-union-address.html>

[SEPP Comment: It is not only the science, but also man's inhumanity to his fellow man.]

Oxford Union Debate on Climate Catastrophe

Army of Light and Truth 135, Forces of Darkness 110

SPPI, Org, May 24, 2010

<http://sppiblog.org/news/oxford-union-debate-on-climate#more-1756>

Rebel scientists force Royal Society to accept climate change skepticism

By Ben Webster, Times Online, May 29, 2010

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7139407.ece>

Report from Heartland-4

By Bob Carter, Quadrant Online, May 23, 2010

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2010/05/heartland-4>

EPA Making the Move – Or Not

Avoiding the slick spots: Agency more adept at blowing hot air

By Steve Milloy, Washington Times, May 27, 2010

<http://www.washingtimes.com/news/2010/may/26/avoiding-the-slick-spots/>

<http://greenhellblog.com/2010/05/27/avoiding-the-slick-spots-agency-more-adept-at-blowing-hot-air/>

The standard for an environmental hazard: Litigators clean up while taxpayers are taken to the cleaners

By Steve Milloy, Washington Times, May 27, 2010

<http://greenhellblog.com/2010/05/27/the-standard-for-an-environmental-hazard-litigators-clean-up-while-taxpayers-are-taken-to-the-cleaners/>

ClimateGate Continues

BP and the Climategate Inquiry

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, May 21, 2010

<http://www.thegwpf.org/climategate/990-bp-and-the-climategate-inquiry.html>

Climate Fears Turn to Doubts Among Britons

By Elisabeth Rosenthal, NYT, May 24, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/25/science/earth/25climate.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: Six months after ClimateGate broke, the New York Times breaks the news to its readers.]

Climategate and the Scientific Elite: Climategate starkly revealed to the public how many global-warming scientists speak and act like politicians.

Iain Murray, National Review Online, May 26, 2010

<http://article.nationalreview.com/434861/climategate-and-the-scientific-elite/iain-murray>

Don't sweat it

Development and public-health initiatives will matter much more to malaria than the climate will
May 19th 2010 | From *The Economist* online [H/t Charles Shafer]
http://www.economist.com/world/international/displaystory.cfm?story_id=16160473
[SEPP Comment: Another fear gone bad.]

NASA accused of 'Climategate' stalling: FOIA response long overdue

By Stephen Dinan, Washington Times, May 26, 2010
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/may/26/nasa-accused-of-climategate-stalling/>

Consequences from BP's Oil Leak

Obama cancels Gulf drilling projects

By Kara Rowland, Washington Times, May 27, 2010
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/may/27/obama-cancels-gulf-drilling-projects/>

Other Energy Issues

Promise and peril of Canada's oil sands

UPI, May 21, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]
http://www.upi.com/Science_News/Resource-Wars/2010/05/21/Promise-and-peril-of-Canadas-oil-sands/UPI-37641274470190/

Wind Integrated Realities: The Bentek Study for Texas (Part IV)

By Kent Hawkins, Master Resource, May 26, 2010
<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/05/wind-integration-realities-texas-iv/>
[SEPP Comment: The final of a four part series covering the Netherlands, Colorado, and Texas on the issue of substituting wind for fossil fuel actually reduces carbon dioxide emissions.]

Green Jobs for Prosperity

Cap and Flee: California refutes its own 'green jobs' policy

Opinion, WSJ, May 25, 2010
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703559004575256981030653158.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_AboveLEFTTop

Cash 'Black Hole' Threatens Scots Low-Carbon Economy

By Jenny Fyall, The Scotsman, May 25, 2010 [H/t CCNet]
<http://www.scotsman.com/news/Cash-39black-hole39--threatens.6316501.jp>
[SEPP Comment: Banks don't have the money to lend for high risk green jobs.]

Ideas to Improve the System

Drilling for Certainty

By David Brooks, NYT, May 27, 2010
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/28/opinion/28brooks.html>
[SEPP Comment: Well reasoned op-ed on the need to deal with potentially catastrophic events in a complex technical society.]

Climate Science Policy Needs a “Team B” (Big Science + Big Government = Bad Science & Policy)

By David Schnare, Master Resource, May 18, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/05/climate-science-policy-needs-a-team-b/>

[SEPP Comment: NIPCC **is** Team-B]

Global warming: Looking in the wrong direction

Thomas Fuller, Washington Examiner, May 27, 2010

<http://www.examiner.com/x-9111-Environmental-Policy-Examiner~y2010m5d27-Global-warming-Looking-in-the-wrong-direction?cid=examiner-email>

Oh' Mann!

Cuccinelli Is Following the Law; Mann Up, UVa

By Christopher Horner, Richmond Times Dispatch, May 23, 2010

http://www2.timesdispatch.com/rtd/news/opinion/op_ed/article/ED-HORNER23_20100521-204606/346118/

Quash the Subpoena, U.Va. Urges

By Sindy Bhanoo, NYT, May 28, 2010

<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/05/28/quash-the-subpoena-u-va-urges/?ref=science>

U-Va. Goes to court to fight Cuccinelli's subpoena of ex-professor's document

By Rosalind Helderman, Washington Post, May 28, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/27/AR2010052705374.html?hpid=newswell>

Miscellaneous Topic of Possible Interest

Mining for Cold, Hard Facts

By Robert Lee Hotz, WSJ, May 29, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704655004575114010457906340.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

Also at: <http://www.icecap.us/> (in case you cannot open the above URL)

[SEPP Comment: *Efforts to meticulously extract ice cores in Antarctica for new studies.*]

El Nino 2009/10 Over – La Nina Coming

Joseph D'Aleo, ICECAP, May 23, 2010

http://icecap.us/images/uploads/LANINA_COMING.pdf

Musings on the 2010 Hurricane Season

By Joseph D'Aleo, ICECAP, May 28, 2010

<http://www.icecap.us/>
http://icecap.us/images/uploads/HURRICANE_THREAT_2010.pdf

[SEPP Comment: *With the Atlantic in a warm mode, the northeast may be hit by a major storm*]

Why NASA Keeps a Close Eye on the Sun's Irradiance

By Adam Voiland, NASA, May 5, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.nasa.gov/topics/solarsystem/features/sun-brightness.html>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Another \$1m pay day for Blair as the former PM lands a job as a climate change guru

By Jason Groves, Daily Mail, May 26, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1281247/Tony-Blairs-new-job-green-advisor-Khosla-Ventures.html#ixzz0p2jTODqJ>

Obama's Model 'Green' Country? Denmark Evicts Citizens, Clear-Cuts Forests for Windmill Space

By Chris Horner, Pajamas Media, May 24, 2010

<http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/obamas-model-green-country-denmark-evicts-citizens-clear-cuts-forests-for-windmill-space/>

Polar bears face 'tipping point' due to climate change

By Matt Walker, BBC, May 25, 2010

http://news.bbc.co.uk/earth/hi/earth_news/newsid_8700000/8700472.stm

[SEPP Comment: Creationism science – even the IPCC admits that northern part of the Northern Hemisphere was hotter 5,000 years ago than today. Thus, the bears must have been created since then.]

#####

ARTICLES

1. The National Academy Lays a \$6-Million Egg

Fred Singer's Letter to the Editor of the Washington Times

(published on-line May 28, 2010)

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/may/28/greenhouse-gases-arent-warming-earth>

The report of the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences [[Advancing the Science of Climate Change](#), May 2010] claims that the climate is warming and that the **cause** is human. <http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2010/05/three-academy-reports-urge-clima.html?etoc>

The first claim of this federally funded \$6-million exercise is meaningless and trivial, the second claim is almost surely wrong. Their recommendation is that the United States should put a price on carbon to staunch emissions of CO₂; it is pointless, counterproductive, and very costly..

The climate certainly has warmed considerably since 10,000 years ago (the end of the last Ice Age) -- and much less since 1850, the end of the Little Ice Age. No one disputes these facts. But the climate has not warmed during the past decade -- in spite of the steady rise in human-caused emissions of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide. According to Dr Phil Jones, head of the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia (CRU-UEA, of Climategate fame), there has been no warming trend since 1995.

The 2007 report of the UN-sponsored IPCC furnished no credible evidence for anthropogenic global warming (AGW). None at all – see here the Summary of the NIPCC report . “*Nature – Not Human Activity – Rules the Climate*” http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf The NRC-NAS panel did not add any new relevant information – nor did it have the expertise to do so.

The IPCC panel was made up of many qualified atmospheric scientists, active in research. The NAS panel was politically chosen and listed among its 'climate science experts' a sociology professor and a professor of 'sustainable development' – whatever that may mean. That certainly doesn't inspire much confidence in the NAS conclusions.

"This is our most comprehensive report ever on climate change," said Dr. Ralph Cicerone, president of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), at a briefing to discuss the effort, more than 2 years in the making and involving 90 scientists. It "analyzes the reality of climate change and how should the nation respond. ... It emphasizes why the United States should act now."

Looking back, this may well have been a low point for the NAS, which will inevitably discredit all other NAS activities. But it will provide a useful lesson to other scientific organizations that have uncritically jumped on the AGW bandwagon.

S Fred Singer
Arlington, Virginia
Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia

2. Response to Washington Post Editorial Insisting on Passing Kerry-Lieberman Cap and Tax.

By Donna Bethell, SEPP Director, May 21, 2010

For six months, news about the collapse of the "science" of human-caused climate change has filled international media and the Internet. Judging from your May 19 editorial, "A Climate for Change," the Post is unaware of some of the facts reported:

1. Dr. Phil Jones, former head of the UK's Climate Research Unit, told the BBC that the warming trend of 1975-1998 was not significantly different from those of 1860-1880 and 1910-1940 and that there has been no significant warming since 1995.¹ Then what evidence is there that human-caused CO2 is causing warming, as temperature increases and decreases the same way regardless of the CO2 level?

2. Thirty percent of the citations in the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are to non-peer-reviewed sources, including news articles and reports produced by advocacy groups.² Yet the head of the IPCC, Dr. R. K. Pachauri, says that "the IPCC studies only peer-review science."³ The AR4 was intended to be used and is used by policy makers to enact such legislation as is now proposed in the Senate. While the Post reported the IPCC's error in predicting that Himalayan glaciers could be gone by 2035, it did not report that the editor of that chapter admitted the claim was known to be unsubstantiated but was included in order to influence public policy.

How can we trust the IPCC -- or the Post?

Most importantly, consider this fact, which I have never seen in the Post: water, especially in low clouds, causes 95% of the greenhouse effect, yet the "climate models" do not include clouds. CO2 accounts for only about 3% of the greenhouse effect; human-caused CO2 accounts for about 3% of that 3%. Do the math: 3% of 3% is .09%. That is our contribution to the greenhouse effect from CO2. We could stop all human CO2 emissions and there would be no discernible effect on climate, ever.⁵

Donna Fitzpatrick Bethell
Under Secretary, US Department of Energy, 1988-1989
Member of the Board of Directors, Science and Environmental Policy Project

1. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/8511670.stm>
2. <http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/findings-main-page.php>
3. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/No-proof-of-Himalayan-ice-melting-due-to-climate-change/articleshow/5213045.cms>
4. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1245636/Glacier-scientists-says-knew-data-verified.html>
5. http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossils/greenhouse_data.html

3. Latest climate climbdown: the Royal Society review its statements on global warming

By Gerald Warner, Telegraph, UK May 28, 2010

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/geraldwarner/100041427/latest-climate-climbdown-the-royal-society-reviews-its-statements-on-global-warming/>

The latest institutional retreat from uncritical support of the AGW hypothesis is one that will chill warmists to the core: the Royal Society has announced it is to review its public statements on climate change. The Society now believes that its previous communications did not properly distinguish between what was widely agreed on climate science and what is not fully understood. It has appointed a panel to review its statements, assisted by two critical sub-groups, including a number of Fellows who have doubts about the received view on the risks of increasing CO2 levels.

In fact this review has been forced on the Society by 43 of its Fellows who demanded last January that the pamphlet *Climate Change Controversies*, produced in 2007 and published on its website, should be rewritten to take a less aggressive stance in support of AGW and respect climate change “agnostics”. In such partisan activities the Royal Society has form: in 2005 it published “A guide to facts and fictions about climate change”, which denounced 12 “misleading arguments” which today, post Climategate and the subsequent emboldening of sceptical scientists to speak out, look far from misleading.

This development does not, of course, mean that the Royal Society is embracing climate scepticism. On the contrary, it is very reluctantly modifying its stance to accommodate some of its Fellows who take the very scientific position that a degree of agnosticism is good practice when hypotheses remain unproven. Yet this retreat from absolutist global warming orthodoxy will deeply dismay the AGW lobby. For years, there was no fiercer proponent of the AGW theory than the Royal Society. Its previous president Lord May notoriously stated: “The debate on climate change is over.”

That was about as unscientific a statement as you could get: even the theories of iconic pioneers such as Einstein are routinely revisited by scientists. Yet Lord May intolerantly declared: “On one hand, you have the entire scientific community and on the other you have a handful of people, half of them crackpots.” Most major scientific advances have been achieved by a handful of people. That kind of dogmatic assertiveness brought great joy and comfort to the Al Gore cultists; to sceptics it was a reminder that the Royal Society’s founding members dabbled in alchemy – was the Society returning to its roots? Is carbon capture the new Philosopher’s Stone?

Clearly, that kind of blind commitment to the AGW cause will no longer be endorsed by the Royal Society. It is a sign of the times. Two months ago the Science Museum in London changed the name of its Climate Change Gallery to the Climate Science Gallery, as it began to distance itself from the partisan assumptions of the climate lobby. In fact it was abashed by the derision to which its previous posture had been subjected by visitors. Its director said: “We have come to realise, given the way this subject has become so polarised over the past three to four months, that we need to be respectful and welcoming of all views on it.”

That same realisation is dawning on more and more institutions and individuals, as the AGW scam becomes ever more discredited. Scepticism is now the prevailing public sentiment: the onus is on the alarmists to prove, rather than assert, their increasingly untenable claims. The European and global financial crisis has also concentrated minds on the insanity of squandering \$45 trillion on an imaginary threat, to make carbon traders billionaires.

Slowly but surely, the sceptical camp is winning. Daily the alarmists are forced to give ground. They will contest every inch of the way; it will be trench warfare against them for years; but the tide of battle has shifted decisively and the AGW superstition will ultimately be defeated.

4. The Drill Is Gone

IBD Editorial, May 27, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/535718/201005271857/The-Drill-Is-Gone.aspx>

Energy: An administration never enthusiastic about offshore drilling is using the Gulf oil spill as an excuse to suspend Arctic exploration. Who could've seen that coming? Now we'll be more dependent on foreign oil.

Suspicions in some quarters that the administration was being deliberately lax in its response to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico in order to pursue a larger, anti-domestic energy agenda were met with derision. But if not deliberate, the effect is the same as the administration prepares to shut down our search for new oil.

President Obama on Thursday announced a suspension of offshore drilling in the Arctic until the causes and solutions to the Gulf spill are found. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar said in a report delivered to the White House on Thursday that he will not consider applications for permits to drill in the Arctic until 2011. Shell Oil was poised to begin exploratory drilling this summer on leases as far as 140 miles offshore.

The irony here is that it's been the reluctance of Congress and the White House to allow more onshore development of our vast untapped oil and natural gas energy reserves that has forced oil companies such as Shell and British Petroleum to go farther and farther offshore to drill deeper and deeper in riskier waters.

"I am frustrated that this decision by the Obama administration to halt offshore development for a year will cause more delays and higher costs for domestic oil and gas production to meet the nation's energy needs," Sen. Mark Begich, D-Alaska, said in a statement. As with nuclear power, domestic oil exploration will now be consigned to the "study forever, develop never" category.

As we noted recently, this is another energy crisis that environmentalists will not let go to waste. The nonfatal accident at Three Mile Island in 1979 and the Soviet disaster at Chernobyl conspired to deprive the U.S. of a non-polluting form of power generation — nuclear power. The danger here is that similar overblown fears of offshore oil production will doom the U.S. to being the Bangladesh of domestic energy production.

Other nations continue to build new nuclear power plants, build new coal plants and build new offshore oil rigs (including China, in the Gulf of Mexico). They know that despite the risks and dangers, their economies and their people need the energy. The U.S., uniquely among industrial nations, will stick its head in the tundra.

A recent study by Science Applications International Corp. shows that the U.S. economy will suffer \$2.3 trillion in lost opportunity costs over the next two decades, monies that would go a long way to reining in runaway deficits and creating economic growth we sorely need.

The net effect of our energy inaction will be a reduction in gross domestic product by \$2.36 trillion cumulatively through 2029, or by 0.52% annually. We would also be forgoing hundreds of thousands of high-paying energy and construction sector jobs here in the U.S. as well as missing a golden opportunity to sharply cut our trade deficit.

Alaska's Chukchi Sea holds more oil and gas than anyone thought — 1,600 trillion cubic feet of undeveloped natural gas, or 30% of the world's supply, and 83 billion barrels of undeveloped oil, 4% of estimated global resources. You can be sure the Russians won't be as reluctant.

We'll become ever more dependent on the world's petrotyrants, including Russia's Vladimir Putin, Iran's Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Venezuela's Hugo Chavez, who are all too willing to use their energy wealth as a weapon.

This will make neither our wildlife nor our country more safe and secure.

5. This and That On Climate

By Rudy Baum, Editor in Chief, Chemical & Engineering News, May 17, 2010 [H/t Andrew Kaldor]

<http://pubs.acs.org/cen/email/html/8820editor.html>

[SEPP Comment: Boldface Added]

The American Association for the Advancement of Science and several other science-oriented organizations including the American Chemical Society held [a congressional briefing on climate science last week](#). Hosted by AAAS Chief Executive Officer Alan I. Leshner, the briefing featured a panel made up of Warren M. Washington, a senior scientist and former head of the Climate Change Research Section at the [National Center for Atmospheric Research](#); Richard B. Alley, a geosciences professor at Pennsylvania State University; and Richard L. Smith, a statistics and biostatistics professor at the University of North Carolina.

In his opening remarks, Leshner said that the large number of cosponsors of the briefing was a “measure of the seriousness with which we take climate science.” Leshner made a point of reading the names of all 13 cosponsors, which in addition to AAAS and ACS included the American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, American Statistical Association, and University Corporation for Atmospheric Research.

“Climate and energy are among the most pressing issues facing the global community,” Leshner said, and he decried recent efforts to “tarnish climate science.” The point of the briefing, he noted, was to review “what we know and what we don’t know” about climate science.

Well, what we know, Washington, Alley, and Smith made pretty clear, is that climate change is happening and humans are driving it. Alley, in particular, in a point-by-point presentation showed that incontrovertible data exist showing that atmospheric CO₂ concentrations are rising, the increase is due to burning fossil fuels, Earth’s temperature has increased in the past 100 years, and that, so far, the changes in climate have been small compared with what will happen if we continue on the path we’re on.

“No single mistake, or small set of mistakes, could possibly change these results,” Alley said.

Smith, the statistician, showed convincingly that two of global-warming skeptics’ principal arguments—that global temperature has decreased since 1998 and that the “hockey stick” graph of global temperature developed by Michael E. Mann and coworkers was inaccurate—are without statistical merit.

Both Washington and Smith made the point that climate-change skeptics should be allowed to publish their research. Skeptics regularly claim that their research is being suppressed. However, when I asked the panel—which had spent an hour skewering just about every argument advanced by skeptics—if they knew of any such research that ought to be published, they were unable to cite any current examples.

Meanwhile, C&EN reported in last week’s issue that Virginia Attorney General Kenneth T. Cuccinelli II has initiated a probe of Mann, now at Penn State, for possible fraud in carrying out his research ([C&EN, May 10, page 10](#)). This is an attempt to use raw political power to suppress science, no more, no less. As C&EN reported, scientists on both sides of the climate-change debate criticized the action.

Not S. Fred Singer, the University of Virginia emeritus professor of environmental sciences who leads the charge of the climate-change skeptics. *The Hook*, a Charlottesville, Va., weekly newspaper, also [reported on Cuccinelli's action](#). Among the 194 comments on the online version of the article is one from Singer, who wrote: "We know from the leaked e-mails of Climategate that Prof. Michael Mann was involved in the international conspiracy to 'hide the decline' [in global temperatures], using what chief conspirator Dr. Phil Jones refers to as 'Mike [Mann]'s trick.' Now at last we may find out just how this was done."

Singer knows that what he wrote is untrue, that there was **no attempt to hide a decline in global temperature, and that the "trick" Mann employed was a legitimate approach to reconciling two data sets** (contemporary temperature measurements and tree ring data that deviated from them). Singer has long since left any shred of scientific integrity far behind him. There is no longer any reason for scientists or anyone else—especially the media—to pay any attention to him.

Thanks for reading.

[SEPP Comment: Baum leaves himself open to a libel suit, but at least he quoted Fred Singer correctly]

6. Vaccines' Safety Confirmed, Wakefield's Validity Denied

By Curtis Porter, American Council on Science and Health, May 26, 2010
ACSH Dispatch [morning@acsh.org]

A study published in the journal *Pediatrics* demonstrates that the recommended vaccine schedule for young children does not pose a health threat, despite fears that [Reuters](#) says led some parents to "skip recommended vaccines out of fear of autism, for instance, and ... choose to space out shots."

Health experts such as Dr. Michael J. Smith, one of the study's researchers and a pediatric infectious-disease specialist at the University of Louisville School of Medicine in Kentucky, as well as ACSH trustee Dr. Paul Offit, a vaccine expert and chief of the division of infectious diseases at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, told [The Wall Street Journal](#) that they understand why some parents would be concerned, but that the real danger is not in the vaccines:

Dr. Smith likens a parent's decision to delay vaccination to someone buckling their seat belt after 20 minutes of riding in the car. "You don't know when you'll get hit," he says. ... Dr. Offit says the viral material in vaccines for babies is "literally a drop in the ocean" compared with how much bacteria a baby's immune system copes with each day.

ACSH staffers hope this news will allay parents' fears, and we can't help but notice the study's propinquity to the recent [news out of Britain](#). After almost a three-year hearing, Britain's General Medical Council has found Andrew Wakefield guilty of "serious professional misconduct" in the way he carried out his research in the late 1990s and revoked his medical license.

"Wakefield was among those who propagated this rumor that too many vaccines are harmful for kids," says ACSH's Dr. Gilbert Ross. "His 1998 study published in *The Lancet*, which has since been retracted, is also the source of the rumor that the MMR vaccine causes autism in children. His license was appropriately pulled, albeit 12 years too late. The council reproached him for his unethical conduct, but they didn't say anything about the quality of his research, which we've been decrying for years."

ACSH's Dr. Elizabeth Whelan, who wrote about the Wakefield debacle for the [New York Post](#), adds, "He was a hero to so many anti-vaccine activists because of his professionally unethical and deceptive involvement in publicizing this theory that vaccines cause autism. Hopefully, this realization that he is a charlatan and all of the evidence supporting vaccines' safety will put the rumors to rest."

7. Who Is Really To Blame For this Blowout

By Charles Krauthammer, IBD, May 27 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/535634/201005271815/Who-Is-Really-To-Blame-For-This-Blowout.aspx>

Here's my question: Why are we drilling in 5,000 feet of water in the first place? Many reasons, but this one goes unmentioned: Environmental chic has driven us out there.

As production from the shallower Gulf of Mexico wells declines, we go deep (1,000 feet and more) and ultra deep (5,000 feet and more), in part because environmentalists have succeeded in rendering the Pacific and nearly all the Atlantic coast off-limits to oil production. (President Obama's tentative, selective opening of some Atlantic and offshore Alaska sites is now dead.)

And of course, in the safest of all places, on land, we've had a 30-year ban on drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

So we go deep, ultradeep — to such a technological frontier that no precedent exists for the April 20 blowout in the Gulf of Mexico.

There will always be catastrophic oil spills. You make them as rare as humanly possible, but where would you rather have one: in the Gulf of Mexico, upon which thousands depend for their livelihood, or in the Arctic, where there are practically no people?

All spills seriously damage wildlife. That's a given. But why have we pushed the drilling from the barren to the populated, from the remote wilderness to a center of fishing, shipping, tourism and recreation?

Not that the environmentalists are the only ones to blame. Not by far. But it is odd that they've escaped any mention at all.

The other culprits are pretty obvious.

It starts with BP, which seems not only to have had an amazing string of perfect-storm engineering lapses but no contingencies to deal with a catastrophic system failure.

However, the railing against BP for its performance since the accident is harder to understand. I attribute no virtue to BP, just self-interest. What possible interest can it have to do anything but cap the well as quickly as possible? Every day that oil is spilled means millions more in losses, cleanup and restitution.

Federal officials who rage against BP would like to deflect attention from their own role in this disaster. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar, whose department's laxity in environmental permitting and safety oversight renders it among the many bearing responsibility, expresses outrage at BP's inability to stop the leak, and even threatens to "push them out of the way."

"To replace them with what?" asked the estimable, admirably candid Coast Guard Adm. Thad Allen, the national incident commander.

No one has the assets and expertise of BP.

Government Impotence

The federal government can fight wars, conduct a census and hand out billions in earmarks, but it has not a clue how to cap a one-mile-deep out-of-control oil well.

Obama didn't help much with his finger-pointing Rose Garden speech in which he denounced finger-pointing, then proceeded to blame everyone but himself.

Even the grace note of admitting some federal responsibility turned sour when he reflexively added that these problems have been going on "for a decade or more" — translation: Bush did it — while, in contrast, his own interior secretary had worked diligently to solve the problem "from the day he took office."

Really? Why hadn't we heard a thing about this? What about the September 2009 letter from Obama's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration accusing Interior's Minerals Management Service of understating the "risk and impacts" of a major oil spill?

When you get a blowout 15 months into your administration, and your own Interior Department had given BP a "categorical" environmental exemption in April 2009, the buck stops.

In the end, speeches will make no difference. If BP can cap the well in time to prevent an absolute calamity in the Gulf, the president will escape politically.

If it doesn't — if the gusher isn't stopped before the relief wells are completed in August — it will become Obama's Katrina.

That will be unfair, because Obama is no more responsible for the damage caused by this than Bush was for the damage caused by Katrina.

But that's the nature of American politics and its presidential cult of personality: We expect our presidents to play Superman. Helplessness, however undeniable, is no defense.

Moreover, Obama has never been overly modest about his own powers.

Two years ago next week, he declared that history will mark his ascent to the presidency as the moment when "our planet began to heal" and "the rise of the oceans began to slow."

Well, when you anoint yourself King Canute, you mustn't be surprised when your subjects expect you to command the tides.

#####

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