

The Week That Was: 2011-03-12 (March 12, 2011)

Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

The Science and Environmental Policy Project

PLEASE NOTE: The complete TWTW, including the articles, can be downloaded in an easily printable form at the SEPP web site: www.sepp.org.

Quote of the Week:

We are not afraid to entrust the American people with unpleasant facts, foreign ideas, alien philosophies, and competitive values. For a nation that is afraid to let its people judge the truth and falsehood in an open market is a nation that is afraid of its people. -John F. Kennedy, 35th US president (1917-1963)

Number of the Week: 160,000 premature deaths prevented in 2010

THIS WEEK:

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

The 2011 Economic Report of the President (ERP) was briefly discussed in last week's TWTW including the questionable concept of the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) which, with vague definitions, is an ideal tool for bureaucrats to justify regulation of carbon based fuels and other carbon based products. The example in the ERP calculating the benefits of energy independence, without increasing domestic production of oil and gas, was discussed.

In praising benefits of reducing carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, the ERP systematically omits any of the benefits of increasing carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, which are significant.

The ERP promotes the development of solar and wind, but has significant omissions:

- The ERP omits any plan for sensible development of the huge oil resources in the United States and its off-shore boundaries.
- It omits stating imported oil is principally used as a transportation fuel – less than one percent is used to generate electricity. Generating electricity from solar or wind does not significantly reduce the need for transportation fuels.
- It omits any plan for promoting the construction of modern nuclear power plants to include the recycling of nuclear fuel.
- It omits any discussion of the poor 120-year economic history of wind-generated electricity – erratic wind power was always rejected by consumers demanding reliable, affordable electricity.
- It omits the staggering investments China is making in traditional sources for generating electricity. The ERP emphasizes China's development of solar and wind but ignores massive investments in nuclear, coal, and hydro. This omission leads to the false assertion that the US is in a race with China for wind and solar power.
- It omits any rigorous economic discussion of the difference between government expenditures and government investment. Expenditures are exactly that, they may create jobs and prosperity for a few, but not for the general public. Successful investments create general prosperity yielding far more to the general public than the cost. Replacing coal plants which reliably generate affordable electricity with wind farms or solar plants that unreliably generate more expensive electricity is an expenditure, not an investment. Such an action is no more an investment than replacing the reliable family car with an exotic, expensive, high-maintenance sports car. It may create jobs for some but at the expense of the family.
- It omits any discussion of an existing technology that can economically store electricity on an industrial scale. Without one, spending heavily on solar or wind is speculation.

In short, the EPR does not provide a path to a prosperous energy future, but a path to a boxed canyon that will make the US uncompetitive in the world markets.

S. Fred Singer publicly stated: “Congress should give the 2011 Economic Report of the President an ‘F’ and send it back.”

(Please see Article # 2, and articles under the article under Carbon Dioxide Benefits.

This week the Energy and Power Subcommittee of the US House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce held a hearing entitled “Climate Science and EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations.” The hearing was in preparation for a vote on legislation to remove from EPA the power to regulate Greenhouse Gases, particularly carbon dioxide.

Thus far the new Congress allows for greater diversity in witnesses than the past Congress. Prior to this Congress such a hearing would commonly have, say sixteen, experts testifying. Fifteen would claim the science establishes the need for such regulations and one would was not. This hearing had six witnesses represented the conflicting views of what the science establishes. The testimony of the witnesses is referenced below.

Roger Pielke, Sr, who testified, posted on his web blog his views of the hearing and possible opportunities missed. Judith Curry contrasted the testimony on extreme-weather events by Francis Zwiers of the University of Victoria, with that of John Christy of University of Alabama in Huntsville. Of course, the partisans in the press had their own take on the testimony.

The legislation passed the subcommittee. (Please see referenced items under “Let the Games Begin,” “Seeking a Common Ground,” and “Extreme Weather.”

Michael Mann has been in the press again. Some posts suggest Mann deceived Penn State University or that the University whitewashed its investigation. Others suggest all was merely a slight-of-hand by Mann. The post by Steve McIntire may give the best summation of the situation. (Please see articles referenced under Climategate Continued.)

Also, the Supreme Court of Virginia ruled on the appeal by Virginia Attorney General Cuccinelli regarding the local court severely limiting the scope of his investigation of Mann’s emails while at the University of Virginia. In general, the Court found for Cuccinelli. However, it also raised the question whether or not the University, as an agency of the state, was subject to the type of demand Cuccinelli issued. As of this time SEPP has seen no articles defining the actual legal meaning of the finding and the options open to Cuccinelli.

This leads to the Quote of the Week from John F. Kennedy: If the University of Virginia has nothing to hide, why is it bitterly fighting public disclosure of the facts?

With the crash of the Glory satellite into the ocean, NASA is suffering terrible blows in studying the earth’s climate. This is the second failure resulting in the destruction of an important, expensive satellite, raising questions about the NASA missions and the launchers it is using.

Satellite observations of the earth’s weather and climate provide unparalleled information on the ever-changing planet. The global temperature calculations from satellites are the finest available. Unfortunately, NASA allowed its contributions to climate science to be dominated by NASA-GISS, which used surface-based instruments and highly questionable computer models, to promoted the fear of global warming – a fear, that, increasingly, the public no longer accepts

Recently-elected Congressmen, rightly, question the work of NASA-GISS and its surface based data. NASA made a huge public relations error with this Congress by allowing the leaders of NASA-GISS to be the symbol for NASA's earth / climate program. As a result, understandably, many Congressmen are questioning the entire program. (Please see articles under "Other Scientific Issues.")

Number of the Week: 160,000 premature deaths prevented in 2010. Last week's TWTW had as the Number of the Week the EPA's claim that the AMENDMENTS to the Clear Air Act resulted in benefits of \$1.2 Trillion in 2010 alone. Several readers responded citing that in the same documents the EPA claims that in 2010 these Amendments prevented 160,000 premature deaths as well as many other questionable benefits. The readers stated that they could not justify such numbers. Neither can SEPP.

EPA is not clear on its accounting procedures, so one can only speculate about how it arrives at its numbers. However, after the initial Clean Air Act in 1970, that many of the dominant air pollutants prior to 1970 were removed by 1990. Thus, the remaining ones would largely be pollutants which contribute to respiratory diseases.

Heavy metals such as lead, which can create nervous disorders, may be a contributor to premature deaths. However, the EPA report focused on oxides of nitrogen, sulfur, small particles, etc., that are generally associated with respiratory disease. Cigarette smokers were not considered.

There are two major categories of deaths from respiratory diseases reported in the statistical abstracts of the US: 1) "Malignant neoplasms of trachea, bronchus, and lung," and 2) "Chronic lower respiratory diseases." In 1990, the total reported deaths from the category one were 146,400 with a death rate of 58.9 per 100,000 and total reported deaths from category two were 86,700 with a death rate of 34.9/100,000. In 2007, the last year with published statistics, the total deaths from the first category was 158,760 with a death rate of 52.6/100,000 and total deaths from the second category were 127,924 with a rate of 42.4/100,000.

The results are conflicting. Total deaths in both categories rose with population increases. The death rate in the category one declined after the Clean Air Act amendments. However, the death rate in the category two increased after the Clean Air Act amendments. There is no explanation for this increase.

None of the above considers the reduction in cigarette smoking rates. Casting further doubt on the validity of EPA claims, according to the Center for Disease Control, from 2000 to 2004, an average of 128,900 people died each year from lung cancer and 92,900 from other respiratory diseases caused by cigarette smoking. If consistent with 2007 deaths, cigarette smoking would account for about 81 percent of the category one deaths and about 73 percent of the category two deaths. (Of course, these are approximations.)

Until EPA fully substantiates its calculations, its claim of 160,000 persons saved from premature death by Clean Air Act amendments in 2010 cannot be accepted as valid.

#####

ARTICLES:

For the numbered articles below please see: www.sepp.org.

1. Good bye, Kyoto

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Mar 13, 2011

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/03/good_bye_kyoto.html

2. And now, the good news!

The Many Benefits of Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment

By Craig D. Idso & Sherwood B. Idso

Reviewed by John Brignell, Number Watch, Feb 2011

http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/good_news.htm

3. Our Man-Made Energy Crisis

There's plenty of oil and no fundamental reason to expect prices of \$200 per barrel. But that doesn't excuse the administration's punitive approach toward the industry.

By Nasen Saleri, WSJ, Mar 9, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703386704576186622682563228.html?mod=djemEditorialPage_h

4. Australia's Carbon Warning for Obama

It turns out emissions restrictions do not grow more popular the more you try to pitch them.

By Tom Switzer, WSJ, Mar 11, 2011 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703453804576191712500363464.html>

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Climategate Continued

Penn State Whitewashed Climategate

By Chris Horner, Daily Caller, Mar 8, 2011

<http://dailycaller.com/2011/03/08/penn-state-whitewashed-climategate/>

Exclusive: Climatologist Says He Deleted E-mails, But Not at Mann's Behest

By Eli Kintisch, Science Insider, Mar 9, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2011/03/exclusive-climatologist-says-he-.html>

[SEPP Comment: A dubious claim.]

What Did Penn State Know?

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Mar 10, 2011

<http://climateaudit.org/2011/03/10/what-did-penn-state-know/#more-13211>

Challenging the Orthodoxy

Aussie skeptics destroy EU carbon commissioner

By James Delingpole, Telegraph, UK, Mar 9, 2011

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100079237/aussie-sceptics-destroy-eu-carbon-commissioner/>

Defenders of the Orthodoxy

On Climate, Who Needs the Facts?

Editorial, NYT, Mar 4, 2011 [H/t Catherine French]

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/05/opinion/05sat4.html?_r=1&nl=todaysheadlines&emc=th211

Seeking a Common Ground

Oral Presentation On March 8 2011 At The House of Representatives Energy and Commerce Committee Hearing Climate Science and EPA's Greenhouse Gas Regulation

By Roger Pielke, Sr, Pielke Research Group, Mar 9, 2011

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2011/03/09/oral-presentation-on-march-8-2011-at-the-house-of-representatives-energy-and-commerce-committee-hearing-climate-science-and-epa%E2%80%99s-greenhouse-gas-regulation/>

Missed Opportunity At The March 8, 2011 The House of Representatives Energy and Commerce Committee Hearing “Climate Science and EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulation”

By Roger Pielke, Sr, Pielke Research Group, Mar 10, 2011

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2011/03/10/missed-opportunity-at-the-march-8-2011-the-house-of-representatives-energy-and-commerce-committee-hearing-climate-science-and-epa%E2%80%99s-greenhouse-gas-regulation/>

An Inaccurate Claim By IPCC Co-Chair Christopher Field

By Roger Pielke, Sr, Pielke Research Group, Mar 11, 2011

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/>

The Seas are Changing

Ice sheets melting faster than earlier estimates

By Brian Vastag, Washington Post, Mar 10, 2011 [H/t David Manuta]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/09/AR2011030905642.html?referrer=emailarticle>

[SEPP Comment: No mention that the projected of 5.9 inch increase in sea levels by 2050 is well within the range of the IPCC’s maximum prediction of 23 inches by 2100 or well below the projection by Jim Hansen of NOAA-GISS of 236 inches by 2100.]

Carbon Dioxide Benefits

55 Positive Externalities: Hail to Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment

By Chip Knappenberger, Master Resource, Mar 10, 2011

<http://www.masterresource.org/2011/03/positive-externalities-co2/#more-14307>

Extreme Weather

Extreme testimony

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc., Mar 8, 2011 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://judithcurry.com/2011/03/08/extreme-testimony/>

Winter for US Was 39th Coldest in 117 Years – Decadal Cooling of 4.1F

By Joseph D’Aleo, ICECAP, Mar 8, 2011

<http://www.icecap.us/>

Natural Variability Main Culprit of Deadly Russian Heat Wave That Killed Thousands

By Staff Writers, NOAA, Mar 9, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

http://www.noaanews.noaa.gov/stories2011/20110309_russianheatwave.html

[SEPP Comment: Contrary to most reports, warming is not happening everywhere and the deaths last year in Russia were not caused by “global warming.”.]

BP Oil Spill and Administration Control of Drilling

Obama’s DOI 2012 budget imposes big but indirect cuts on industry, Gulf residents

By Thomas Pyle, Washington Examiner, Mar 6, 2011

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/op-eds/2011/03/obama-s-doi-2012-budget-imposes-big-indirect-cuts-industry-gulf-residents>

Let the Games Begin

Energy and Power Subcommittee Examines Climate Science and EPA's Greenhouse Gas Regulations

Press Release, House Energy & Commerce Committee

<http://energycommerce.house.gov/news/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=8313>

Witnesses and Testimony

<http://energycommerce.house.gov/hearings/hearingdetail.aspx?NewsID=8304>

Upton, Hastings athwart Obama agenda yelling 'Stop!'

Editorial, Examiner, Mar 6, 2011

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/editorials/2011/03/examiner-editorial-upton-hastings-athwart-obama-agenda-yelling-stop>

House Panel Votes to Strip E.P.A. of Power to Regulate Greenhouse Gases

By John Broder, NYT, Mar 10, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/11/science/earth/11climate.html?ref=science>

EPA and other Regulators on the March

EPA's Clean Air Act: Pretending air pollution is worse than it is

By Steve Milloy, Mar 9, 2011

http://junksciencecom.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/epa_s-clean-air-act-final.pdf

"Science's role is to inform, not dictate, policy." Right, So Overturn EPA's Policy Dictating Endangerment Rule!

By Marlo Lewis, Global Warming.org, Mar 11, 2011

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2011/03/11/sciences-role-is-to-inform-not-dictate-policy-right-so-overturn-epas-endangerment-rule/>

Anti-Energy, Anti-Industrial Policy; When is Enough Enough?

By Paul Driessen, Master Resource, Mar 11, 2011

<http://www.masterresource.org/2011/03/anti-energy-anti-industrial-policy/#more-14321>

E.P.A. Steps Up Scrutiny of Pollution in Pennsylvania Rivers

By Ian Urbina, NYT, Mar 7, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/08/science/earth/08water.html?nl=todaysheadlines&emc=tha23>

Showdown on Vermont Nuclear Plant's Fate

By Matthew Wald, NYT, Mar 10, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/11/science/earth/11nuke.html?ref=science>

[SEPP Comment: According to Vermont Department of Public Service 35.5% of Vermont's electricity is produced by the nuclear plant, Vermont Yankee, the second highest production, 28.2%, comes from Hydro Quebec in Canada (latest posted numbers, 2003)]

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

Italy moves to reduce renewable energy handouts

By Staff Writers, Energy Daily, Mar 3, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Italy_moves_to_reduce_renewable_energy_handouts_999.html

The Silent Killer of America's Economy

By Marita Noon, Energy Tribune, Mar 8, 2011 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm/6776/The-Silent-Killer-of-Americas-Economy>

Inspector Faults Energy Department Over Loan Program

By Matthew Wald, NYT, Mar 7, 2011 [H/t Randy Randol]

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/08/business/energy-environment/08guarantee.html?_r=1&src=busln

The energy emperor's ethanol wardrobe looks mighty bare

By Gary Wolfram, Editorial, Washington Examiner, Mar 6, 2011

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/op-eds/2011/03/energy-emperors-ethanol-wardrobe-looks-mighty-bare>

Energy Issues

Obama's 'starve America first' energy policy creates a backlash

By Ron Arnold, Washington Examiner, Mar 6, 2011

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columnists/2011/03/ron-arnold-obamas-starve-america-first-energy-policy-creates-backlash>

Obama's energy transformation

President prolongs American power drain

Editorial, Washington Times, Mar 4, 2011

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/mar/4/obamas-energy-transformation/>

Western China the 'Middle East' for coal

By Staff Writers, UPI, Mar 8, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Western_China_the_Middle_East_for_coal_999.html

[SEPP Comment: As the US administration is abandoning coal-fired power plants, is China winning the race for coal-fired power plants?]

Taking a Risk for Rare Earths

By Keith Bradsher, NYT, Mar 8, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/09/business/energy-environment/09rare.html?ref=science>

[SEPP Comment: Trying to provide an alternative to China for the key components of alternative energy.]

The Grand Canyon Uranium Rush

Editorial, NYT, Mar 7, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/08/opinion/08tue4.html?nl=todaysheadlines&emc=tha211>

[SEPP Comment: Another effort by the Gray Lady to save the planet by stopping development of energy resources.]

Alternative, Green Energy

Wind Energy's Overblown Prospects

By Larry Bell, Forbes, Mar 8, 2011

<http://blogs.forbes.com/larrybell/2011/03/08/wind-energys-overblown-prospects/>

Grand dream loses sheen in glare of daylight

L.A. community colleges' green energy plan proves wildly impractical. The blunders cost taxpayers \$10 million.

By Michael Finnegan and Gale Holland, Los Angeles Times, Mar 6, 2011

<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-build6-20110306.0,2339677,full.story>

Light Wars

Let There Be More Efficient Light

By Roger Pielke, Jr, NYT, Mar 10, 2011

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/11/opinion/11pielke.html?_r=1&nl=todaysheadlines&emc=th212

[SEPP Comment: America's founders recognized the importance of standards in weights and measurements to promote commerce. The Constitution gave Congress the power to regulate such standards. That power is far different than Congress mandating a particular product, which it did in the light-bulb legislation.]

Welcome to the new green dark age

Daily Bayonet, Mar 8, 2011 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://dailybayonet.com/?p=7988>

California Dreaming

Recycled Anti-Prop 23 Arguments are Still trash

By Benjamin Zycher, Environmental Trends, Mar 8, 2011

<http://www.environmentaltrends.org/single/article/recycled-anti-prop-23-arguments-are-still-trash.html>

Berkeley Highlights Challenges Meeting 2050 Energy Goals

By Staff Writers, SPX, Mar 9, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.energy->

[daily.com/reports/Berkeley_Highlights_Challenges_Meeting_2050_Energy_Goals_999.html](http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Berkeley_Highlights_Challenges_Meeting_2050_Energy_Goals_999.html)

[SEPP Comment: Let California show the way!]

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

For a full list of articles see www.NIPCCreport.org

The Green(leaf)ing of the Earth Continues

Reference: Liu, S., Liu, R. and Liu, Y. 2010. Spatial and temporal variation of global LAI during 1981-20006. *Journal of Geographical Sciences* **20**: 323-332.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/9mar2011a6.html>

Tropospheric Humidity and CO₂-Induced Global Warming

Reference: Paltridge, G., Arking, A. and Pook, M. 2009. Trends in middle- and upper-level tropospheric humidity from NCEP reanalysis data. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*: 10.1007/s00704-009-0117-x.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/9mar2011a1.html>

Earth's Thermal Sensitivity to a Doubling of Atmospheric CO₂

Reference: Lindzen, R.S. and Choi, Y.-S. 2009. On the determination of climate feedbacks from ERBE data. *Geophysical Research Letters* **36**: 10.1029/2009GL039628.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a2.html>

The Top-of-the-Atmosphere Radiation Budget: Model Simulations vs. Direct Measurements over the tropics

Reference: Andronova, N., Penner, J.E. and Wong, T. 2009. Observed and modeled evolution of the tropical mean radiation budget at the top of the atmosphere since 1985. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **114**: 10.1029/2008JD011560.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/9mar2011a5.html>

The Changing Climate

Amazing Arctic Reconstructions

World Climate Report, Mar 10, 2011 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.worldclimaterreport.com/index.php/2011/03/10/amazing-arctic-reconstructions/#more-478>

A Warmer Climate May Not Mean El Niño Comes to Stay

By Sid Perkins, Science Now, Mar 9, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://news.sciencemag.org/sciencenow/2011/03/a-warmer-climate-may-not-mean-el.html?ref=hp>

[SEPP Comment: The IPCC dismissed El Niños as a cause of warming – too short lived. But the work of McLean, Carter and de Freitas suggests that changes in the El Niño-Southern Oscillation may explain a great part of late 20th Century warming. There is no scientific reason to suggest warming causes El Niños.

Health and Warming

The Global Warming Health Scare

By Timothy Birdnow, American Thinker, Mar 5, 2011

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/03/the_global_warming_health_scar.html

Other Scientific Issues

NASA's Bolden defends Earth science

By Staff Writers, UPI, Mar 4, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.spacemart.com/reports/NASAs_Bolden_defends_Earth_science_999.html

NASA reels from climate science setbacks

By Staff Writers, APF, Mar 6, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.spacemart.com/reports/NASA_reels_from_climate_science_setbacks_999.html

Other Issues that May Be Of Interest

Democrats attack Republican candidate's children

By Art Robinson, World Net Daily, Mar 7, 2011 [H/t Joe D' Aleo, ICECAP]

<http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=271753>

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

CA GOV Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment – Proposition 65

Notice of Intent to List Chemicals By The Labor Code Mechanism:

http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/CRNR_notices/admin_listing/intent_to_list/LCset12a030411.html

[SEPP Comment: Including ethanol in alcoholic beverages and salted fish, Chinese style.]

Full cost accounting for the life cycle of coal

By Paul Ebstein, et al, Annals of the New York Academy of Science, 1219 (2011) 78-98

<http://blog.cleanenergy.org/files/2011/02/full-cost-accounting.pdf>

#####

ARTICLES:

1. Good bye, Kyoto

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Mar 13, 2011

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/03/good_bye_kyoto.html

The 1997 Kyoto Protocol expires in 2012, after surviving 15 years, mostly spent on life support. It reached its peak in Bali in 2007 at the annual UN gabfest, had a sudden unexpected collapse in Copenhagen in 2009, and has been in a coma since.

Kyoto had its real beginning at the 1992 Global Climate Summit in Rio de Janeiro. I missed that great party but George Bush the elder went and signed up for the United States. The language of the Global Climate Treaty, the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), was vague enough to not be completely objectionable -- although we should have known better than to let the camel's nose enter the tent. It has prejudiced the subsequent discussion by focusing only on anthropogenic global warming (AGW).

The 1997 Protocol, negotiated in Kyoto, Japan, tried to put teeth into the FCCC. And its bite was strong enough so that the United States never ratified it -- even during the Clinton-Gore years in the White House. The US Senate, bless their hearts, had voted unanimously, 95 to 0, for the 1997 Byrd-Hagel Resolution against imposing any kind of restrictions on energy use mandated by the United Nations. And during the Obama administration, with the most pro-AGW people in the White House, the Democrat-controlled Senate refused to consider the Cap-and-Trade bill (to restrict emissions of CO2) that the House had passed in 2009.

The origin of Kyoto and its demise is a thrilling tale, full of heroes and villains, which has never been fully told. It produced some household words like "Hockeystick," "Climategate," "Mike's trick" and "hide the decline." I was fortunate, if that is the right word, to have been involved continuously in all aspects of Kyoto. Much of it is published in a Hoover Institution booklet "From Rio to Kyoto" -- and I am now working on the sequel "From Kyoto to Copenhagen."

The Rise of Kyoto

I trace the main actor behind Kyoto as the UN-sponsored IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). Its first full assessment report in 1990 provided the basis for the Rio Summit and its doctored second assessment report of 1996 provided the scientific underpinning for the Kyoto Protocol.

What exactly did the IPCC have to say in 1996, when its printed report became available? Those of us present in Madrid in 1995, when a final draft was approved by the scientists, became aware that the crucial language was changed after its approval and before it was printed. While this has been hotly denied by the perpetrators, the evidence is quite clear; one only has to compare the two documents. Dr. Frederick Seitz, one of America's most distinguished scientists and President Emeritus of the Rockefeller University, had this to say in an op-ed piece in the Wall Street Journal on June 12, 1996:

"In my more than 60 years as a member of the American scientific community, including service as president of both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society, I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to this IPCC report."

And he had good reason to be upset because here are the phrases that were [deleted](#) from the final draft:

- *"None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed [climate] changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases."*
- *"While some of the pattern-base studies discussed here have claimed detection of a significant climate change, no study to date has positively attributed all or part [of the climate change observed] to [man-made] causes. Nor has any study quantified the magnitude of a greenhouse gas effect or aerosol effect in the observed data - an issue of primary relevance to policy makers."*

- *"Any claims of positive detection and attribution of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the total natural variability of the climate system are reduced."*
- *"While none of these studies has specifically considered the attribution issue, they often draw some attribution conclusions, for which there is little justification."*
- *"When will an anthropogenic effect on climate be identified? It is not surprising that the best answer to this question is, 'We do not know.'"*

But the following sentence was added in the "revision":

The body of statistical evidence in chapter 8, when examined in the context of our physical understanding of the climate system, now points to a discernible human influence on the global climate. [IPCC chapter 8, p.439]

The memorable phrase "the balance of evidence" used in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers is essentially meaningless, and certainly not backed by any scientific evidence. It turns out that the two main pieces of evidence, two crucial graphs in the IPCC report, were based on bad information or had actually been doctored [see my Hoover report].

Kyoto: A Money Machine -- for Some

The Kyoto Protocol was a fraud right from Day One. Even if it had been punctiliously followed by all of the nations who ratified it, it would have achieved essentially nothing -- a measly reduction in the calculated temperature half a century hence of 0.02 degrees C -- an amount too small to even measure.

Kyoto was all about politics and money. The terms of the Kyoto Protocol demanded a 5.2% overall reduction from the emission levels of 1990 for industrialized nations. The choice of 1990, however, favored Europe, Britain, Germany, and Russia at the expense of the United States.

Around 1990, Britain switched from primarily coal to natural gas, thus reducing CO2 emissions. And at about the same time, the Soviet Union collapsed and Germany took over its Eastern part, closing down much of its inefficient coal-fired electricity production.

The most pernicious provisions of the Kyoto Protocol were permits for emissions trading within the European Union and the so-called Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). CDM permitted industries and others to keep emitting CO2 while buying unused credits from other Kyoto nations or by sponsoring projects in developing nations that would reduce emissions.

What a racket this turned out to be. It has made Al Gore a "climate billionaire" who emits CO2 copiously from his four residences, jet planes and yachts, but then buys "carbon offsets," emission credits from his own company, set up to trade CO2 permits.

The other big money item has been the drive for so-called "clean energy" -- with its huge subsidies for wind power and solar energy, widely abused in Europe -- but especially in the United States where the subsidies are among the highest.

The poster child for clean energy is probably ethanol -- a huge sink for government subsidies, essentially a wasteful scheme to transfer money from consumers to corn growers and refiners. Even

environmentalists admit that ethanol does not lead to CO2 reductions overall -- and has many other undesirable environmental consequences.

Among the worst of the consequences of this "bio-fuel craze" has been the rise in the world price of corn - doubling to \$7 a bushel in the past six months -- wheat, and other agricultural commodities. It has led to food riots in many developing nations and served to perpetuate poverty throughout the world.

The general restrictions on CO2 emissions have also slowed down economic growth by making energy more expensive. All in all, the Kyoto Protocol has caused nothing but disasters.

The Fall of Kyoto

Just as Rio marked the beginning of the Kyoto misadventure, the end became really evident in 2009 in Copenhagen. Even desperate efforts by scientist-alarmists (that went well beyond the IPCC) failed to make an impact. Who still remembers the "Copenhagen Diagnosis" or UNEP's rehash of the IPCC, churned out at the last minute? Ultimately, China and major developing nations rejected all efforts to impose limits on the use of fossil fuels; economic growth proved to be more important than hypothetical climate disasters.

The Climategate revelations may have played a decisive role in shaking the public's faith in the climate science of the IPCC. Not only did a clique of key IPCC scientists hide their raw temperature data and the methodology of their selection and adjustments, but they conspired to delete incriminating e-mails and fought hard against all attempts by independent outside scientists to replicate their results. They also undermined the peer-review system and tried to make it impossible for skeptical scientists to publish their work in scientific journals. In the process, they damaged the whole science enterprise, based on full publication of data and methods, replication of results, and open debate.

No Sequel to Kyoto -- We Hope

And what about the future? There is not likely to be an extension of the Protocol or any similar international demand for emission restrictions. The 2010 gab fest, held in Cancun, Mexico, was not even a holding action and the 2011 conference in Durban, South Africa, will surely be an even greater waste of time and money.

But the financial subsidies have established politically important stakeholders who will continue to fight for programs of "clean energy", "renewable energy", and other such programs -- all in the name of "saving the earth's climate for our children and grand-children."

One only has to look at the current situation in the United States to realize how bad things have become. Western states, under the leadership of California, have established the Western Climate Initiative. Eastern states have established a similar regime. One of the worst ideas is the so-called Renewable Electricity Standard (RES), which would force electric utilities to generate a certain percentage of their power from "renewable energy". Many of these groups demand a 20% "feed-in" quota by 2020, although politicians are playing all kinds of games with numbers. President Obama is calling for a 80% reduction by 2050. As he promised during the 2008 campaign, under his plan "electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket."

Probably the worst of all of the proposals may be the scheme to capture and sequester the emissions of CO2 from power plants. Fortunately, carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) may never come to pass because of technological reasons. In the US, a little more than 50% of electric power is produced from coal burning plants, with the cheapest and most secure fuel we have.

The George W. Bush administration was not much better in this respect than the Obama White House. Remember the "hydrogen economy"? Bush is responsible also for feeding the various interest groups with subsidies -- even while he refused to consider CO2 as a pollutant.

Unfortunately also, his EPA and his Justice Department did not mount an adequate scientific defense before the Supreme Court in 2007. By a 5-4 decision, the Court called CO2 a pollutant under the Clean Air Act, but left it up to the EPA to demonstrate that it would constitute a hazard to "human health and welfare." The EPA has now issued an Endangerment Finding based only on the flimsy evidence of the IPCC. But without waiting for the legal challenge to the EF to be settled in court, the EPA is trying to proceed energetically to impose CO2 restrictions under the Clean Air Act. It would be interesting to see how the EPA will set the national ambient air quality standard for CO2, which is globally determined now by the emissions of China and other developing nations - and no longer under the control of the United States.

The battle against the unreasonable efforts of the EPA has to be fought on several fronts. The Congress, with a Republican majority in the House, is trying to cut off funding for EPA programs that involve dubious efforts to control climate change. In the House, the "Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011" is sure to pass. The US Senate may finally pass the "Murkowski Resolution", which would nullify the Endangerment Finding of the EPA.

On the scientific front, it behooves us to demonstrate to all concerned that the conclusion of the IPCC about anthropogenic global warming is not based on any credible evidence. Future generations will thank us for this service: "Skeptics" now labeled "deniers," "traitors," "criminals," and worse, will become the "realists" who correctly recognized Global Warming as a non-problem and saved our economy from going down the drain.

2. And now, the good news!

The Many Benefits of Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment

By Craig D. Idso & Sherwood B. Idso

Reviewed by John Brignell, Number Watch, Feb 2011

http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/good_news.htm

First, a declaration of prior interest: your reviewer once wrote an essay [in praise of carbon](#) and is therefore unlikely to be neutral in the case of a book with such a title. Of course, a promising title can often herald a treatment that has all the clarity and meaning of a mission statement. Fear not: this is a work that is scholarly, with copious references to genuine scientific research, yet manages to be accessible to the lay reader through judicious use of summaries and sidebars. It is a curious manifestation of the politics and religion of modern times that a rare atmospheric gas, which to be called benign would be an understatement, has been perversely cast in the role of original sin in the new system of belief. Here the manifold benefits of the gas are helpfully arranged in alphabetical order.

The results of a large number of scientific experiments are arrayed to demonstrate how an increase in carbon dioxide concentration enhances the metabolism of plants and therefore the animals (including humanity) that are dependent on them. Not only is growth improved, but plants are more resistant to disease and stresses (pollution, light, salinity, temperature, radiation and water). Furthermore, beneficial substances such as vitamins and other bioactive compounds also increase with carbon dioxide exposure. A caveat here: some of the claims are from the realm of modern epidemiology, with its wayward treatment of statistical significance, and accounts of, for example, cancer prevention by consuming particular vegetables need to be regarded with some reserve.

It is clear that we are a fortunate generation. Given that it is demonstrated that carbon dioxide concentration is a follower of temperature, the warming after the little ice age has awarded us all the prosperity that has previously accompanied warm periods (in Roman and Mediaeval times). That this has occurred at a time when there is also a perverse establishment in much of the world and a media for whom “good news is no news” provides just another demonstration of human perversity.

The Many Benefits of Atmospheric CO₂ Enrichment

By Craig D. Idso & Sherwood B. Idso

Published by [Vales Lake Publishing](#)

Copyright © 2011 by the Science and Public Policy Institute and the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change

ISBN 978-0-9819694-2-8

Library of Congress Control number: 2010941431

3. Our Man-Made Energy Crisis

There's plenty of oil and no fundamental reason to expect prices of \$200 per barrel. But that doesn't excuse the administration's punitive approach toward the industry.

By Nasen Saleri, WSJ, Mar 9, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703386704576186622682563228.html?mod=djemEditorialPage_h

The unfolding turmoil in Libya has amplified concerns about the reliability of global energy supplies in an era of political uncertainty. Is oil at \$200 per barrel inescapable? Is this the beginning of the end so vigorously underscored by peak oil enthusiasts for the last several decades? The short answer is clearly "No."

Yet the question remains: What will happen to the price of crude? This, in turn, necessitates an appreciation of the "anxiety" component in current and future prices. The anxiety premium may range from \$10 to \$30 given current events in Libya and their spillover effects.

The good news is that such a premium is not sustainable in the long run. Prices will eventually come down due to global excess capacity—estimated at three million to five million barrels of oil per day—and even more so due to migration of demand from oil to natural gas by electric utilities and industrial markets. Natural gas holds more than a 3-to-1 price advantage over oil on an equivalent unit energy basis in the U.S. So \$200 crude is unlikely given market fundamentals.

In the context of global liquids production, the civil strife in Libya represents a minor disruption (less than 2% of the total, approximately 85 million barrels of oil per day). Nor is there any evidence to suggest that even a protracted scenario of instability will result in a sustained reduction of crude supplies. Iraqi oil production dropped by 30% at the start of the second Iraq war in 2003, and then it quickly bounced back to the prewar level of two million barrels of oil per day. Currently, Iraqi oil production stands at 2.6 million barrels of oil per day, with much higher levels projected during this decade.

Fossil fuels make up about 85% of total U.S. energy demand, which is estimated at about 45 million to 50 million barrels of oil equivalent per day. Energy imports, mainly crude oil, account for 20% of the total U.S. energy requirements. This level of imports is a huge burden on the balance of payments, hence the U.S. dollar.

What is less widely recognized is the overall inefficiency of energy utilization. According to a 2007 study by National Petroleum Council, at the request of the U.S. Department of Energy, approximately 61% of energy produced is lost due to factors such as poor insulation, gas-guzzling vehicles or suboptimal power

plants. On average, only one out of three reservoir barrels is recovered, which translates to an overall efficiency of only 13% for oil that is converted to a usable form. Improving energy efficiency should be a top priority, not just in our surface usage but also at the point of extraction.

Technology is reshaping every facet of our lives. The energy world is no different. This includes the resurgence of U.S. liquid production in recent years (5.5 million barrels of oil per day and trending upward), as well as conventional gas production's six-fold increase over the last two decades (to approximately 32 billion standard cubic feet of gas per day in 2010, nearly equaling U.S. liquid production). Both are attributable to recent innovations, such as highly sophisticated wells that can reach thousands of feet underground with GPS precision.

The planet is endowed with plentiful sources of natural gas and oil, conventional and unconventional. Some estimates place global unconventional gas resources at about 33,000 trillion cubic feet, or about five times the amount of proven reserves at the end of 2009. The outlook for liquids is no less promising. At current rates of global consumption, there are sufficient oil and gas supplies to last well into the next century.

What's missing is a coherent U.S. energy policy. At best, the Obama administration's approach to U.S. domestic oil and gas production can be characterized as a strategy of ambivalence, an uneasy equilibrium between desire to lessen the role of fossil fuels and the reality of their necessity in a functioning U.S. economy. Last year's Deepwater Horizon tragedy in the Gulf tilted the current administration's policies to an even more punitive posture vis-a-vis domestic energy production.

As the French philosopher Antoine de Saint-Exupéry wisely observed, "A goal without a plan is just a wish." Unfortunately for the U.S., there is not even a wish. The time to rethink and redesign our entire energy strategy is now.

The Obama administration must seriously ponder the following questions, because they relate directly to what the president likes to call "winning the future." What will be the make-up of the energy-supply pie, and how can we dramatically increase, even double, our energy efficiency? What exactly are our carbon emission goals? And how do we go from where we are today—importing about 20% of our daily energy supply—to where we want to be in 2026, perhaps even an energy exporter?

We've already entered a new energy era that is dramatically more competitive, diverse and high-tech than the past. The global consumer is king. The future energy picture for the U.S. or the planet is not constrained by the availability of supplies, either fossil or non-fossil, but by efficiency gains in generation and consumption.

This will require real leadership and the clear articulation of energy goals, costs and priorities. Ambiguity will not serve the best interests of future generations. The U.S. does not have an energy problem. It has an energy strategy problem.

Mr. Saleri, president and CEO of Quantum Reservoir Impact in Houston, was formerly head of reservoir management for Saudi Aramco.

4. Australia's Carbon Warning for Obama

It turns out emissions restrictions do not grow more popular the more you try to pitch them.

By Tom Switzer, WSJ, Mar 11, 2011 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703453804576191712500363464.html>

President Obama's Environmental Protection Agency is fighting a rear-guard action to accomplish via regulation what voters rejected via Congress: ruinously expensive restrictions on carbon emissions in the name of fighting "global warming." This is perhaps partly out of the administration's own convictions, but also because Mr. Obama knows that a large slice of his left-wing base is clamoring for such measures. But before he goes much further down that road, he should take a look at how a similar political calculation is playing out in Australia. In short, not well.

Prime Minister Julia Gillard, in office for less than a year, is pushing forward with a carbon tax Down Under. The measure is hugely unpopular—its announcement this week pushed Ms. Gillard's Labor Party to its lowest popularity ever in an opinion poll conducted for The Australian newspaper (owned by News Corporation, which also owns the publisher of this newspaper). Labor shouldn't be surprised. The idea of a carbon tax was so controversial before last August's election that Ms. Gillard promised not to enact one as a ploy to win votes. Members of her administration have repeated that refrain, to proverbial applause, several times since.

Why, then, has Labor been so politically foolish as to revive the idea? Because Ms. Gillard has been backed into a political corner by anti-carbon advocates on the far left. Under her leadership, Labor failed to win a majority in the House of Representatives and the Senate in that August vote, so she governs in an uneasy coalition with a clutch of independent and Green Party legislators.

The leader of those Greens, Bob Brown, has used his kingmaker sway to pull Ms. Gillard steadily leftward ever since, including inducing her to oppose tougher border protection and to support same-sex marriage. The new carbon tax proposal is part and parcel of that.

The situation bears some striking similarities to events in the U.S., although the details are different. In America, voters have shown again and again their distaste for carbon taxation or cap-and-trade emissions regulation in the name of slowing global warming. Enthusiasts' ambitions finally collapsed last year when the Senate, controlled by Democrats, couldn't agree to hold a debate on even the most loophole-ridden version of cap-and-trade.

Meanwhile, although Mr. Obama is not beholden to a small band of congressional swing voters who support carbon regulation in the way Ms. Gillard must heed the Greens, he's in a box of a different sort. He actually did campaign in support of carbon regulation, declaring his nomination to lead the Democratic presidential ticket as "the moment when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." This suggests that among his electoral base, and among his supporters in Congress, is a small but potentially important minority who want him to follow through on the promise implied by that grandiose claim.

Mr. Obama at least has the luxury of going about it in a stealthier way. U.S. law gives his EPA just enough of a fig leaf to try to push forward with carbon regulation despite congressional opposition, though even then by most accounts he is pushing existing laws to their limits or even beyond. Ms. Gillard has to go to her parliament for an up or down vote on carbon taxation. That might be one reason why her anti-carbon moves are generating more pronounced opposition now—the Australian public is more aware of what their leaders are getting up to than are their American peers.

Carbon-tax supporters in Canberra will try to make their proposal more palatable with additions like a rebate on the electricity bills the tax would push higher or the like. But this will only further complicate the politics by giving tax opponents more fodder. For instance, they can skewer the rebate as an inefficient and theoretically inconsistent way to hand carbon consumers' money back to them. And while the tax may yet pass, that could prove a Pyrrhic victory for Ms. Gillard and her coalition partners come the next election.

Still, the news from Australia suggests Mr. Obama is taking a big gamble if he figures the public will never catch on. Ms. Gillard's recent experience shows what happens when voters do, and the result is a disaster-in-the-making for any leader facing a re-election battle.

Mr. Switzer is a research associate for the United States Studies Centre at the University of Sydney and editor of Spectator Australia.

#####