Fred Singer will be lecturing overseas until Sept 21, including India, Israel, and Sicily. He asks that you send him only high-priority e-mail. Please direct other correspondence to Ken Haapala. Lectures open to the public are: Princeton U on Sept 23, Annandale, VA on Sept 25, and Purdue U on Sept 27. To attend, contact ken@haapala.com for details.

If you are in the Washington DC Area, you are cordially invited to attend the SEPP-SEEE Climate-Energy Forum at 10:30 am on Sept 25 in the Ernst Community Center at the Annandale Campus of the Northern Virginia Community College. This is located about one mile outside the Beltway off Little River Turnpike. No reservations are required. This is no fee but donations are greatly appreciated. The speakers will include Fred Singer on recent science, Marc Morano on the political situation, and Ken Haapala on energy and economics. Please follow the Visitor Parking signs to the garage. The Ernst Center is on the right facing away from the parking lot and the event will be held on the second floor. There will be plenty of seating. For information on the Ernst Center see: (http://tinyurl.com/cs5ij76)

At 8 pm on September 27 Fred Singer and Ken Haapala will be panelists in a Global Warming Forum held at the Loeb Playhouse of Purdue University sponsored by the Purdue College of Engineering, College of Science, and the Global Policy Research Institute. The two other panelists will be Susan Avery, President and Director of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, and Robert Socolow, Co-Director, the Carbon Mitigation Initiative. The Moderator is Moira Gunn, host of NPR’s Tech Nation and BioTech Nation. The Forum is free and open to the public.

PLEASE NOTE that the complete TWTW, including the articles, can be downloaded in an easily printable form at the web site: http://www.haapala.com/sepp/the-week-that-was.cfm.

The Heartland Institute is holding a conference in Sydney on October 1. For information see: http://www.quadrant.org.au/pages/whats-on

Quote of the Week:
For all our conceits about being the center of the universe, we live in a routine planet of a humdrum star stuck away in an obscure corner ... on an unexceptional galaxy which is one of about 100 billion galaxies. ... That is the fundamental fact of the universe we inhabit, and it is very good for us to understand that. -Carl Sagan

Number of the Week: $237 per ton

THIS WEEK:
By Ken Haapala, Executive Vice President Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP)
There is little justification for indiscriminate, wide spread use of persistent, environmentally damaging chemicals, and such use should be controlled. However, by the 1960’s, it was clearly established that indoor spraying of DDT is invaluable in eliminating the scourge, malaria, in developing countries. Yet, without scientific evidence, the US EPA declared DDT a possible human carcinogen and banned its use. The ban was used to justify efforts of a ban of DDT world-wide – with disastrous consequences. Malaria rates skyrocketed in areas in which it had been greatly reduced. In Article # 1 below, Physician Elizabeth Whelan reviews a new film on the consequences of EPA’s ban.
Last week’s TWTW referenced some articles criticizing Borg Lomborg for his apparent about face in calling for major world expenditures to prevent global warming. This week Lomborg wrote an article defending this action. Please see Article # 2 below.

The Global Warming Policy Foundation released a new report on the poor quality of the Climategate inquiries principally written by Andrew Montford. Monford’s book on the Hockey Stick was reviewed in last week’s TWTW. Please see Article # 3 below.

A number of groups participated in three separate petitions to the Federal DC Court of Appeals requesting that the Court prevent EPA from implementing its greenhouse gas regulations until the Court rules on the on the lawsuit seeking to overturn EPA’s Endangerment Finding which provides the justification for these regulations. SEPP, CEI, and Freedom Works participated in one of the three petitions. Please see Article # 4 which is the press release from the office of the Attorney General of Texas explaining the rational for its petition.

As illustrated by the works of George Orwell, slogans are important to political movements. Effective slogans can persuade people to a cause and eliminate further thought on the subject. In his book Climate: The Counter Consensus, Bob Carter discusses how slogans become type of code. Do you believe in global warming is actually do you believe that mankind is causing unprecedented and dangerous global warming? Similarly, saying that someone is a “climate denier” is a pejorative way to describe a person who believes that climate change is normal and natural.

The slogans “global warming” and “climate change” appear to be losing their effectiveness with the public. President Obama’s science advisor John Holdren has invented a replacement – “disruptive climate change.” Of course, what the term means is not precisely defined. So it is appropriate to define it. For the past two million years the dominant climate is one of ice ages interrupted by brief warm periods. Thus, warm periods must be “disruptive climate changes” including the current one that has permitted humanity to thrive and gave rise to civilization. Please see the first article under “Defending the Orthodoxy.”

Last week’s TWTW referenced a criticism of a study by the Columbia Climate Center at the Earth Institute, Columbia University, produced for Deutsche Bank (DB) entitled: “Climate Change: Addressing the Major Skeptic Arguments.” According to reports, the Bank has a US $5 Billion portfolio for green investments, including carbon trading, so it is natural for the Bank to defend its portfolio. DB announcement of the report concludes that human caused dangerous warming is upon us and it will last for thousands of years.

Now the study is now being used to attack those skeptical about the IPCC. Thus, it is instructive to look at a few main points of the study which claims to summarize the arguments of the skeptics and effectively respond to them.

- The DB response to the claim that climate models cannot provide reliable projections is that the models have been improved and unanimously predict warming with increasing greenhouse gases.

SEPP response: A deficient model that has been improved but makes unverified predictions is still deficient.
- The DB response to the claim that the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) existed is that the existence of the MWP does not challenge the case of anthropogenic warming.
  **SEPP response:** it is the obligation of those claiming the 20th Century warming is different than past warm periods to scientifically explain the difference and demonstrate why 20th Century warming must be anthropogenic.

- In responding to the fact that ice cores reveal that temperatures changed first then carbon dioxide concentrations the study claims that carbon dioxide changes amplify the temperature changes.
  **SEPP response:** The CO2 amplification claim avoids the issue of cause. For example, what causes temperatures to drop when carbon dioxide concentrations are rising? This is inconsistent with the IPCC models that project temperatures will only increase with rising carbon dioxide.

- The study states that skeptics claim “Earth’s climate is driven only by the sun.”
  **SEPP response:** The authors of the study ignored the works of many skeptics, for example Joe D’Aleo and Roy Spencer.

- The DB response to water vapor being the most prevalent greenhouse gas is to assert that water vapor provides a positive feedback.
  **SEPP response:** The water vapor feedback is precisely the assumption that must be – and has not been – tested.

Many similar issues in the paper can be refuted in a similar fashion. For references please see the article under “Keep On Trading.”

**************************************************************************************************************
**Number of the Week: $237 per ton**
One of the justifications for the Federal government’s cash for clunkers program was that it would reduce carbon dioxide emissions. According to the referenced article “‘Clunkers,’ a classic government folly,” researchers at the University of California, Davis estimate that it cost the Federal Government (i.e. taxpayers) $237 per ton of emissions reduced. The current posted price for a metric ton (1.1 US tons) on the Chicago Climate Exchange is $0.10. However, no one is buying.

It is interesting to speculate what the costs of reductions of emissions are from subsidizing and mandating wind and solar power.

**************************************************************************************************************

In a rather long four part series posted in Master Resource, Jon Boone challenges the American Wind Energy Association (AWEA) to produce the empirical evidence supporting its claim that reduction in carbon dioxide emissions is “one of the universally recognized and uncontestable benefits of wind energy…” Independent researchers have great difficulty in obtaining the necessary data to evaluate the effectiveness of wind. The wind industry routinely denies access to the data claiming it is proprietary. It is unconscionable that legislators and other government officials subsidize and mandate the use of wind energy without full and transparent knowledge of the costs and the benefits to the citizen. (Please see “Overblown” under “Energy Issues.”)

**************************************************************************************************************

SEPP CORRECTIONS AND AMPLIFICATIONS: Reader Tom Sheahen pointed out that last week’s discussion of hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling did not sufficiently differentiate between the new techniques of drilling for natural gas and the old techniques of drilling for oil and natural gas in the East. In the past, the wells in the east were relatively shallow and vertical. Compared to wells in the West, they produced poorly. Solvents and even explosives were used to
fracture rock and open pores to obtain the gas or oil. As a result, before solid regulations were established, solvents could appear in the ground water or drinking water.

The new techniques involved drilling deep wells thousands of feet below the surface through layers of impervious rock far below ground water and aquifers. The walls of the vertical and initial horizontal wells are sealed to prevent any seepage into porous layers. It is then that additional horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing of the gas bearing shale commences. The amount of chemicals used is typically below 1% of the total fluids, the balance being water. When claims of pollution of drinking water, etc, are made, it is necessary to differentiate between the old techniques and the new.

SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL #27-2010 (Sep 18, 2010)
Guest Editorial by Dr. Harrison “Jack” Schmitt

Harrison H. Schmitt is a former United States Senator from New Mexico as well as a geologist and former Apollo Astronaut. He currently is an aerospace and private enterprise consultant and a member of the new Committee of Correspondence.

hhschmitt@earthlink.net

THE ROLE OF GREENLAND AND ANTARCTIC ICE CORES IN CLIMATE SCIENCE

Analysis of ice cores from Antarctica [1] and Greenland [2] play an important role in understanding the history of global temperatures and atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane, and other gases and aerosols. Through analysis of dust, they also provide up to 800,000-year chronologies of global scale volcanic eruptions and major trends toward desertification. Clearly, data from ice cores play a critical underlying role in the science of climate change.

Unfortunately, ice cores do not always appear to be a reliable record of past carbon dioxide or methane concentrations in the atmosphere. Their information needs to be confirmed by consistency with data from other sources. Particular care must be taken in the interpretation of the carbon dioxide “record” in ice cores due to uncertainties in the mechanics of gas preservation over time.[4]

In some cases, the trapped “atmosphere” in the ice sheets may not be part of a closed system. To be a closed system for carbon dioxide or methane, no gas components can escape or be added during the burial process; liquid water cannot have interacted with the gases; none of the trapped gas components can combine, separate, diffuse, or solidify; and all components must stay in the same proportions as pressure increases with time due to added ice above. The observational science of ice has demonstrated that for some cores all these conditions do not hold. Further, the process of core extraction from great depth to surface pressure may open and disturb the gas systems.

For example, the Siple Antarctic ice core indicates that carbon dioxide reached a level of about 330ppm in about 1900. Comparison with the 1960 initial Mauna Loa measurement of 260ppm suggests that either (1) the Siple data is just wrong, or (2) there was a drop of about 60ppm in carbon dioxide level between 1900 and 1960, or (3) it takes 80-some years for the carbon dioxide gas system to close.[4] This discrepancy does not appear to have been resolved,[5] but the smooth shape of the Siple core carbon dioxide curve as a function of core depth (approaching a constant level with increasing core depth/age) suggests it might not ever have been a closed system. Over time, carbon dioxide in the sampled Siple ice may have gradually equilibrated to a constant carbon dioxide value of about 280ppm now indicated for the 1720-year old and older layers. Also, this core suffered some melting during transport and prior to analysis.[6]
Not surprisingly, considering the known variability in ice preservation, measured carbon dioxide concentrations in the trapped gases of many cores older than about 300 years hold remarkably constant over the last 7-8000 years of ice accumulation.[7] This constancy is incompatible with other data, including that from other ice cores and from preserved Ginkgo leaf stomata, both indicating significant variation during that period. Stomata are pores through which a plant takes in carbon dioxide. They vary in size depending on the carbon dioxide concentration in the air, and preserved stomata suggest that carbon dioxide levels ranged between 270 and 326 ppm over the last 7-8000 years.[8]

Some Greenland ice cores do not show expected temperature-driven carbon dioxide increases during the Medieval Warm Period (~800-1300) or the expected decreases during the Little Ice Age (~1400-1900)[9], although these events show clearly in other cores[10]. This further indicates that some ice cores potentially give an unreliable history of atmospheric carbon dioxide, nitrogen, and methane concentrations.

Analyses from the EPICA Dome C and Vostok cores of the Antarctic ice sheets, on the other hand, show plausible parameter variations. A strong correlation exists back to ~800,000 years ago between carbon dioxide and methane concentrations and deuterium and oxygen isotopic temperature determinations.[11] The five hundred year time resolution of these correlations, however, remains insufficient to determine if carbon dioxide and methane changes lead or lag temperature changes. Similarly, up to 123,000 years of climate temperature variations measured in three deep cores from the Greenland ice sheet (GRIP, GISP2, and NGRIP) appear to be consistent with other climate proxy data, such as North Atlantic sediment cores.[12]

Although carbon dioxide measurements can be suspect in some ice cores, data from many others constitute extremely valuable records of additional parameters that exist within truly closed subsystems. For example, Greenland ice core data indicate that large climatic temperature shifts can occur over a very few years. Oxygen isotopes, deuterium, dust and calcium, sodium, and ice accumulation rates support data from cave deposits that indicate rapid cooling often follows periods of gradual natural warming.[13]

A particularly prolonged warm period between 9000 and 6000 years ago, within the current interglacial, has been documented, most recently in oxygen isotopic analyses of Greenland ice cores.[14] That prolonged warm period resulted in significant thinning of Greenland’s ice sheet to thicknesses within a 100 km of those of today. Several other warm periods have occurred since, the most pronounced of which has been termed the Medieval Warm Period (500-1300).[15] Warm periods of this nature were initially highly beneficial to fledgling human cultures. During the latter centuries of the Medieval Warm Period, however, severe weather and drought, overpopulation relative to available agricultural technology, and other factors forced migrations from many centers of civilization,[16] primarily to locations with more reliable water resources and better defensive positioning.

Adverse effects of warming, however, stand in contrast to the general advancement of human civilization during the 10,000 years of warming since the last Ice Age. On the other hand, adaptation to the stresses of climate change, including cold periods, probably was a major factor in the evolution of modern humans.[17] The last Ice Age also permitted the advantageous migrations of modern humans from Asia into the Americas about 22,000 years ago. At that time, low sea levels created a land bridge between Asia and North America.[18] Adaptability has been the key for human survival and advancement.
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In its two decades of widespread use, DDT saved more lives than any other man-made chemical.
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Climategate Continued
The Global Warming Establishment Needs More than Cosmetic Fixes

Climategate Investigations Revealed as Hopelessly Inadequate

Challenging the Orthodoxy
7 Signs of the Times
If we are winning this war, we would expect to see signs of retreat, and many signs have crossed my desk recently.
By Joanne Nova, Sep 7, 2010

**Australian Temperatures in cities adjusted up by 70%!**
By Joanne Nova, Sep 14, 2010

[SEPP Comment: It appears that NASA-GISS is not the only organization that has discovered that one can manipulate a trend by lowering historic temperatures.]

Coral Bleaching
World Climate Report, Sep 13, 2010

States tell Obama to take a hike
Feds denied jurisdiction on environment, health and guns
Editorial, Washington Times, Sep 15, 2010

Global warming is dead. Long live, er, ‘Global climate disruption’
By James Delingpole, Telegraph, UK, Sep 17, 2010

Who gains profit from global warming myth?
By Anton Eyseyev, Pravda, Sep 13, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

‘Clunkers,’ a classic government folly
By Jeff Jacoby, Boston Globe, Sep 1, 2010 [H/t Tom Sheahen]
http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2010/09/01/clunkers_a_classic_government_folly/

The real reasons why one billion go hungry: wind farms, biofuels, sustainability
By James Delingpole, Telegraph, UK, Sep 15, 2010

Defending the Orthodoxy
White House: Global Warming Out, ‘Global Climate Disruption’ In
Fox News, Sep 16, 2010 [H/t Brad Veek]

Green movement needs a different approach to appeal beyond the usual audience
Campaigners should focus on things people care about, not polar bears and melting ice caps
By Ben West, Guardian, UK. Sep 15, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]
http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2010/sep/15/green-movement-approach

High Noon For Climate Skepticism
By Bradford Plumer, New Republic, Sep 14, 2010
http://www.tnr.com/blog/the-vine/77664/high-noon-climate-skepticism
**BP Oil Spill and Aftermath**

**Allen: Blown-out Gulf well to be sealed by Sunday**  
By Harry Weber, Associated Press, Sep 15, 2010  

**Gulf May Avoid Direst Predictions After Oil Spill**  
By Leslie Kaufaman and Shaila Dewan, NYT, Sep 13, 2010  
[SEPP Comment: Making good news seem bad.]

**Energy Issues**

**China to offer Russia $US6 – bln loan for 25-year coal supply**  
Chinamining.org, Sep 13, 2010 [H/t Joanne Nova]  
[http://www.chinamining.org/News/2010-09-10/1284090826d39023.html](http://www.chinamining.org/News/2010-09-10/1284090826d39023.html)

**Overblown: Wind power on the Firing Line (Part I)**  
By Jon Boone, Master Resource, Sep 13, 2010  

**EPA and other Regulators On the March**

**States Ask Supreme Court to Decide on Public Nuisance Case**  
Power News, Sep 15, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]  
[SEPP Comment: Connecticut and several others, including environmental groups, have sued utilities claiming carbon dioxide emission is a public nuisance. Other states are now challenging the this litigation.]

**Refiners Fight Emissions Law**  
By Vauhini Vara, WSJ, Sep 17, 2010  

**Keep On Trading**

**Deutsche Bank Debunks Skeptics with a Report – and a $5 billion Climate Portfolio**  
By Michael Keller, Reuters, Sep 15, 2010  
[SEPP Comment: For the full report see:]  

**Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC**

**For a full list of articles see** [www.NIPCCreport.org](http://www.NIPCCreport.org)

**Gulf of Mexico Coastal Hurricane Strickes**  

**Responses of 18 Benthic Marine Calcifiers to Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment**  
The Case for a Global Medieval Warming Period Grows Ever Stronger

Effects of Predicted Climate Change on Australian Fisheries … and More!

The Little Ice Age in the Atlantic Warm Pool

Other Scientific Issues
Bringing Grace To Earth Mass And Water Movements
By Staff Writers, JPL, Space Daily, Sep 15, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]
http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Bringing_Grace_To_Earth_Mass_And_Water_Movements_999.html
[SEPP Comment: Using new methodology, calculated ice loss between 2002 and 2008 is significantly less than previous estimates.]

Say Goodbye to Sunspots?
By Phil Berardelli, Science, Sep 14, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

NOAA outsources climate data management
By Anthony Watts, Sep 17, 2010
[SEPP Comment: Anthony Watts points out that no longer will NOAA be able to use the claim they are understaffed to ignore Freedom Of Information Act requests.]

No Change In The Length Of the Arctic Melt Season
By Steven Goddard, Real Science, Sep 12, 2010
[SEPP Comment: The melt season is shorter than in the mid-1990s but the record since satellite measurements began in 1979 indicates no trend.]

Miscellaneous Topics of Possible Interest
Hybrids May Thrive Where Parents Fear to Tread
By Sean Carroll, NYT, Sep 13, 2010

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Next, Congress will approve whale oil subsidies
By Mark Tapscott, Washington Examiner, Sep 15, 2010

[SEPP Comment: After the failure of cap and trade, the Renewable Energy Standard is now the big issue for the environmental lobby.]

**Giant kangaroo rat puts kink in California Valley solar project**
Bly David Sneed, San Luis Obispo Tribune, Sep 12, 2010 [H/t Best on the Web]

### ARTICLES:

**1. The Deadly War against DDT**
In its two decades of widespread use, DDT saved more lives than any other man-made chemical.
By Elizabeth M. Whelan, National Review, Sep 15, 2010 [H/t American Council on Science and Health]
http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/246562/deadly-war-against-ddt-elizabeth-m-whelan

A remarkable new documentary tells the story of how political and ideological forces combined to ban a widely and safely used chemical, DDT, leading to a surge of malaria deaths in developing countries like Kenya, Indonesia, and India.

*3 Billion and Counting*, which premieres this Friday in Manhattan, was produced by Dr. Rutledge Taylor, a California physician who specializes in preventive medicine. His film will both shock and anger you.

DDT was first synthesized in 1877, but it was not until 1940 that a Swiss chemist demonstrated that it could kill insects without any harm to humans. It was introduced into widespread use during World War II and became the single most important pesticide in maintaining human health for the next two decades. The scientist who discovered the insecticidal properties of DDT, Dr. Paul Müller, was awarded the 1948 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine for his work on DDT. (In the 1940s and 1950s the chemical was the “secret” ingredient in a popular new cocktail, the Mickey Slim: gin, with a pinch of DDT.)

In 1962, Rachel Carson’s lyrical but scientifically flawed book, *Silent Spring*, argued eloquently, but erroneously, that pesticides, especially DDT, were poisoning both wildlife and the environment – and also endangering human health. The National Academy of Sciences, the American Medical Association, and the U.S. surgeon general were among those who dismissed these charges and came out in support of continuing to use DDT to fight disease and protect crops. A federal hearing was held on the safety of DDT, and in April 1972 Judge Edmund Sweeney concluded that not only was DDT safe, but it was an essential chemical. Two months later, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency, William Ruckelshaus – who had never attended a single day’s session of the EPA’s hearings and admitted that he had not read the transcripts — overturned the judge’s decision, declaring, without evidence, that DDT was “a potential human carcinogen” and banned it for virtually all uses. The ban on DDT was considered to be the first major victory for the environmentalist movement in the United States, and countries around the world followed America’s lead.

In Ceylon (now Sri Lanka), DDT spraying had reduced malaria cases from 2.8 million in 1948 to 17 in 1963. After spraying stopped, malaria cases rose sharply, reaching 2.5 million over the next decade.

Scientists have never found an effective substitute for DDT — and so the malaria death rate has kept on soaring.

In his dissection of the rise of the environmental movement and the fall of science, Dr. Taylor not only educates us, but he also sparks outrage about the unforeseen consequences of a scientifically ignorant chemical witchhunt, one that has caused untold human suffering and billions of deaths, primarily among
children. While any man-on-the-street interview will yield an overwhelming majority of negative comments about DDT — a “highly toxic, killer chemical” – the reality is that DDT has saved more lives than any other man-made chemical.
– Dr. Elizabeth M. Whelan is president of the American Council on Science and Health.

2. U-Turn On Global Warming? Hardly
Being skeptical of Al Gore’s solution doesn’t make me a ‘denier.’
By Bjorn Lomborg, WSJ, Sep 15, 2010
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703376504575491643716526782.html?mod=ITP_opinion

After years of being accused of believing something I didn't believe—or, more accurately, not believing something I really did—I made headlines last month for changing my mind even though I hadn't.

Confused? Imagine how I feel.

It's worth explaining what happened to me because it tells us something important about why the global warming debate has produced so little in the way of results.

First, a little background. Ever since 2001, when I published "The Skeptical Environmentalist"—a book in which I argued that the world's environmental problems were getting better—I've been wrongly accused of being a global warming denier.

The fact that I've always asserted the reality of man-made climate change never seemed to make an impression on my critics. What mattered was that I had the temerity to question two key tenets of the received wisdom about global warming: I was skeptical of the idea that we were facing the apocalypse, and I didn't accept that the only solution was to mandate drastic cuts in carbon emissions.

That's the way it is with heresy—there is no middle ground. Either you believe global warming is the worst problem mankind has ever faced and that cutting carbon is the only solution, or you are an antiscientific ignoramus who probably thinks the Earth is flat.

My reputation among climate activists worsened in 2008, when the Copenhagen Consensus Center, the think tank I founded, published the results of a wide-ranging cost-benefit analysis of solutions to 10 of the world's most pressing problems. We assembled a group of top economists and asked them to assess which solutions to which problems would deliver the most bang for the buck. In addition to global warming, we considered issues like malnutrition, unsafe drinking water, malaria and terrorism.

The main global-warming solution our experts analyzed was the carbon-cutting approach advocated by Al Gore and endorsed at the 1997 global climate summit in Kyoto. We found that compared to solutions to other problems, direct carbon cuts were woefully ineffective. For example, while every dollar spent on fighting malnutrition would yield nearly $20 in benefits, every dollar spent on cutting carbon would avoid much less than a dollar of global warming damage. When we published our list of investments we thought should be prioritized, cutting carbon was near the bottom. Once again, I was pilloried for being a global warming denier.

The Kyoto approach is not the only way forward. In 2009, we convened another group to look at a variety of potential solutions to climate change beyond simply cutting carbon. Our experts (including three Nobel laureates) identified a number of other approaches to the problem that were economically feasible and likely to have a quicker and more powerful impact.

The most promising involved massive increases in R&D funding for green energy technologies and geo-engineering. I spent a good part of last year and most of this year advocating for this sensible approach to
solving global warming, which is "one of the chief concerns facing the world today," as I said in an Aug.
31 interview with the Guardian, the British newspaper.

What happened next was startling. The Guardian reported my commonplace observation as evidence of
"an apparent U-turn" by "the world's most high-profile climate change skeptic." This set off a media
stampede; news organizations around the world scrambled to report my so-called change of heart.

I tried to explain that I had always considered climate change to be a problem. The only thing that had
changed was that we finally had some good solutions to consider. Some people took the point, but just as
many didn't. As far as the latter group was concerned, I had finally seen the light, and that was that.

I suppose I should take some comfort in the fact that I've been accused of being both a denier and a
warmist. But the polarized nature of the global warming debate is no laughing matter. Limiting the debate
to only two valid positions—for or against—makes a constructive discussion impossible. If we truly want
to make progress on climate change, we must acknowledge a middle way—one that recognizes that while
we do need to deal with the reality of global warming, solutions based on worst-case scenarios will
actually do more harm than good.

The smart middle path means making green energy so cheap everyone wants it. There's nothing confusing
about it.

Mr. Lomborg is director of the Copenhagen Consensus, a think tank, and author of "Cool It: The

3. Damning New Investigation Into Climategate Inquiries
Global Warming Policy Foundation, Sep 14, 2010

London, 14 September - The Global Warming Policy Foundation today publishes a detailed assessment of
the Climategate inquiries set up by the University of East Anglia and others which finds that they avoided
key questions and failed to probe some of the most serious allegations.

The report The Climategate Inquiries, written by Andrew Montford and with a foreword by Lord
(Andrew) Turnbull, finds that the inquiries into the conduct and integrity of scientists at the Climatic
Research Unit of the University of East Anglia were rushed and seriously inadequate.

In particular, the report finds that:

- none of the Climategate panels mounted an inquiry that was comprehensive within their area of
  remit
- insufficient consideration in the choice of panel members led to a failure to ensure balance and
  independence
- none managed to be objective and comprehensive
- none made any serious attempt to consider the views and submissions of well-informed critics
- terms of reference were either vague or non-existent
- none of them performed their work in a way that is likely to restore confidence in the work of
  CRU.

Andrew Montford, the author of the GWPF report, said:

"The lack of impartiality manifested itself in the different ways the panels treated CRU scientists and their
critics. While CRU justifications and explanations were willingly accepted without any serious probing,
critics were denied adequate opportunity to respond and to counter demonstrably inaccurate claims."
"All in all, the evidence of the failings of the three UK inquiries is overwhelming. Public confidence in the reliability of climate science will not be restored until a thorough, independent and impartial investigation takes place," Andrew Montford warned.

Lord Turnbull, who wrote the foreword to the GWPF report, said:

"The report by Andrew Montford clearly demonstrates that all three inquiries have serious flaws. The result has been that the three investigations have failed to achieve their objective, ie early and conclusive closure and restoration of confidence."

"The new House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology, which has rightly reopened the issue, would do well to study Andrew Montford's report and take evidence from him. It needs to satisfy itself as to whether the criticisms made are valid and whether the exoneration claimed is justified."

"Only if the integrity of the science is re-established and the strengths and weaknesses of the main propositions are acknowledged will there be the basis of trust with the public which policymakers need," Lord Turnbull said.

Lord Turnbull also called on the Government to look at the serious criticisms of the IPCC made in the recent InterAcademy Council Report. He said: "The Government should demand that the fundamental reforms recommended by the IAC in the practice, governance and leadership of the IPCC are implemented immediately for its Fifth Assessment."

The full report can be downloaded here

********************************************

4. Texas Files Legal Action To Block Imposition of EPA Regulations That Threaten Texas Jobs
http://www.oag.state.tx.us/oagnews/release.php?id=3484

AUSTIN – The State of Texas today filed four motions to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from implementing new federal regulations that threaten the Texas economy and jeopardize Texas jobs. Specifically, Texas petitioned the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit to stay the EPA’s greenhouse gas Endangerment Finding, the Light-Duty Vehicle Rule, the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Interpretive Rule, and the Tailoring Rule.

Court documents filed by the State explain that the EPA’s Endangerment Finding is legally unsupported because the agency outsourced its legally mandated “scientific assessment” to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which had the objectivity, reliability and propriety of its scientific assessments called into question after a scandal erupted late last year. The State explained that the IPCC – and therefore the EPA – relied on flawed science to conclude that greenhouse emissions endanger public health and welfare. Because the Administration predicated its Endangerment Finding on the IPCC’s questionable reports, the State is seeking to prevent the EPA’s new Rules – and the economic harm that will result from those regulations – from being imposed on Texas employers, workers and enforcement agencies.

Texas is also seeking to stay the imposition of the Light-Duty Vehicle Rule, which is predicated on the EPA’s flawed Endangerment Finding. The Light-Duty Vehicle Rule attempts to apply new federal emissions regulations to passenger vehicles such as cars and trucks. Court documents filed by the State explain that the Light-Duty Vehicle Rule is flawed because it purports to regulate pollutants that are not even found in vehicle emissions. Further, although federal law requires that new environmental regulations quantify their purported health and welfare benefits, the EPA failed to include that data when the Light-Duty Vehicle Rule was published. Third, despite a national economic downturn, the EPA also
failed to adequately consider the harmful economic impact of the mobile source regulations – even though a thorough economic impact analysis is required by the Clean Air Act.

Under the so-called PSD Interpretive Rule – which the State is also challenging – once a substance is regulated for any purpose, all emissions sources are subject to regulation. Thus, because the Light-Duty Vehicle Rule attempts to regulate greenhouse gas emissions for the first time, that Rule extends those regulations to stationary sources such as factories, refineries, large office buildings with boilers – any stationery location that emits greenhouse gases. Although EPA officials plainly knew their regulations would extend to stationary sources, the federal regulator’s Light-Duty Vehicle Rule economic impact analysis failed to consider the economic implications of imposing its greenhouse gas regulations on factories, refineries, and other large employers.

The State is challenging the PSD Interpretive Rule itself because the Rule leads to absurd results. Effective January 2, 2011, the Rule requires that greenhouse gases be automatically regulated pursuant to the Clean Air Act’s statutorily specified emission level requirements. However, the emission levels were written to control toxic pollution – not carbon dioxide and other non-toxic substances. As a result the Clean Air Act contains lower emission levels than are practicable for regulating high-volume, non-toxic greenhouse gases. Thus, by the EPA’s own admission, the PSD Interpretive Rule produces an absurd result.

To solve the “absurd results” problem of its own creation, the EPA promulgated the so-called Tailoring Rule, which purports to limit greenhouse gas permitting and regulation to only the largest emitters. Texas is challenging the Tailoring Rule because the EPA is attempting to ignore the plain language of the Clean Air Act and rewrite the law to advance its regulatory agenda. The Tailoring Rule would require Texas to reinterpret or revise its ‘State Implementation Plan’ – which is the State’s federally-approved Clean Air Act enforcement program – by Jan. 2, 2011. If the State fails to meet the Administration’s requirement, the EPA will impose its own federal implementation plan upon Texas. Thus, today’s court filings challenge the EPA’s attempts to ignore federal law, impose their federally mandated deadlines and force Texas to spend millions of dollars advancing the Administration’s regulatory agenda.

The State’s petitions for stay ask the court to prevent the EPA from imposing their greenhouse gas regulations until the State’s legal challenge is resolved. By granting the State’s motions to stay, the Court will provide greater regulatory certainty, avoid government waste, and protect Texas jobs.

5. The Earth Doesn’t Care About what is done to or for it
By George Will, Newsweek, Sep 12, 2010

The cover of The American Scholar quarterly carries an impertinent assertion: “The Earth Doesn’t Care if You Drive a Hybrid.” The essay inside is titled “What the Earth Knows.” What it knows, according to Robert B. Laughlin, co-winner of the 1998 Nobel Prize in Physics, is this: What humans do to, and ostensibly for, the earth does not matter in the long run, and the long run is what matters to the earth. We must, Laughlin says, think about the earth’s past in terms of geologic time.

For example: The world’s total precipitation in a year is about one meter—“the height of a golden retriever.” About 200 meters—the height of the Hoover Dam—have fallen on earth since the Industrial Revolution. Since the Ice Age ended, enough rain has fallen to fill all the oceans four times; since the dinosaurs died, rainfall has been sufficient to fill the oceans 20,000 times. Yet the amount of water on earth probably hasn’t changed significantly over geologic time.
Damaging this old earth is, Laughlin says, “easier to imagine than it is to accomplish.” There have been mass volcanic explosions, meteor impacts, “and all manner of other abuses greater than anything people could inflict, and it’s still here. It’s a survivor.”

Laughlin acknowledges that “a lot of responsible people” are worried about atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels. This has, he says, “the potential” to modify the weather by raising average temperatures several degrees centigrade and that governments have taken “significant, although ineffective,” steps to slow the warming. “On the scales of time relevant to itself, the earth doesn’t care about any of these governments or their legislation.”

Buy a hybrid, turn off your air conditioner, unplug your refrigerator, yank your phone charger from the wall socket—such actions will “leave the end result exactly the same.” Someday, all the fossil fuels that used to be in the ground will be burned. After that, in about a millennium, the earth will dissolve most of the resulting carbon dioxide into the oceans. (The oceans have dissolved in them “40 times more carbon than the atmosphere contains, a total of 30 trillion tons, or 30 times the world’s coal reserves.”) The dissolving will leave the concentration in the atmosphere only slightly higher than today’s. Then “over tens of millennia, or perhaps hundreds” the earth will transfer the excess carbon dioxide into its rocks, “eventually returning levels in the sea and air to what they were before humans arrived on the scene.” This will take an eternity as humans reckon, but a blink in geologic time.

It seems, Laughlin says, that “something, presumably a geologic regulatory process, fixed the world’s carbon dioxide levels before humans arrived” with their SUVs and computers. Some scientists argue that “the photosynthetic machinery of plants seems optimized” to certain carbon dioxide levels. But “most models, even pessimistic ones,” envision “a thousand-year carbon dioxide pulse followed by glacially slow decay back to the pre-civilization situation.”

Laughlin believes that humans can “do damage persisting for geologic time” by “biodiversity loss”—extinctions that are, unlike carbon dioxide excesses, permanent. The earth did not reverse the extinction of the dinosaurs. Today extinctions result mostly from human population pressures—habitat destruction, pesticides, etc.—but “slowing man-made extinctions in a meaningful way would require drastically reducing the world’s human population.” Which will not happen.

There is something like a pathology of climatology. To avoid mixing fact and speculation, earth scientists are, Laughlin says, “ultraconservative,” meaning they focus on the present and the immediate future: “[They] go to extraordinary lengths to prove by means of measurement that the globe is warming now, the ocean is acidifying now, fossil fuel is being exhausted now, and so forth, even though these things are self-evident in geologic time.”

Climate change over geologic time is, Laughlin says, something the earth has done “on its own without asking anyone’s permission or explaining itself.” People can cause climate change, but major glacial episodes have occurred “at regular intervals of 100,000 years,” always “a slow, steady cooling followed by abrupt warming back to conditions similar to today’s.”

Six million years ago the Mediterranean dried up. Ninety million years ago there were alligators in the Arctic. Three hundred million years ago Northern Europe was a desert and coal formed in Antarctica. “One thing we know for sure,” Laughlin says about these convulsions, “is that people weren’t involved.”