

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

#####

Fred Singer will be on a lecture tour from Feb 11 to March 7, including the Technion (Haifa, Israel), National University of Singapore, and cities in India. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) has commissioned his essay "The End of IPCC?" He will not have regular access to e-mail and requests that no routine messages be sent. For high-priority mail, send a copy also to ken@haapala.com.

#####

Quote of the Week

"If the IPCC wasn't there, why would anyone be worried about climate change?" Rajendra Pachauri, Chairman of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Science*, February 5, 2010

THIS WEEK:

The Washington region is being hit by another major snow storm which will probably exceed the snow of December 19, 2009 that forced President Obama to leave the global warming conference in Copenhagen early. This is the first time since record keeping started (before 1880) that two storms of such magnitude have hit the region during one winter. Already some localities are reporting the largest snowfall ever recorded. Blizzard conditions have been declared for the city of Washington, DC. Mail service was stopped. The weight of the snow caused the roof of the Dulles Jet Center to collapse. The Center houses mostly private jets at Dulles Airport. Amazingly, no injuries have been reported.

Although events such as these do not "prove" or "disprove" human caused global warming, this may be an appropriate time to review the science US EPA used to justify its finding that human emissions of carbon dioxide endanger public health and welfare. Organizations, including SEPP, are preparing petitions to EPA requesting reconsideration of this finding.

In the Federal Register, EPA states

"Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global average sea level.

... Global mean surface temperature was higher during the last few decades of the 20th century than during any comparable period during the preceding four centuries."

http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment/downloads/Federal_Register-EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0171-Dec.15-09.pdf#page=23

SEPP comment: Widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global average sea levels are not physical evidence of anthropogenic global warming. These physical events started 18,000 years ago, when global warming started melting of the snow and ice of the great ice sheets covering large parts of the Northern Hemisphere, including Canada, the United States, and Eurasia, long before human emissions of carbon dioxide by burning fossil fuels.

EPA justifies its claim of unequivocal warming in the last few decades of the 20th Century by stating:

"The global surface temperature record relies on three major global temperature datasets, developed by NOAA, NASA, and the United Kingdom's Hadley Center. All three show an

unambiguous warming trend over the last 100 years, **with the greatest warming occurring over the past 30 years.**" (emphasis added)

SEPP comment: As readers of TWTW realize, improper treatment of the three major global surface temperature datasets by NOAA, NASA and Hadley Center – CRU make EPA’s claim of warming trends scientifically indefensible. The datasets have been thoroughly compromised and likely have warming biases of an unknown magnitude. Further, in spite of frequent requests, these datasets have not been released for independent review and verification. Thus, the public comment process has been thwarted without any established need for such secrecy.

EPA ignores the satellite data reported by University of Alabama, Huntsville, which is available for independent review and verification. This dataset meets the critical principle of science of repeated, independent verification. These data over thirty years show modest warming trends in the middle to upper latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere, little warming of the tropics and the Southern Hemisphere, and distinct cooling of the Antarctic region – hardly the unequivocal warming proclaimed by EPA.

Such is the state of EPA science.

Science Editorial #6-2010 (Feb 6, 2010)

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

[Note: This is another of a series of mini-editorials on the “junk science” influencing the global warming issue. Other topics will include the UN Environmental Program, and some individuals heavily involved in these matters.]

Junkscience #8: The “warmest year, decade, century” game

A NASA press release claims that “January 2000 to December 2009 was the warmest decade on record,” citing James Hansen and Gavin Schmidt (of NASA-GISS). They are practicing what magicians call “misdirection,” designed to mislead the unsuspecting reader. Let me explain:

Let us grant that the past decade was the “warmest on record.” What exactly does this prove? Since the warming trend started well before the release of substantial amounts of greenhouse gases, the most likely cause is simply a natural recovery of the global climate from the Little Ice Age, which historical records place between around 1400 and 1800 AD. And since we are still well below the temperatures seen during the Medieval Climate Optimum (when Norsemen were able to grow crops and raise cattle in Greenland), we will likely experience even warmer decades during the 21st century. But this is a pure guess; we still don’t understand what controls millennial climate cycles of warming – and cooling.

However, the data do *not* support a human influence on climate. Temperatures have not warmed (i.e., shown an upward trend) during the past decade -- in spite of sharply rising levels of atmospheric CO₂. The confusion comes about when people mix up temperature *level* (measured in deg C) with temperature *trend* (measured in deg C per decade). They are entirely different concepts. We currently have a record temperature *level* but no upward *trend* -- and possibly even a slight cooling.

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

1. Letter from Howard Hayden to EPA

By Stephan Kinsella, Ludwig von Mises Institute, Oct 29, 2009

<http://blog.mises.org/archives/010939.asp>

2. India forms new climate change body

By Dean Nelson in New Delhi, Telegraph, U.K., Feb 4, 2010 [H/t Warren Wetmore]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7157590/India-forms-new-climate-change-body.html>

“The Indian government has established its own body to monitor the effects of global warming because it “cannot rely” on the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the group headed by its own leading scientist Dr R.K Pachauri.”

3. Do three errors mean breaking point for IPCC

By Li Xing, China Daily, Jan 28, 2010

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2010-01/28/content_9388032.htm

Chinese research was excluded by the IPCC because it was not “peer reviewed.” Greenpeace and World Wildlife Fund reports are?

4. Editorial: Climate debate needs facts, not anecdotes

New Zealand Herald, Feb 3, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c_id=2&objectid=10623715

5. Global warming science implodes overseas: American media silent

By Rick Moran, American Thinker, January 31, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2010/01/global_warming_science_implode.html

6. Junk science kills: Who’ll apologize to dead kids?

By Elizabeth Whelan, New York Post, Feb 4, 2010

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/junk_science_kills_K9wFK3O6cqeRnAEkzulhN

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Amazongate: new evidence of the IPCC’s failures

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Jan 30, 2010

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7113582/Amazongate-new-evidence-of-the-IPCCs-failures.html>

Climate change emails between scientists reveal flaws in peer review

By Fred Pearce, Guardian, UK, Feb 2, 2010

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/feb/02/hacked-climate-emails-flaws-peer-review>

“A close reading of the hacked emails exposes the real process of science, its jealousies and tribalism.” The claim is outrageous, but illustrates the damage that unscrupulous actions by a few scientists are creating for scientists in general.

Climategate: confusion over the law in email case

The Information Commission claims it is powerless to bring charges over the Climate Research Unit ‘conspiracy’

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph. UK, Jan 30, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7113552/Climategate-confusion-over-the-law-in-email-case.html>

Climategate: Is It Criminal?

By Dexter Wright, American Thinker, Feb 5, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/02/climategate_is_it_criminal_1.html

Now Kiwigate: New Zealand climatologists destroy nation’s raw temperature data

By John O'Sullivan, Climategate.org, Feb 2, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]
<http://www.climategate.com/now-kiwigate-new-zealand-climatologists-destroy-nations-raw-temperature-data>

Sea level blunder enrages Dutch minister

By Rob Kievit, Radio Netherlands Worldwide, Feb 4, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.rnw.nl/english/article/sea-level-blunder-enrages-dutch-minister>

The 2007 IPCC Report added the area subject to flooding to the area below sea level. "In fact, just 20 percent of the country consists of polders that are pumped dry, and which are at risk of flooding if global warming causes rising sea levels. Dutch Environment Minister Jacqueline Cramer has ordered a thorough investigation into the quality of the climate reports which she uses to base her policies on."

The Hottest Hoax in the World

By Ninad D. Sheth, Open Magazine, India, Feb 1, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.openthemagazine.com/article/international/the-hottest-hoax-in-the-world>

Why Climate Science Is On Trial

By Walter Russell Mead, The American Interest Online, Feb 5, 2010, [H/t Real Clear Politics.com]

<http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/02/05/why-climate-science-is-on-trial/>

Provocative article not on science, but why scientists should be concerned.

EPA biofuels guidelines could spur production of ethanol from corn

By Steven Mufson, Washington Post, Feb 4, 2010

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/03/AR2010020303804.html>

"Some critics noted that the EPA's own documentation on the biofuels standards issued Wednesday acknowledged that higher ethanol use could worsen smog in some regions and cause '245 cases of adult premature mortality.'"

"The administration established an interagency task force to come up with a plan to bring about, by 2016, the construction of five to 10 commercial-size coal plants that would capture and store carbon-dioxide emissions."

"For this year, Congress had set a target of 100 million gallons of ethanol made from cellulosic raw materials such as switchgrass, corn cobs or wood chips. But the EPA said Wednesday that cellulosic production will amount to 6.5 million gallons, equal to a few pilot projects."

Biofuel Production Falls Far Short of Targets

By Russell Gold and Siobhan Hughes, WSJ, Feb 4, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704259304575043422176790914.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

President Requests \$760.4 Million for Fossil Energy Programs

FY 2011 Budget Emphasizes Carbon Capture and Storage Technology, Allowing Continued Use of Fossil Fuels in a Carbon Constrained Future

Fossil Energy Techline, U.S. Department of Energy

<http://www.fossil.energy.gov/news/techlines/2010/10002->

[President_Requests_%24760.4_Million_.html](http://www.fossil.energy.gov/news/techlines/2010/10002-President_Requests_%24760.4_Million_.html)

China's Labor Edge Overpowers Obama's 'Green' Jobs Initiatives

By Christopher Martina and Jim Efstathiou, Jr., Bloomberg.com, Feb 4, 2010

<http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601109&sid=adIdrmtTtyw8>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

More climate research

Indirect Effects of Temperature on Stink Bug Fitness, via Maintenance of Gut Associated Symbiots

By Simone S. Prado, Kim Y. Hung, Mathew P. Daugherty, and Rodrigo P.P. Almeida
Applied and Environmental Microbiology February 2010
<http://aem.asm.org/cgi/content/abstract/76/4/1261?ct>

EPA capitulates on ethanol, hearts clean coal

By Tom Philpott, Grist: a beacon in the smog, Feb 4, 2010
<http://www.grist.org/article/2010-02-04-epa-capitulates-ethanol-clean-coal>
Agree on ethanol and Carbon Capture Storage –Waste of resources. Tree-huggers unite – give EPA hell!

High Hopes for Clean-Energy Jobs

By Rebecca Smith, WSJ, Feb 4, 2010
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703357104575045603846058926.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines
Every study SEPP has reviewed on actual jobs created from wind power that promises greatly exceed performance. Most jobs are temporary and very costly.

Minnesota wind turbines won't work in cold weather

By Ed Morrissey, HotAir, Jan 30, 2010 [H/t Froncois Guillaumat]
<http://hotair.com/archives/2010/01/30/minnesota-wind-turbines-wont-work-in-cold-weather/>

Carbon dioxide emissions cause obesity in American Trees

Study Finds a Tree Growth Spurt

By Leslie Kaufman, NYT, Feb 1, 2010
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/02/science/earth/02trees.html?partner=rss&emc=rss>
#####

1. Letter from Howard Hayden to EPA

By Stephan Kinsella, Ludwig von Mises Institute, Oct 29, 2009
<http://blog.mises.org/archives/010939.asp>

October 27, 2009

The Honorable Lisa P. Jackson, Administrator Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Washington, DC 20460

Dear Administrator Jackson:

I write in regard to the Proposed Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, Proposed Rule, 74 Fed. Reg. 18,886 (Apr. 24, 2009), the so-called "Endangerment Finding."

It has been often said that the "science is settled" on the issue of CO2 and climate. Let me put this claim to rest with a simple one- letter proof that it is false.

The letter is s, the one that changes model into models. If the science were settled, there would be precisely one model, and it would be in agreement with measurements.

Alternatively, one may ask which one of the twenty-some models settled the science so that all the rest could be discarded along with the research funds that have kept those models alive.

We can take this further. Not a single climate model predicted the current cooling phase. If the science were settled, the model (singular) would have predicted it.

Let me next address the horror story that we are approaching (or have passed) a "tipping point." Anybody who has worked with amplifiers knows about tipping points. The output "goes to the rail." Not only that, but it stays there. That's the official worry coming from the likes of James Hansen (of NASA GISS) and Al Gore.

But therein lies the proof that we are nowhere near a tipping point. The earth, it seems, has seen times when the CO₂ concentration was up to 8,000 ppm, and that did not lead to a tipping point. If it did, we would not be here talking about it. In fact, seen on the long scale, the CO₂ concentration in the present cycle of glacials (ca. 200 ppm) and interglacials (ca. 300-400 ppm) is lower than it has been for the last 300 million years.

Global-warming alarmists tell us that the rising CO₂ concentration is (A) anthropogenic and (B) leading to global warming.

(A) CO₂ concentration has risen and fallen in the past with no help from mankind. The present rise began in the 1700s, long before humans could have made a meaningful contribution. Alarmists have failed to ask, let alone answer, what the CO₂ level would be today if we had never burned any fuels. They simply assume that it would be the "pre- industrial" value.

The solubility of CO₂ in water decreases as water warms, and increases as water cools. The warming of the earth since the Little Ice Age has thus caused the oceans to emit CO₂ into the atmosphere.

(B) The first principle of causality is that the cause has to come before the effect. The historical record shows that climate changes precede CO₂ changes. How, then, can one conclude that CO₂ is responsible for the current warming?

Nobody doubts that CO₂ has some greenhouse effect, and nobody doubts that CO₂ concentration is increasing. But what would we have to fear if CO₂ and temperature actually increased?

A warmer world is a better world. Look at weather-related death rates in winter and in summer, and the case is overwhelming that warmer is better.

The higher the CO₂ levels, the more vibrant is the biosphere, as numerous experiments in greenhouses have shown. But a quick trip to the museum can make that case in spades. Those huge dinosaurs could not exist anywhere on the earth today because the land is not productive enough. CO₂ is plant food, pure and simple.

CO₂ is not pollution by any reasonable definition.

A warmer world begets more precipitation.

All computer models predict a smaller temperature gradient between the poles and the equator. Necessarily, this would mean fewer and less violent storms.

The melting point of ice is 0 °C in Antarctica, just as it is everywhere else. The highest recorded temperature at the South Pole is -14 °C, and the lowest is -117 °C. How, pray, will a putative few degrees of warming melt all the ice and inundate Florida, as is claimed by the warming alarmists?

Consider the change in vocabulary that has occurred. The term global warming has given way to the term climate change, because the former is not supported by the data. The latter term, climate change, admits of all kinds of illogical attributions. If it warms up, that's climate change. If it cools down, ditto. Any change whatsoever can be said by alarmists to be proof of climate change.

In a way, we have been here before. Lord Kelvin "proved" that the earth could not possibly be as old as the geologists said. He "proved" it using the conservation of energy. What he didn't know was that nuclear energy, not gravitation, provides the internal heat of the sun and the earth.

Similarly, the global-warming alarmists have "proved" that CO2 causes global warming.

Except when it doesn't.

To put it fairly but bluntly, the global-warming alarmists have relied on a pathetic version of science in which computer models take precedence over data, and numerical averages of computer outputs are believed to be able to predict the future climate. It would be a travesty if the EPA were to countenance such nonsense.

Best Regards,

Howard C. Hayden

Professor Emeritus of Physics, UConn

“The Indian government has established its own body to monitor the effects of global warming because it ‘cannot rely’ on the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the group headed by its own leading scientist Dr R.K Pachauri.”

2. India forms new climate change body

By Dean Nelson in New Delhi, Telegraph, U.K., Feb 4, 2010 [H/t Warren Wetmore]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7157590/India-forms-new-climate-change-body.html>

The move is a significant snub to both the IPCC and Dr Pachauri as he battles to defend his reputation following the revelation that his most recent climate change report included false claims that most of the Himalayan glaciers would melt away by 2035. Scientists believe it could take more than 300 years for the glaciers to disappear.

The body and its chairman have faced growing criticism ever since as questions have been raised on the credibility of their work and the rigour with which climate change claims are assessed.

In India the false claims have heightened tensions between Dr Pachauri and the government, which had earlier questioned his glacial melting claims. In Autumn, its environment minister Mr Jairam Ramesh said while glacial melting in the Himalayas was a real concern, there was evidence that some were actually advancing despite global warming.

Dr Pachauri had dismissed challenges like these as based on “voodoo science”, but last night Mr Ramesh effectively marginalized the IPC chairman even further.

He announced the Indian government will established a separate National Institute of Himalayan Glaciology to monitor the effects of climate change on the world's 'third ice cap', and an 'Indian IPCC' to use 'climate science' to assess the impact of global warming throughout the country.

"There is a fine line between climate science and climate evangelism. I am for climate science. I think people misused [the] IPCC report, [the] IPCC doesn't do the original research which is one of the weaknesses... they just take published literature and then they derive assessments, so we had goof-ups on Amazon forest, glaciers, snow peaks.

"I respect the IPCC but India is a very large country and cannot depend only on [the] IPCC and so we have launched the Indian Network on Comprehensive Climate Change Assessment (INCCA)," he said.

It will bring together 125 research institutions throughout India, work with international bodies and operate as a "sort of Indian IPCC," he added.

The body, which he said will not rival the UN's panel, will publish its own climate assessment in November this year, with reports on the Himalayas, India's long coastline, the Western Ghat highlands and the north-eastern region close to the borders with Bangladesh, Burma, China and Nepal. "Through these we will demonstrate our commitment to climate science," he said.

The UN panel's claims of glacial meltdown by 2035 "was clearly out of place and didn't have any scientific basis," he said, while stressing the government remained concerned about the health of the Himalayan ice flows. "Most glaciers are melting, they are retreating, some glaciers, like the Siachen glacier, are advancing. But overall one can say incontrovertibly that the debris on our glaciers is very high the snow balance is very low. We have to be very cautious because of the water security particularly in north India which depends on the health of the Himalayan glaciers," he added.

The new National Institute of Himalayan Glaciology will be based in Dehradun, in Uttarakhand, and will monitor glacial changes and compare results with those from glaciers in Pakistan, Nepal and Bhutan.

Chinese research was excluded by the IPCC because it was not "peer reviewed." Greenpeace and World Wildlife Fund reports are?

3. Do three errors mean breaking point for IPCC

By Li Xing, China Daily, Jan 28, 2010

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2010-01/28/content_9388032.htm

While covering the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, I took a morning away from the main venue to attend a forum of "climate skeptics".

The speakers presented political, economic, and scientific analyses to counter the series of assessments by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

A few of the skeptics went so far as to suggest that the current international drive to tackle global warming would eventually lead the world into some kind of "energy tyranny". One even showed a video clip of how "energy police" would invade private homes in the American suburbs, unplugging and removing the owners' microwave ovens, television sets, and other appliances.

I left the forum before the morning session ended. I felt that most of the speakers were too emotional and politically charged to be considered objective.

But I was impressed by the presentation of Dr Fred Singer, an atmospheric physicist and founding director of the US Weather Satellite Service, who challenged the IPCC findings with his research data.

In the next few days, I talked with several scientists, including Dr Rajendra Pachauri, the IPCC chair, and asked them about Singer's data. All of these scientists brushed aside Singer's arguments, saying that the IPCC's primary finding is indisputable: "Warming in the climate system is unequivocal".

I believed the IPCC reports, which summarize the research of some 4,000 scientists, but I had some serious reservations. For one thing, the IPCC reports contained very little data from Chinese researchers. I was told the IPCC refused to consider Chinese data because the Chinese research was not peer-reviewed.

China is not a small country. Its landmass spans several climate zones and includes the roof of the world. I have to wonder how data from China would affect the IPCC's findings.

Several Chinese scientists who have gone over the IPCC report believe that the IPCC may have overstated the link between global temperature and CO2 in the atmosphere.

In a paper published in the December issue of the Chinese language Earth Science magazine, Ding Zhongli, an established environmental scientist, stated that the current temperatures on earth look normal if global climate changes over the past 10,000 years are considered.

Ding's paper highlighted the fact that in its policy suggestions, the IPCC offered solutions that would give people in rich countries the right to emit a much higher level of greenhouse gas per capita than people in developing countries. It in effect set limits on the economic growth of developing countries, which will result in furthering the gap between rich and poor countries."

A series of "climategate" scandals now add more reason to give the IPCC research closer scrutiny.

Last November, hackers revealed that some scientists had favored data which supports the case for "global warming" in order to enhance their grant proposals.

Just last week, the IPCC announced that it "regrets the poor application of well-established IPCC procedures" in a claim that glaciers in the Himalayas could melt away by 2035. Instead of coming from a peer-reviewed scientific paper, the statement was sheer speculation, the IPCC conceded.

Then over the weekend, the media revealed that the IPCC had misrepresented an unpublished report, which it said linked climate change with an increase in natural disasters. However, the author of the report, Dr Robert Muir-Wood, clearly stated the opposite: "We find insufficient evidence to claim a statistical relationship between global temperature increase and catastrophe loss." Muir-Wood is not a climatologist, but a researcher in risk management.

I am particularly troubled by the fact that top IPCC officials do not seem to take these revelations seriously. Interviewed by the BBC, Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, vice-chairman of the IPCC, dismissed the matter as a "human mistake".

Ancient Chinese considered three a breaking point. They could forgive two errors, but not a third. Now that the IPCC has admitted three "human" errors, isn't it time scientists gave its work a serious review?

4. Editorial: Climate debate needs facts, not anecdotes

New Zealand Herald, Feb 3, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c_id=2&objectid=10623715

Anyone who sets out to discredit a piece of published work can do so by finding a single factual error.

No matter how peripheral the mistake may be, it undermines public confidence in the work. People naturally wonder, if the authors were careless on this point how much else might be wrong?

More than one mistake has been found recently in the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, set up by the United Nations to provide authoritative reports on global warming, and the errors are hardly peripheral.

The IPCC's powerful Fourth Assessment Report in 2007 declared there was a probability of glaciers disappearing from the Himalayas by 2035 or sooner.

This statement - frightening for Indian and Chinese communities depending on Himalayan meltwater - has been investigated and turns out to have been taken from a green campaign group, WWF, which took it from an interview with an Indian glaciologist in the magazine *New Scientist* in 1999.

He has admitted his prediction was "speculation" not supported by scientific measurement and peer-reviewed.

Worse, the IPCC was notified of this in 2006 and yet the claim appeared in the 2007 report. The glaciologist who alerted the panel to the error can only attribute its appearance to "a kind of amateurism" among those who wrote the offending chapter.

If the Himalayan debacle was bad enough, the panel references to disappearing ice in the Andes, the European Alps and Africa are even more embarrassing.

They turn out to have been based on a student dissertation and an article in a climbing magazine.

Mountaineers may be the only people in a position to notice alpine ice levels but their impressions fall some way short of scientific evidence.

It is not encouraging to hear a New Zealand contributor to the report, climate scientist Jim Salinger, defending it on the grounds that it accords with interviews from somebody as illustrious as the late Sir Edmund Hillary.

Last week, the IPCC's attempts to link natural disasters to global warming was critically examined.

Its claim in 2007 that the world had "suffered rapidly rising costs due to extreme weather-related events since the 1970s" turns out to have been based on a paper that had not been peer-reviewed or published at that time.

When the paper was published in 2008 it included a caveat that the evidence was insufficient to establish a statistical relationship between the global temperature increase and catastrophes.

Yet the panel said nothing about the caveat before last year's Copenhagen Conference where the fear of natural disasters loomed large among African nations in particular.

These errors are not merely academic; they cause real worry in the regions concerned.

New Zealand frequently hears the fear of Pacific states vulnerable to rising sea levels from the predicted melting of polar ice.

Climate scientists are anxious to deny that these "slip-ups" discredit the IPCC's conclusions overall but sceptics of climate change have seized upon them to do exactly that.

The IPCC's reputation is not helped now by the argument of authority its supporters have employed for so long. Criticism was dismissed as conceit in the face of a "scientific consensus" that by implication could not be wrong.

Well the consensus has been wrong, or at least careless on several points. Scepticism has strengthened, but it is only scepticism; human-induced climate change has not been disproved. It remains too worrying to be dismissed.

Governments need dispassionate scientific assessments of it, not anecdotes, unchecked papers and agitators' propaganda.

The IPCC urgently needs new leadership and a return to strict scientific rigour if it hopes to be taken seriously again.

5. Global warming science implodes overseas: American media silent

By Rick Moran, American Thinker, January 31, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2010/01/global_warming_science_implode.html

The revelations have been nothing short of jaw dropping. Dozens - yes dozens - of claims made in the IPCC 2007 report on climate change that was supposed to represent the "consensus" of 2500 of the world's climate scientists have been shown to be bogus, or faulty, or not properly vetted, or simply pulled out of thin air.

We know this because newspapers in Great Britain are doing their job; vetting the 2007 report item by item, coming up with shocking news about global warming claims that formed the basis of argument by climate change advocates who were pressuring the US and western industrialized democracies to transfer trillions of dollars in wealth to the third world and cede sovereignty to the UN.

[Glaciergate](#), [tempgate](#), [icegate](#), and now, disappearing Amazon forests not the result of warming, but of logging. And the report the IPCC based their bogus "science" on was written by a food safety advocate according to this Christopher Booker piece in the [Telegraph](#) :

Dr North next uncovered "Amazongate". The IPCC made a prominent claim in its 2007 report, again citing the WWF as its authority, that climate change could endanger "up to 40 per cent" of the Amazon rainforest - as iconic to warmists as those Himalayan glaciers and polar bears. This WWF report, it turned out, was co-authored by Andy Rowell, an anti-smoking and food safety campaigner who has worked for WWF and Greenpeace, and contributed pieces to Britain's two most committed environmentalist newspapers. Rowell and his co-author claimed their findings were based on an article in Nature. But the focus of that piece, it emerges, was not global warming at all but the effects of logging.

A Canadian analyst has identified more than 20 passages in the IPCC's report which cite similarly non-peer-reviewed WWF or Greenpeace reports as their authority, and other researchers have been uncovering a host of similarly dubious claims and attributions all through the report. These range from groundless allegations about the increased frequency of "extreme weather events" such as hurricanes, droughts and heatwaves, to a headline claim that global warming would put billions of people at the mercy of water shortages - when the study cited as its authority indicated exactly the opposite, that rising temperatures could increase the supply of water.

This is a great story. It has everything a media outlet could desire; scandal, conflict of interest (IPCC head Pauchuri runs companies that benefited from climate scare stories), government cover ups - why then, has this unraveling of the basis of climate science that posited catastrophic man made warming not been making any news at all in the United States?

It's too easy to simply claim "bias." Media outlets don't pass up juicy stories that could potentially increase their readership and revenue for ideological purposes (except the New York Times - and even they could spin all of this to show skeptics to be using flawed arguments like the liberal [Guardian](#) is doing in England).

Perhaps its time to ask why this story being revealed overseas with new revelations almost daily in the Daily Mail, the Telegraph, the Timesonline, and other Fleet Street publications can't get any traction here. Blogs like [Watts up with That](#) and [Climate Depot](#) are keeping us informed of the latest from England but we hear crickets chirping when it comes to stories from major newspapers and - outside of Fox News - the cable nets.

As global warming the political movement is losing its scientific justification, the American people - who will be asked to foot the bill to the tune of trillions of dollars if Obama goes ahead with his "green" plans - are grossly uninformed about the state of the debate. Until the media starts to give this story the coverage it deserves, that state of affairs will not change.

6. Junk science kills: Who'll apologize to dead kids?

By Elizabeth Whelan, New York Post, Feb 4, 2010

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/junk_science_kills_K9wFK3O6cqeRnAEkzulhN

The media gave big headlines to this week's stories on a prestigious British medical publication's retraction of an article that had claimed to show a causal link between standard childhood vaccinations (measles, mumps and rubella) and autism.

Yet the coverage of the Lancet affair didn't truly convey the outrageousness of the original publication or the gravity of its consequences -- consequences long festering, since the paper was published not last week but *12 years ago*.

Many of us in the scientific community recognized the "study" as junk when it appeared in 1998. Even before we learned of then-unknown ethical failings by its lead author, we knew the study was based on a tiny population of only 12 children. More, it relied on a novel methodology that assumed some bizarre, previously unheard of, association between children's autism and their manifestation of intestinal problems.

Nonetheless, the media back then seized on this story from a prestigious medical source -- and the scare picked up steam when TV appearances by actress [Jenny McCarthy](#) and a Rolling Stone article by Robert Kennedy Jr. blared word of the putative dangers of vaccines.

When criticism of the paper intensified in the days after publication, Lancet editor-in-chief Dr. Richard Horton defended his decision to publish what he acknowledged as an inferior study by claiming it would generate debate on the autism/vaccine issue. Even when 10 of the original 13 authors withdrew their names from the article, Horton still refused to withdraw the study.

Nor did he take such action when multiple studies subsequently appeared showing no link between vaccines and autism. Nor even in 2004 -- when it was revealed that the lead author, Dr. [Andrew](#)

[Wakefield](#), had been paid, in part, by lawyers for parents seeking to sue vaccine makers, claiming adverse health consequences.

All the publicity led many parents to forgo these vital infant immunizations: Vaccination rates in Britain, especially, plummeted. And since then, hundreds of unvaccinated children have been hospitalized in Britain with the measles. Some died of the illness.

Here in America, more than 1,000 children have died from [H1N1](#) flu over the last year -- numbers that would surely be smaller had not so many parents been frightened away from getting flu shots by the general Wakefield-induced paranoia over vaccines.

In other words, a *medical journal* triggered a chain of events that led to preventable disease -- and some child deaths.

Some will argue the Lancet piece was an aberration: Most peer-reviewed journals publish only carefully reviewed, well-conducted studies. But there is a disturbing trend in recent years: publication of small, uncontrolled, isolated findings -- which the media immediately present as fact, under alarming headlines.

And health and environmental activists have founded their own cliquish "peer review" journals: Small groups of ideologically fueled scientists publish the manuscripts compatible with their activist mission.

In the specific case of vaccines, a cottage industry of conspiracy theorists, "investigative journalists" and (understandably) desperate parents of sick children in search of explanations also stands ready to pounce on any apparent indictment of vaccines -- and spread the word.

All of which makes it all the more important for serious journals, as the Lancet claims to be, to avoid junk science -- not promote it.

Nor did the journal's editors, after 12 years, finally independently come to their senses and vote to retract. Horton finally pulled the trigger on the retraction *only* after a British medical panel (the General Medical Council) concluded that Wakefield had been dishonest, violated basic research ethics rules and showed a "callous disregard" for the suffering of children following his spurious publication.

Even with the retraction, the widespread rumors of a vaccine-autism link will prevail: The broader anti-vaccine movement is alive and well, albeit without a shred of evidence to support their case. As the chief of Infectious Disease at Philadelphia Children's Hospital, Dr. Paul Offit, reflected sadly, "This retraction by Lancet came far too late. It's very easy to scare people; it's very hard to *unscare* them."

Horton has made no effort whatsoever to apologize or take editorial responsibility for this egregious error. He should step forward and say, "I regret the needless suffering and death for which I am partly responsible."

This incident leads to one very unsettling but unavoidable conclusion: Even a study in a top-notch, peer-reviewed medical journal may still be scientific garbage. Imagine how many other false (if less controversial) reports glide by under the radar -- undetected but still destructive to good science and public health.

Dr. Elizabeth M. Whelan is president of the American Council on Science and Health (AC SH.org).