

The Week That Was: 2011-06-18 (June 18, 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.

#####

Restoring the Scientific Method is the theme of the Sixth International Conference on Climate Change (ICCC-6), Sponsored by the Heartland Institute. It will take place in Washington, DC from breakfast Thursday, June 30, to noon Friday, July 1, at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel. This event will be more modest than in the past, yet as informative and, perhaps, even more challenging to the orthodoxy.

Senator James Inhofe is the Keynote Speaker at the Thursday breakfast. Senator Inhofe, probably more than anyone, prevented the US Senate from adopting cap-and-trade. Other principal speakers include S. Fred Singer, Craig Idso, and Bob Carter – all major contributors to the NIPCC reports. Of course, SEPP is a co-sponsor. For the program please see: <http://www.heartland.org/events/iccc2011>

#####

Quote of the Week:

“To point to this [a quiet sun] as something that could in any way ameliorate greenhouse gas warming is folly, said [Michael] Mann.” [H/t Wired Science]

“In the coming years the sun will show by itself how important it is.” Hendrik Svensmark [H/t The Hockey Schtick]

#####

Number of the Week: 3

#####

THIS WEEK:

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

A number of events occurred this week that increases the turmoil surrounding climate science.

American Meteorological Society: Noted hurricane expert and a member of the American Meteorological Society (AMS) for over 50 years, Bill Gray, blasted the current, ideologically driven leadership of the AMS for embracing the human-caused global warming (AGW) hypothesis espoused by the UN Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change. According to Gray, the leadership did so without considering the views of many expert members of the society who do not embrace that view. The AMS failed its responsibilities to facilitate the scientific debate. Instead, the leadership adopted one side of a scientific issue without regard for its traditions of fostering scientific inquiry. As such, the effectiveness of the AMS has been greatly compromised.

Gray states two specific failings of the IPCC and its models which the AMS has embraced. One is that the upper troposphere water vapor feedback loop is grossly wrong. The models fail to handle the rainfall process correctly and project greater warming than justifiable. [This is illustrated in the missing fingerprint in weather balloon and satellite observations of the atmosphere centered over the tropics at about 10 km as shown in NIPCC 2008.]

The second failing Gray cites is the failure to comprehend the fundamental role of the deep ocean circulation, the Meridional Overturning Circulation (MOC). [The MOC is a more rigorous concept than the more popularly known Thermohaline Circulation.] To Gray, the MOC significantly influences rainfall, wind, and surface temperature changes independent of greenhouse gases and radiation.

The displeasure Gray expresses is similar to the displeasure numerous members of other physical societies have expressed towards the leadership of their organizations, which have issued political statements regarding AGW without fully consulting the views of the membership. We are witnessing a decline in scientific rigor and discipline in scientific debates. The damage being done to the societies is significant as is damage to the American science as a whole. Please see Article # 1.

On Monday, at the annual meeting of the solar physics division of the American Astronomical Society, three separate groups announced the findings of their research –solar activity appears to be diminishing. The three studies examined three different components of activity, 1) the jet stream in the solar interior, 2) diminishing sunspots on the visible surface and 3) changes in the corona and near the poles. All three research efforts pointed to the same direction – a pronounced decline in solar activity including sun spots and solar magnetism.

Immediate responses range from it means little or nothing, the orthodoxy, to an alarmist future Little Ice Age. The quote above from Michael Mann reflects the orthodox view that solar changes have little influence on global warming and the climate.

The orthodoxy totally ignores the solar-cosmic ray hypothesis that solar activity, namely solar wind and magnetism, influences the number of high energy cosmic rays hitting the earth's atmosphere, which, in turn, influences the formation of low level clouds which reflect sunlight, thus have a cooling effect. A dormant sun results in more cosmic rays and more clouds and cooler temperatures. A small change in cloud cover can result in significant temperature changes.

The quote above from Henrik Svensmark reflects the solar-cosmic ray hypothesis. At this time, one cannot confirm if the sun's activity will continue to diminish, as the new research suggests. Nor can one confirm that sunspot activity is clearly related to solar wind and magnetism. (The effects of changes in solar wind and magnetism on cosmic rays have been long established.) If solar wind and magnetism diminishes, and clouds increase, then these events become a physical test of the solar-cosmic ray hypothesis.

At this time, the extent of the possible cooling, if any, cannot be determined. Don Easterbrook posted on Anthony Watt's web site an excellent analysis of possible alternative cooling scenarios. The result may be a shallow cooling similar to 1945 to 1977, a more severe cooling similar to 1880-1915, a much more severe cooling similar to the Dalton Minimum of 1790 to 1820, or a return to a Little Ice Age. (Please see articles referenced under "Is the Sun Rising?" and under "Defenders of the Orthodoxy.")

Of course, several British satirists have seized upon these projections and wrote articles on what actions their government would take to prevent global cooling. Please see articles referenced under "Below the Bottom Line."

Climategate: and similar IPCC shenanigans are upon us once again. One of the favorite marketing ploys of the IPCC is to make press releases and issue a Summary for Policymakers (SPM) with exciting claims with details to follow. It did so in the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), in which the SPM was released months before the main report. The main report poorly supported, or failed to support, many of the claims in the SPM. Further, many of the claims were supported by gray literature written by operatives from environmental groups.

On May 9, the IPCC released a summary report claiming that close to 80% of the world's energy needs can be supplied from renewable energy sources by 2050. According to IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri, the report was based on the best information available and was a sound basis for policymakers to meet the challenges of global warming. It did not pass the sniff test.

On June 14, the IPCC released the main report. Steve McIntyre of Climate Audit examined it and discovered the lead author of the critical chapter arriving to 80% of the world's energy needs was a Greenpeace activist, Sven Teske, appointed to the IPCC by the German government. Even more interesting, the IPCC claim was based on a report by Greenpeace and the European Renewable Energy Council (EREC), with the lead author none other than Sven Teske. Thickening the plot, the preface to the Greenpeace report was written by none other than IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri. This is the best IPCC can do for objective, scientific reports!

As the dubious science of the IPCC was unraveling, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), under which IPCC festivities take place is asking member nations for donations to increase its roughly \$25 Million budget by 15% because it has taken on new responsibilities, including gearing up to dispense \$100 Billion per year by 2020 in payments from developed nations to developing nations as compensation for global warming.

Perhaps it's time for UNFCCC and IPCC to demand payments from the multibillion dollar environmental industry, which raises great sums playing to the false fears the IPCC creates. This would relieve the taxpayers of Western nations from the obligation of supporting an organization that is dedicated to lessening their standards of living. Further, it would remove the last shrouds covering the claim that the IPCC is an objective, scientific organization and identify it for what it has become— an organization for promotion of the environmental industry. Please see articles referenced under “Climategate Continued” and “Defenders of the Orthodoxy.”

EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson has repeatedly made claims of the monetary benefits conferred to Americans by EPA regulations, especially under the Clean Air Act, that, simply, are not credible. Only the EPA and the environmental industry use them. Independent economists disregard them.

This week David Montgomery and Anne Smith of NERA Economic Consulting released a report stating the basis by which EPA obtains some of its dubious numbers. It is not by an objective measure, but by surveys, political polls – how much do you think we should pay for (cleaner air)? Obviously, the answer would be different for government employee as compared with a recently unemployed gulf oil worker. If the report is correct, then no numbers emanating from the EPA should be accepted as reliable. Please see report referenced under “Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate?”

The Number of the Week: 3 is taken from the web site of John Brignell, Number Watch, who posted it on June 6, after an extended absence. Three is the number of campaigns (fronts) undertaken by the environmental industry and political enablers to, in Brignell's terms, bring down the modern state by attacking “its energy, manufacturing and transport systems.” It worked well against Germany in World War II.

To Brignell the first front was global warming / climate change, and that is failing. The second front is ocean acidification, actually a marginal reduction in alkalinity of sea water, which is not doing well. Any tropical fish fancier recognizes the absurdity of many of the claims (some members of Congress may not).

The third front is particulates – invisible air pollution – tiny particles that may endanger health even though they are in low concentrations. The British government is sounding the alarm of the 1950s when burning of high sulfur coal, without scrubbers, killed thousands in a pea-soup fog. It makes little difference to government officials that automobiles or coal fired utilities with sulfur scrubbers do not produce the same sulfur emissions. The US EPA is invoking that dreaded metal mercury, without any physical evidence supporting its claims. Please see “Opening the third front” under “Challenging the Orthodoxy,” Article # 4, and referenced articles under “EPA and Other Regulators on the March.”

#####

ARTICLES:

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

1. On The Hijacking of the American Meteorological Society (AMS)

By Bill Gray, WUWT, Jun 16, 2011

(AMS Fellow, Charney Award recipient, and over 50-year member)

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/16/on-the-hijacking-of-the-american-meteorological-society-ams/>

2. Term ‘sustainability’ widely misused

By Charles Battig, VA-SEEE, Letter, Daily Progress, Jun 12, 2011

<http://www2.dailyprogress.com/news/2011/jun/12/term-sustainability-widely-misused-ar-1103248>

3. The Return of the Population Bomb

When the experts tell you there are too many people, they don't mean too many Swedes

By William McGurn, WSJ, Jun 14, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303714704576383764019676614.html?mod=ITP_opinion_0

4. The EPA's War on Jobs

Coal is from Earth, Lisa Jackson is from mercury.

Editorial, WSJ, Jun 13, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703818204576206662079202844.html?mod=ITP_opinion_2

5. America Needs the Shale Revolution

The drilling boom is the best U.S. energy news in generations and is crucial for reviving domestic manufacturing.

By Robert Bryce, WSJ, Jun 13, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304432304576369140191493636.html?mod=ITP_opinion_0

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Science: Is the Sun Rising?

Sun’s Fading Spots Signal Big Drop in Solar Activity

By Denise Chow, Space.com, Jun 14, 2011 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.space.com/11960-fading-sunspots-slower-solar-activity-solar-cycle.html>

Scientists predict rare 'hibernation' of sunspots

By Kerry Sheridan, AFP June 14, 2011

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5g8SvBAIVp4aWOUD18T2E4C7Vj5zA?docId=CNG.b3569aafd06fe78f58be73c5faaa97a5.341>

The Demise of Sunspots – Deep Cooling Ahead

By Don Easterbrook, WUWT, Jun 17, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/17/easterbrook-on-the-potential-demise-of-sunspots/>

All three of these lines of research to point to the familiar sunspot cycle shutting down for a while.

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Jun 14, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/14/all-three-of-these-lines-of-research-to-point-to-the-familiar-sunspot-cycle-shutting-down-for-a-while/>

Earth may be headed into a mini Ice Age within a decade

Physicists say sunspot cycle is 'going into hibernation'

By Lewis Page, A Register, Jun 14, 2011 [H/t Anne Debeil]

http://www.theregister.co.uk/2011/06/14/ice_age/

NASA JPL on New Insights on How Solar Minimums Affect Earth

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Jun 14, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/14/nasa-jpl-on-new-insights-on-how-solar-minimums-affect-earth/#more-41675>

Climategate Continued

Greenpeace karaoke

IPCC report is based on Greenpeace renewables plan

By Steve McIntyre, Financial Post, Jun 16, 2011

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/06/16/junk-science-week-greenpeace-karaoke/>

“Even more interesting, the original Teske-Greenpeace report comes with a preface from one R.K. Pachauri, a.k.a. Rajendra Pachauri, the illustrious chairman of the IPCC and mastermind of its many scientific endeavors.”

Responses from IPCC SRREN

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Jun 16, 2011

<http://climateaudit.org/>

“Close to 80 percent of the world’s energy supply could be met by renewables by mid-century if backed by the right enabling public policies a new report shows.” [SEPP Comment: It must be true because Greenpeace said it.]

The IPCC loses its last credibility

By Lorne Gunter, National Post, Jun 17, 2011

<http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2011/06/17/lorne-gunter-the-ipcc-loses-its-last-credibility/>

Climate change panel in hot water again over ‘biased’ energy report

By Oliver Wright, Independent, UK, Jun 16, 2011 [H/t Best of the Web]

<http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/climate-change-panel-in-hot-water-again-over-biased-energy-report-2298055.html>

[SEPP Comment: To paraphrase the Best on the Web: And if there are honest scientists who think global warming [AGW] is real, why aren't they the ones blowing the whistle on the malefactors who discredit the theory?]

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304319804576389671491393898.html?mod=djemBestOfT>

Ideological money laundering

By Ben Pile, Bishop Hill, Jun 16, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2011/6/16/ideological-money-laundering.html>

[SEPP Comment: Not only is Greenpeace involved in IPCC reports, but the European Renewable Energy Council is involved as well.]

Challenging the Orthodoxy

The opening of the third front

By John Brignell, Number Watch, Jun 6, 2011

<http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/2011%20April.htm>

The temperature trend is not as simple as Garnaut makes out

By Tom Quirk, On Line Opinion, AU, Jun 14, 2011

<http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=12177>

Agenda 21: The U.N.'s Earth Summit Has Its Head In The Clouds

By Larry Bell, Forbes, Jun 14, 2011

<http://blogs.forbes.com/larrybell/2011/06/14/the-u-n-s-earth-summit-has-its-head-in-the-clouds/>

Climate policy crisis

By Bob Carter, Quadrant, Jun 12, 2011

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/06/climate-colonial-criinge>

[SEPP Comment: Neo-colonialism in Western countries.]

Defenders of the Orthodoxy

Sunspot Drop Won't Cause global Cooling

By Brandon Keim, Wired Science, Jun 15, 2011 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.wired.com/wiredscience/2011/06/solar-minimum-climate/>

Would Solar Lull Snuff Climate Action?

By Andrew Revkin, NYT, Jun 15, 2011 [H/t David Manuta]

<http://dotearth.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/06/15/would-solar-lull-snuff-climate-action/?emc=eta1>

Examining Dr. John Christy's Global Warming Skepticism

By Dana Nuccitelli, Treehugger, Jun 14, 2011 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://www.treehugger.com/files/2011/06/examining-john-christy-global-warming-skepticism.php>

[SEPP Comment: The author gets hypothesis testing wrong. The alternative of the hypothesis that human greenhouse gas emissions are causing significant warming is the null hypothesis, they are not the cause.]

Rio eco-summit 'top priority' for UN

Staff Writers, AFP, June 16, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Rio_eco-summit_top_priority_for_UN_999.html

[SEPP Comment: Creating more fears. See above article on Agenda 21 by Larry Bell.]

Budget battle at cash-strapped UN climate forum

By Staff Writers, AFP, June 16, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Budget_battle_at_cash-strapped_UN_climate_forum_999.html

IPCC asks scientists to assess geo-engineering climate solutions

Leaked documents ahead of key Lima meeting suggest UN body is looking to slow emissions with technological fixes rather than talks

By John Vidal, Guardian, UK, Jun 15, 2011 [H/t Robert Pritchard]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/jun/15/ipcc-geo-engineering-climate?INTCMP=SRCH>

“The meeting has been given added weight because last week, Christiana Figueres, head of the UNFCCC, [told the Guardian](#) that the world may have to investigate geo-engineering because emissions were continuing to rise.”

Curb soot, smog to help keep Earth cool: UN

By Staff Writers AFP June 14, 2011

http://www.terraily.com/reports/Curb_soot_smog_to_help_keep_Earth_cool_UN_999.html

Questioning the Orthodoxy

New Paper Under Review “Changes In Seasonal Snow Cover In Hindu Kush-Himalayan Region” By Gurung Et Al 2011

By Roger Pielke, Sr, Pielke Climate Science, Jun 17, 2011

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

[SEPP Comment: As reviewed by Pielke, the study suggests “changes in snow cover between 2000 and 2010 are due to inter annual variations in circulation pattern.” Pielke also praises interactive review process of *The Cryosphere*, posting all reviews and responses.]

1995 And All That

By David Whitehouse, GWPF, Jun 14, 2011

<http://www.thegwgf.org/the-observatory/3207-1995-and-all-that.html>

[SEPP Comment: *Playing games with statistics.*]

Questioning the European Green

UK faces job losses as businesses threaten to flee abroad to escape green energy levies

British industry's ability to compete with companies overseas is under threat from punitive green energy costs, the new president of the CBI has told The Sunday Telegraph.

By Robert Mendick, Edward Malnick, and Andrew Cave, Telegraph, UK, Jun 12, 2011

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/newsbysector/energy/8570141/UK-faces-job-losses-as-businesses-threaten-to-flee-abroad-to-escape-green-energy-levies.html>

Climate change should be excluded from curriculum, says adviser

Head of government review says school syllabus needs to 'get back to the science in science'

By Jessica Shepherd, Guardian, UK, Jun 12, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2011/jun/12/climate-change-curriculum-government-adviser>

Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate?

Assessment of the Obama Administration’s Cost-Benefit Analysis of Clean Air Act Regulations

By David Montgomery and Anne Smith, NERA Economic Consulting, Jun 14, 2011

http://www.ntu.org/news-and-issues/energy-environment/macro_vs_wtp_v19-pdf3.pdf

Models v. Data

The Failure Of Dynamic Downscaling As Adding Value to Multi-Decadal Regional Climate Prediction

By Roger Pielke, Sr, Pielke Climate Science, Jun 15, 2011

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

[SEPP Comment: *A review of major, largely unanswered, issues in downscaling global multi-decadal models to obtain regional climate projections.*]

Extreme Weather

Flooding in China Worsens

By Jeff Sussman, Weather Bell, Jun 17, 2011

<http://www.weatherbell.com/weather-news/flooding-in-china-worsens/>

Thick snowpack holds water — and potential peril

Much of the West's high country remains buried under a snowpack. Dam operators are watching for jumps in temperature that could turn piles of snow into raging floodwaters.

By Bettina Boxall, LA Times, Jun 12, 2011

<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-snowpack-20110608,0,47010.story>

[SEPP Comment: Balancing water output is a constant issue for the dam operators. Many of the dams were built first to control raging floods, then for other uses such as irrigation and hydroelectric power.]

Largest Dead Zone on Record Predicted for Gulf

By Christine McEnrue, Weather Bell, Jun 17, 2011

<http://www.weatherbell.com/weather-news/largest-dead-zone-on-record-predicted-for-gulf/>

[SEPP Comment: Apparently the records go back to 1985.]

New peer reviewed study: Surge in North Atlantic hurricanes due to better detectors, not climate change

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Jun 16, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/16/new-peer-reviewed-study-surge-in-north-atlantic-hurricanes-due-to-better-detectors-not-climate-change/>

Changing Climate

Study of 800-year-old tree rings backs global warming

The decline in recent decades of the mountain snows that feed the West's major rivers is virtually unprecedented for most of the past millennium, according to new research published today.

By Craig Welch, Seattle Times, Jun 9, 2011

http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/localnews/2015274835_snowpack09m.html

[SEPP Comment: Warming is not the issue, the issue is cause. A study going back 1000 years would be more informative.]

Changing Seas

Changing Tides: Research Center Under Fire for 'Adjusted' Sea-Level Data

By Maxim Lott, Fox News, Jun 17, 2011 [H/t Debbie Wetlaufer]

<http://www.foxnews.com/scitech/2011/06/17/research-center-under-fire-for-adjusted-sea-level-data/>

New sea level dataset now available – still flat

By Bob Tisdale, WUWT, Jun 11, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/11/new-sea-level-dataset-now-available-still-flat/>

What Will Climate Change and Sea Level Rise Mean for Barrier Islands

By Staff Writers, SPX, Jun 16, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/What_Will_Climate_Change_and_Sea_Level_Rise_Mean_for_Barrier_Islands_999.html

[SEPP Comment: No uniform answer – the islands will come and go as they always have.]

The Political Games Continue

Labor spends \$12m on campaign to promote carbon pricing, but has no scheme in place

By Malcolm Farr, News.com AU, Jun 16, 2011

<http://www.news.com.au/national/labor-spends-12-million-on-campaign-to-promote-carbon-pricing-but-has-no-scheme-in-place/story-e6frfkw9-1226076419553#ixzz1PRfoTcHu>

Truth is that Garnaut is partisan

By Greg Sheridan, The Australian, Jun 16, 2011 [H/t Des Moore]

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/commentary/truth-is-that-garnaut-is-partisan/story-e6frgd0x-1226075912763>

A Bill To Make Soros Richer

Editorial, IBD, Jun 14, 2011

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=575282&p=1>

Litigation Issues

Montana Supreme Court rejects the Global Warming petition by Our Children's Trust

By Ed Berry, Climate Physics Institute, June 16, 2011

<http://climatefire.com/2011/06/15/montana-supreme-court-rejects-the-global-warming-petition-by-our-childrens-trust/#more-132>

[SEPP Comment: Important finding – the evidence offered for human-caused global warming is in legally substantial doubt. It appears that the court was less than impressed by the argument that the State must “protect and preserve the atmosphere.”]

Cap-and-Trade and Carbon Taxes

Northeast U.S. Carbon Auction Leaves More Than 2/3 of Allowances Unsold

By Simon Lomax , Bloomberg, Jun 10, 2011 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-06-10/northeast-u-s-carbon-auction-leaves-69-percent-of-allowances-unsold.html>

[SEPP Comment: A pricing bubble?]

EU climate chiefs in row over future of emissions trading

Ambitious new energy efficiency directive could destroy pioneering greenhouse gas trading system

By Fiona Harvey, Guardian, UK, Jun 17, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/jun/17/european-energy-emissions-trading-row>

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

Ethanolics Anonymous

By Rich Trzupke, Front Page, Jun 17, 2011

http://frontpagemag.com/2011/06/17/ethanolics-anonymous/?utm_source=FrontPage+Magazine&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=3e03cedd05-RSS_EMAIL_CAMPAIGN

[SEPP Comment: Although removing the tax credit for ethanol removes a subsidy, the mandate still hurts the public.]

EPA and other Regulators on the March

A Scientific Critique of the EPA’s Proposed “National Emission Standards ...”

By Willie Soon, Jun 2011 [H/t Joe Bast]

[http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/SABPRODUCT.NSF/432EEBD19DE16B2B852578AB0076B922/\\$File/Soon11_June10_comments_EPA_new+rules.pdf](http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/SABPRODUCT.NSF/432EEBD19DE16B2B852578AB0076B922/$File/Soon11_June10_comments_EPA_new+rules.pdf)

[SEPP Comment: Focuses on new mercury standards]

Comment period ends July 5.

Posted comments can be found at:

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/SABPRODUCT.NSF/MeetingCal/4A60092A413F56608525783F0050F148?OpenDocument>

Regulation As Ruinous As Taxation

By Pete Sepp, Editorial, Jun 14, 2011

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=575335&p=1>

EPA Delays GHG Rule for More Public Input

By Staff Writers, Power News, Jun 15, 2011

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3777.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2222006&hq_l=7&hq_v=5e660500d0

AEP to Retire 6 GW in Coal Generation Amid EPA Regulation Concerns

By Staff Writers, Power News, Jun 15, 2011

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3775.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2222006&hq_l=4&hq_v=5e660500d0

[SEPP Comment: About thirty years ago Washington demanded that utilities switch from natural gas and oil to coal, now it is making coal fired plants too expensive to operate.]

Consumers' electric bills likely to spike as coal plants close

As stricter environmental regulations approach, some power generators are choosing to shutter their coal-fired plants.

By Julie Wernau, Chicago Tribune, Jun 11, 2011 [H/t Catherine French]

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/ct-biz-0612-rates-20110611,0,7432941.story>

More regulations: EPA's fantasy solution to unemployment

Editorial, Washington Examiner, Jun 15, 2011

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/2011/06/more-regulations-epas-fantasy-solution-unemployment>

Reptile Roils Oil Patch

Companies Oppose Endangered-Species Tag for Lizard, but Brace for Its Listing

By Ana Campoy, WSJ, Jun 14, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304778304576373663157205344.html?mod=ITP_pageone_1

Energy Issues

Obama: Energy Policy Remains “a Hodgepodge”

By Alexis Simendinger, Real Clear Politics, Jun 15, 2011 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2011/06/15/obama_concedes_energy_policy_remains_a_hodgepodge_110218.html

[SEPP Comment: It appears to be more a policy driven by the environmental industry, as President Obama so chose.]

Get ready for electricity prices to “necessarily skyrocket”

By Ed Morrissey, Hot Air, Jun 12, 2011 [H/t Bob Ferguson, SPPI]

<http://hotair.com/archives/2011/06/12/get-ready-for-electricity-prices-to-necessarily-skyrocket/>

Collaboration Central to OBAMA Administration’s Grid Modernization Plan

By Staff Writers, Power News, Jun 15, 2011

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3776.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2222006&hq_l=5&hq_v=5e660500d0

Nuclear Fears & Responses

Cooling fuel pools at Fukushima

By Staff Writers, Word Nuclear News, Jun 13, 2011

http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/RS-Cooling_fuel_pools_at_Fukushima-1306114.html

German Nuclear Exit Hurts Merkel's Green-Energy Goal

By Vanessa Fuhrmans, WSJ, Jun 15, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304665904576383760044558224.html?mod=ITP_pageone_2

Irate Power Companies to Sue Berlin For Damages

By Frank Dohmen and Alexander Neubacher, Der Spiegel, 13, 2011 [H/t Anne Debeil]

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/business/0,1518,768201,00.html>

Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?

Eagle Ford Oil: 'Resources are Not, Resources Become' (and new jobs galore without government subsidy, President Obama)

By Greg Rehmke, Master Resource, June 16, 2011

<http://www.masterresource.org/2011/06/eagle-ford-oil-jobs-galore/#more-15429>

Shale gas doesn't make Poland the new Norway yet

By Ekke Overbeek, European Energy Review, Jun 14, 2011

<http://www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3051>

Alternative, Green ("Clean") Energy

Wind power and water power collide in the Northwest

Wind farms are furious at the Bonneville Power Administration for making them cut electricity generation because high flows on the Columbia River have led to extra hydropower.

By Kim Murphy, LA Times, Jun 14, 2011

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-adv-wind-energy-20110614,0,1852355.story>

[SEPP Comment: Wind advocates want the power authority to pay others to take the excess power – adding another ludicrous subsidy for wind on top of another.]

Greenbacks for 'green' energy

Lucrative subsidies for renewables amount to crony capitalism

Mackubin Thomas Owens, Washington Times, Jun 10, 2011

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jun/10/greenbacks-for-green-energy/>

Tenfold increase of geothermal power and heat is possible

By Staff Writers, IEA, Jun 15, 2011

<http://www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3055>

[SEPP Comment: All that is needed is more taxpayer funded subsidies.]

Renewable energy sources a priority for military, says report

By Staff Writers, UPI, Jun 13, 2011 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2011/06/13/Renewable-energy-sources-a-priority-for-military-says-report/UPI-26321307993644/

[SEPP Comment: In isolated situations, alternative sources may be very useful. “In the mobility domain, much of the focus is on biofuels and synfuels that can serve as replacements for petrofuels for vehicles ranging from tactical vehicles, trucks and tanks to fighter jets and naval vessels.” Unreal! Oil is high performance and comparatively cheap.]

Pentagon’s First Energy Plan

By Keith Johnson, WSJ, Jun 15, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304665904576385843719478096.html?mod=ITP_pageone_1

“The Navy, for example, has experimented with biofuel-powered F-18 fighter jets and is developing the “Great Green Fleet,” an aircraft-carrier strike group that will be powered exclusively by alternative fuels and aims to ship out by 2016.”

[SEPP Comment: Apparently the Pentagon is blissfully unaware of the drilling revolution taking place in the US. As usual it is fighting the last war. May be behind a paywall.]

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

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

Coralline Algal Growth Reveals History of North Atlantic Climate

Reference: Halfar, J., Hetzinger, S., Adey, W., Zack, T., Gamboa, G., Kunz, B., Williams, B. and Jacob, D.E. 2011. Coralline algal growth-increment widths archive North Atlantic climate variability.

Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 302: 71-80.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jun/14jun2011a2.html>

[SEPP Comment: Additional studies indicating the 1920s and 1930s may have been warmer than today in the mid to upper latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere.]

Surviving Global Warming by Migrating Mere Meters ... or Even Millimeters

Reference: Suggitt, A.J., Gillingham, P.K., Hill, J.K., Huntley, B., Kunin, W.E., Roy D.B. and Thomas, C.D. 2011. Habitat microclimates drive fine-scale variation in extreme temperatures. Oikos 120: 1-8.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jun/14jun2011a4.html>

Himalayan Glaciers

Reference: Chaujar, R.K. 2009. Climate change and its impact on the Himalayan glaciers - a case study on the Chorabari glacier, Garhwal Himalaya, India. Current Science 96: 703-708.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jun/15jun2011a3.html>

[SEPP Comment: Another review of the report that contradicted the IPCC claim of the complete melting of the Himalayan Glaciers by 2035. IPCC head, R.K. Pachauri, called the report “voodoo science.”]

No Long-term Trend in Atlantic Hurricane Numbers

Reference: Villarini, G., Vecchi, G.A., Knutson, T.R. and Smith, J.A. 2011. Is the recorded increase in short-duration North Atlantic tropical storms spurious? Journal of Geophysical Research 116: D10114, doi:10.1029/2010JD015493.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jun/15jun2011a6.html>

Health, Energy and Climate

When climate gets wetter, plagues get worse

That's the conclusion of study in China about changes in precipitation levels

By Katharine Gammon, MSNBC, Jun 14, 2011

http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/43398016/ns/technology_and_science-science/

[SEPP Comment: No mention of temperatures. Of course the great plagues of Europe hit during the Little Ice Age.]

Oh Mann!

Computer Scientist Goes on Offensive to Defend Climate Scientists

By Eli Kintisch, Science Magazine, Jun 10, 2011

<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/332/6035/1250.short>

[SEPP Comment: Defending Michael Mann by attacking scientists whose work exposed him. May be behind a paywall.]

Environmental Industry

Obama is packing the government with Big Green ideologues

By Ron Arnold, Washington Examiner, Jun 6, 2011

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columnists/2011/06/obama-packing-government-big-green-ideologues>

Frankenpipeline

Environmental groups spout misinformation on Keystone pipeline

By Peter Foster, Financial Post, Jun 16, 2011

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/06/16/junk-science-week-frankenpipeline/>

Greenpeace Again Scales Oil Rig

By Alexis Flynn, WSJ, Jun 17, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303823104576391253675075870.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

[SEPP Comment: The courts and laws do not apply to the environmental industry. May be behind a paywall.]

Other News that May Be of Interest

Junk Science Week: Lipstick, apples & sperm counts

By Terence Corcoran Jun 13, 2011 – 10:40 PM ET | Last Updated: Jun 14, 2011

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/06/13/terence-corcoran-lipstick-apples-sperm-counts/>

No climate death in Venice

By Terence Corcoran, Financial Post, Jun 15, 2011

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/06/15/junk-science-week-no-climate-death-in-venice/>

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

The Ice Age is coming ... don't panic

By Richard Littlejohn, Daily Mail, UK, Jun 17, 2011 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2004463/Cooler-Earth-The-Ice-Age-coming--dont-panic.html>

10 reasons to be cheerful about the coming new Ice Age

By James Delingpole, Telegraph, UK, Jun 15, 2011 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100092280/10-reasons-to-be-cheerful-about-the-coming-new-ice-age/>

Another stupid polar publicity stunt – “Row To The Pole

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Jun 15, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/15/another-stupid-polar-publicity-stun-row-to-the-pole/>

[SEPP Comment: See the update]

#####

ARTICLES:

1. On The Hijacking of the American Meteorological Society (AMS)

By Bill Gray, WUWT, Jun 16, 2011

(AMS Fellow, Charney Award recipient, and over 50-year member)

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/16/on-the-hijacking-of-the-american-meteorological-society-ams/>

On The Hijacking of the American Meteorological Society (AMS)

by Bill Gray

Professor Emeritus

Colorado State University

(AMS Fellow, Charney Award recipient, and over 50-year member)

June 2011

I am very disappointed at the downward path the AMS has been following for the last 10-15 years in its advocacy of the Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) hypothesis. The society has officially taken a position many of us AMS members do not agree with. We believe that humans are having little or no significant influence on the global climate and that the many Global Circulation Climate Model (GCMs) results and the four IPCC reports do not realistically give accurate future projections. To take this position which so many of its members do not necessarily agree with shows that the AMS is following more of a political than a scientific agenda.

The AMS Executive Director Keith Seitter and the other AMS higher-ups and the Council have not shown the scientific maturity and wisdom we would expect of our AMS leaders. I question whether they know just how far off-track the AMS has strayed since they foolishly took such a strong pro-AGW stance.

The American Meteorological Society (AMS) was founded in 1919 as an organization dedicated to advancing scientific knowledge of weather and climate. It has been a wonderful beacon for fostering new understanding of how the atmosphere and oceans function. But this strong positive image is now becoming tarnished as a result of the AMS leadership's capitulating to the lobby of the climate modelers and to the outside environmental and political pressure groups who wish to use the current AMS position on AGW to help justify the promotion of their own special interests. The effectiveness of the AMS as an objective scientific organization is being greatly compromised.

We AMS members have allowed a small group of AMS administrators, climate modelers, and CO₂ warming sympathizers to maneuver the internal workings of our society to support AGW policies irrespective of what our rank-and-file members might think. **This small organized group of AGW sympathizers has indeed hijacked our society.**

The AMS should be acting as a facilitator for the scientific debate on the pro and con aspects of the AGW hypothesis, not to take a side in the issue. The AMS has not held the type of open and honest scientific debates on the AGW hypothesis which they should have. Why have they dodged open discussion on such an important issue? I've been told that the American Economic Society does not take sides on controversial economic issues but acts primarily to help in stimulating back and forth discussion. This is what the AMS should have been doing but haven't.

James Hansen's predictions of global warming made before the Senate in 1988 are turning out to be very much less than he had projected. He cannot explain why there has been no significant global warming over the last 10-12 years.

Many of us AMS members believe that the modest global warming we have observed is of natural origin and due to multi-decadal and multi-century changes in the globe's deep ocean circulation resulting from salinity variations. These changes are not associated with CO₂ increases. Most of the GCM modelers have little experience in practical meteorology. They do not realize that the strongly chaotic nature of the atmosphere-ocean climate system does not allow for skillful initial value numerical climate prediction. The GCM simulations are badly flawed in at least two fundamental ways:

1. Their upper tropospheric water vapor feedback loop is grossly wrong. They assume that increases in atmospheric CO₂ will cause large upper-tropospheric water vapor increases which are very unrealistic. Most of their model warming follows from these invalid water vapor assumptions. Their handlings of rainfall processes are quite inadequate.
2. They lack an understanding and treatment of the fundamental role of the deep ocean circulation (i.e. Meridional Overturning Circulation – MOC) and how the changing ocean circulation (driven by salinity variations) can bring about wind, rainfall, and surface temperature changes independent of radiation and greenhouse gas changes. These ocean processes are not properly incorporated in their models. They assume the physics of global warming is entirely a product of radiation changes and radiation feedback processes. They neglect variations in global evaporation which is more related to surface wind speed and ocean minus surface and air temperature differences. These are major deficiencies.

The Modelers' Free Ride. It is surprising that GCMs have been able to get away with their unrealistic modeling efforts for so long. One explanation is that they have received strong support from Senator/Vice President Al Gore and other politicians who for over three decades have attempted to make political capital out of increasing CO₂ measurements. Another reason is the many environmental and political groups (including the mainstream media) have been eager to use the GCM climate results as justification to push their own special interests that are able to fly under the global warming banner. A third explanation is that they have not been challenged by their peer climate modeling groups who apparently have seen possibilities for similar research grant support and publicity by copying Hansen and the earlier GCM modelers.

I anticipate that we are going to experience a modest naturally-driven global cooling over the next 15-20 years. This will be similar to the weak global cooling that occurred between the early-1940s and the mid-1970s. It is to be noted that CO₂ amounts were also rising during this earlier cooling period which were opposite to the expected CO₂-temperature association.

An expected 15-20 year cooling will occur (in my view) because of the current strong ocean Meridional Overturning Circulation (MOC) that has now been established in the last decade and a half and ought to continue for another couple of decades. I explain most of the last century and-a-half general global warming since the mid-1800s (start of the industrial revolution) to be a result of a long multi-century slowdown in the ocean's MOC circulation. Increases of CO₂ could have contributed only a small fraction (0.1-0.2°C) of the roughly ~ 0.7°C surface warming that has been observed since 1850. Natural processes have had to have been responsible for most of the observed warming over the last century and a half.

Debate. The AMS is the most relevant of our country's scientific societies as regards to its members having the most extensive scientific and technical background in meteorology and climate. It should have been a leader in helping to adjudicate the claims of the AGW advocates and their skeptical critics. Our country's Anglo-Saxon derived legal system is based on the idea that the best way to get to the truth is to have opposite sides of a continuous issue present their differing views in open debate before a non partisan jury. Nothing like this has happened with regards to the AGW issue. Instead of organizing meetings with free and open debates on the basic physics and the likelihood of AGW induced climate

changes, the leaders of the society (with the backing of the society's AGW enthusiasts) have chosen to fully trust the climate models and deliberately avoid open debate on this issue. I know of no AMS sponsored conference where the AGW hypothesis has been given open and free discussion. For a long time I have wanted a forum to express my skepticism of the AGW hypothesis. No such opportunities ever came within the AMS framework. Attempts at publication of my skeptic views have been difficult. One rejection stated that I was too far out of the mainstream thinking. Another that my ideas had already been discredited. A number of AGW skeptics have told me they have had similar experiences.

The climate modelers and their supporters deny the need for open debate of the AGW question on the grounds that the issue has already been settled by their model results. They have taken this view because they know that the physics within their models and the long range of their forecast periods will likely not be able to withstand knowledgeable and impartial review. They simply will not debate the issue. As a defense against criticism they have resorted to a general denigration of those of us who do not support their AGW hypothesis. AGW skeptics are sometimes tagged (I have been) as no longer being credible scientists. Skeptics are often denounced as tools of the fossil-fuel industry. A type of McCarthyism against AGW skeptics has been in display for a number of years.

Recent AMS Awardees. Since 2000 the AMS has awarded its annual highest award (Rossby Research Medal) to the following AGW advocates or AGW sympathizers; Susan Solomon (00), V. Ramanathan (02), Peter Webster (04), Jagadish Shukla (05), Kerry Emanuel (07), Isaac Held (08) and James Hansen (09). Its second highest award (Charney Award) has gone to AGW warming advocates or sympathizers; Kevin Trenberth (00), Rich Rotunno (04), Graeme Stephens (05) Robert D. Cess (06), Allan Betts (07), Gerald North (08) and Warren Washington and Gerald Meehl (09). And the other Rossby and Charney awardees during this period are not known to be critics of the AGW warming hypothesis.

The AGW biases within the AMS policy makers is so entrenched that it would be impossible for well known and established scientists (but AGW skeptics) such as Fred Singer, Pat Michaels, Bill Cotton, Roger Pielke, Sr., Roy Spencer, John Christie, Joe D'Aleo, Bob Balling, Jr., Craig Idso, Willie Soon, etc. to ever be able to receive an AMS award – irrespective of the uniqueness or brilliance of their research.

What Working Meteorologists Say. My interaction (over the years) with a broad segment of AMS members (that I have met as a result of my seasonal hurricane forecasting and other activities) who have spent a sizable portion of their careers down in the meteorological trenches of observations and forecasting, have indicated that a majority of them do not agree that humans are the primary cause of global warming. These working meteorologists are too experienced and too sophisticated to be hoodwinked by the lobby of global climate modelers and their associated propagandists. I suggest that the AMS conduct a survey of its members who are actually working with real time weather-climate data to see how many agree that humans have been the main cause of global warming and that there was justification for the AMS's 2009 Rossby Research Medal (highest AMS award) going to James Hansen.

Global Environmental Problems. There is no question that global population increases and growing industrialization have caused many environmental problems associated with air and water pollution, industrial contamination, unwise land use, and hundreds of other human-induced environmental irritants. But all these human-induced environmental problems will not go away by a draconian effort to reduce CO₂ emissions. CO₂ is not a pollutant but a fertilizer. Humankind needs fossil-fuel energy to maintain its industrial lifestyle and to expand this lifestyle in order to be able to better handle these many other non-CO₂ environmental problems. There appears to be a misconception among many people that by reducing CO₂ we are dealing with our most pressing environmental problem. Not so.

It must be remembered that advanced industrial societies do more for the global environment than do poor societies. By greatly reducing CO₂ emissions and paying a great deal more for our then needed renewable

energy we will lower our nation's standard of living and not be able to help relieve as many of our and the globe's many environmental, political, and social problems.

Obtaining a Balanced View on AGW. To understand what is really occurring with regards to the AGW question one must now bypass the AMS, the mainstream media, and the mainline scientific journals. They have mostly been preconditioned to accept the AGW hypothesis and, in general, frown on anyone not agreeing that AGW is, next to nuclear war, our society's most serious long range problem.

To obtain any kind of a balanced back-and-forth discussion on AGW one has to consult the many web blogs that are both advocates and skeptics of AGW. These blogs are the only source for real open debate on the validity of the AGW hypothesis. Here is where the real science of the AGW question is taking place. Over the last few years the weight of evidence, as presented in these many blog discussions, is beginning to swing against the AGW hypothesis. As the globe fails to warm as the GCMs have predicted the American public is gradually losing its belief in the prior claims of Gore, Hansen, and the other many AGW advocates.

Prediction. The AMS is going to be judged in future years as having foolishly sacrificed its sterling scientific reputation for political and financial expediency. I am sure that hundreds of our older deceased AMS members are rolling in their graves over what has become of their and our great society.

2. Term 'sustainability' widely misused

By Charles Battig, VA-SEEE, Letter, Daily Progress, Jun 12, 2011

<http://www2.dailyprogress.com/news/2011/jun/12/term-sustainability-widely-misused-ar-1103248>

I support sustainability; I support responsible environmental stewardship; I support freedom of choice and private property rights. These aims are self-consistent.

What is not consistent is the high-jacking of the term "sustainability" by radical extremists who would use that same word as a code word for an agenda to implement their central planning objectives on all members of the public. This is an entirely different vision of "sustainability." This is "mandated sustainability" as determined by the social elites.

It is a virulent strain of politically defined sustainability born of a Norwegian socialist in the Brundtland Commission Report of 1987. These radicals openly seek to count, measure, pass judgment on, limit and define allowed public behavior and use of private property under their self-imposed determination of what they tell the ordinary citizen is "sustainable."

The benign interpretation of sustainability is the camouflage of language used by the social activists to hoodwink the well-meaning citizen, and diminish the concerns of citizens frightened of losing their constitutional rights.

I support "sustaining" our U.S. Constitution and our inalienable rights it enumerates.

3. The Return of the Population Bomb

When the experts tell you there are too many people, they don't mean too many Swedes

By William McGurn, WSJ, Jun 14, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303714704576383764019676614.html?mod=ITP_opinion_0

When Marx wrote that history repeats itself, first as tragedy, then as farce, he had it half correct. In our day, it comes back as the 1970s.

All around us we see its manifestation in the revival of floppy hats, platform shoes and maxi dresses. We can, however, also detect this same retro fashion sense on the op-ed page of the New York Times. There last week Tom Friedman's column carried one of the sentiments most in vogue in the 1970s: "The Earth Is Full."

Mr. Friedman invokes the usual grim specters so beloved of a certain kind of intellectual: natural disasters (tornadoes, floods and droughts); rising prices (food and energy); the threat to stability; and of course the kicker—that there are just too many darn people around these days.

It's a familiar meme, and it comes bearing the familiar scientific credentials. In this case the authority is, Mr. Friedman tells us, "an alliance of scientists" called the Global Footprint Network, "which calculates how many 'planet Earths' we need to sustain our growth rates." Right now they say it is 1.5. Which can mean only one thing unless we cut way, way back: We're doomed.

Back in the days of bad hair and Jimmy Carter, this kind of report was a staple of enlightened thought. Here is but a tiny sampling:

- On the eve of that decade, Stanford University biologist Paul Ehrlich opened his best-selling book "The Population Bomb" with this sunny declaration: "The battle to feed all humanity is over. In the 1970s, the world will undergo famines—hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death." Of course, nothing of the kind happened.
- The Club of Rome, an international group of academics, scientists and global citizens, commissioned a now-infamous 1972 report called "The Limits to Growth." Like so many others, these scientists informed us that we were running out of . . . well . . . everything.
- Or take Robert McNamara, the "whiz kid" president of Ford Motor Co. Later, as chief of the World Bank, he would throw tens of millions of development dollars into population control because he said—sounding much like Mr. Friedman—the alternative was a world no one would want. If voluntary methods failed, he warned, nations would resort to coercion.

All these things were the received orthodoxies of their day, endorsed by the experts, sustained by the scientists, and challenged by only a few brave souls such as economist Julian Simon. From these pet orthodoxies two clear implications flowed.

First, when the experts tell you there are too many people, they don't mean too many Swedes. They mean too many poor people, mostly brown or black or yellow. In Hong Kong, I stumbled across a 1959 book written by an American entitled "Too Many Asians." Today the focus has shifted from Asia—but the theme remains. Early last month, the New York Times ran a page-one story citing United Nations warnings about the growing population of Africa.

Second, if the experts continue to tell countries they need to control their population or else, Mr. McNamara is absolutely right: That "or else" is going to mean coercion.

We saw that throughout the 1970s as well.

In India, the government of Indira Gandhi launched a massive and brutal sterilization campaign. In China, women's monthly periods were charted on blackboards at their places of work—and even today women are sometimes hunted down and forced to abort if they become pregnant without permission. Meanwhile, in the early 1980s, black women in Namibia complained about being forcibly injected with contraceptives after having their first babies. From Peru to the Philippines, the poor and vulnerable were subject to similar outrages.

The one difference between the 1970s and today is this: Back then, the worry was that poor nations would never advance. Today we know they can and are developing.

That's precisely the fear: that as people are eating better and living longer and making their way up the ladder, they will want more of the things that we take for granted—cars, air conditioners, refrigerators and so on. Indeed, the really big dreamers might even hope one day to have for their families the kind of carbon-footprint-maximizing manse that Mr. Friedman has for his family in Maryland.

Ironically, by almost any human measure—food consumption, life expectancy, access to clean water, etc.—life is getting better, not worse. So why the recurring predictions of catastrophe? Partly it's because the apostles of population control assume that resources are fixed and immune to human creativity or effort. In this view, human beings are primarily seen as mouths instead of minds.

The 1970s has many ugly legacies. Surely, however, the cruelest was this leading Western export: the idea that the Earth has reached its limit with us, and that the solution is to persuade other folks who don't yet have what we do to lower both their populations and their expectations.

4. The EPA's War on Jobs

Coal is from Earth, Lisa Jackson is from mercury.

Editorial, WSJ, Jun 13, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703818204576206662079202844.html?mod=ITP_opinion_2

President Obama's jobs council will make its first recommendations today on lifting hiring and strengthening the economy. Too bad the message doesn't seem to be reaching the Administration's regulators, in particular the Environmental Protection Agency.

The EPA is currently conducting a campaign against coal-fired power and one of its most destructive weapons is a pending regulation to limit mercury and other hazardous air pollutants like dioxins or acid gases that power plants emit. The 946-page rule mandates that utilities install "maximum achievable control technology" under the Clean Air Act—and even by the EPA's lowball estimates, it is the most expensive rule in the agency's history.

In 1990, Congress gave the EPA discretion to decide if mercury regulation is "necessary and appropriate," and the Clinton Administration did so in its final days. The Bush Administration created a modest mercury program, only to have it overturned by an appeals court on technical grounds in its final days. The case was still in litigation when Mr. Obama took office, and his appointees used the opening to strafe the power industry, proposing a much more stringent rule.

The EPA issued the utility rule in March, with only 60 days for public comment. Basic administrative practice usually affords between 120 and 180 days, especially for complex or costly regulations of this scale. The proposal was obviously rushed, with numerous errors like overstating U.S. mercury emissions by a factor of 1,000. The word in Washington is that the openly politicized process unsettled even the EPA's career staff.

The agency estimates that the utility rule will cost \$10.9 billion annually but will yield as much as \$140 billion in total health and environmental benefits. Sounds like a deal. But most of those alleged benefits are *indirect*—i.e., not from the mercury reductions that the rule is supposed to be for. Rather, they come from pollutants ("airborne particles") that the EPA *already* regulates under other parts of the Clean Air Act. A good analogy is a corporation double-counting revenue.

According to the EPA's own numbers, every dollar in direct benefits costs \$1,847. The reason is that electric generation—yes, even demon coal—results in negligible quantities of air pollutants like mercury. And mercury is on the decline: In 2005, the entire U.S. coal fleet emitted 26% less than the EPA predicted.

The real goal of the EPA's rule is to shut down fossil fuel electric power in the name of climate change. The consensus estimate in the private sector is that the utility rule and eight others on the EPA docket will force the retirement of 60 out of the country's current 340 gigawatts of coal-fired capacity. Reliability downgrades will hit the South and Midwest where coal energy is concentrated. American Electric Power recently announced that the rules will force it to shut down five plants in West Virginia and Ohio, a quarter of its coal fleet.

The power industry estimates that the true costs of the utility rule will far exceed the EPA estimates, which of course will be passed to consumers and businesses as higher prices. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, normally a White House union ally, says the rule will destroy 50,000 jobs and another 200,000 down the supply chain. That's more jobs lost than if Boeing went bust.

Astonishingly, EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson claimed in March that the utility rule is "expected to create jobs," because it will "increase demand for pollution control technology" and "new workers will be needed to install, operate, and maintain" it. In other words, the government should harm an industry and force it to ruin working assets so maybe other people can clean up the mess.

Such theories help explain why the economic recovery and job creation are far weaker than they ought to be, but the good news is that even many Democrats are beginning to push back against the EPA's willful damage. The least Congress can do is force the EPA to delay the final utility rule to allow for more public debate, though a better option would be to junk it.

5. America Needs the Shale Revolution

The drilling boom is the best U.S. energy news in generations and is crucial for reviving domestic manufacturing.

By Robert Bryce, WSJ, Jun 13, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304432304576369140191493636.html?mod=ITP_opini_on_0

The U.S. is on the verge of an industrial renaissance if—and it's a big if—policy makers don't foul it up by restricting the ability of drillers to use the technology that's making a renaissance possible: hydraulic fracturing.

The shale drilling boom now underway in Texas, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma and other states is already creating jobs, slashing natural-gas prices, and spurring billions of dollars of investment in new production capacity for critical commodities like steel and petrochemicals. Better yet, it's spurring a huge increase in domestic oil production, which has been falling steadily since the 1970s.

Despite the myriad benefits of the low-cost hydrocarbons that are now being produced thanks to hydraulic fracturing, the media, environmental groups and politicians are hyping the possible dangers of the process, which uses high-pressure pumps to force water, sand and chemicals into shale formations. Doing so fractures the formation and allows the extraction of natural gas or petroleum.

Although hydraulic fracturing has been used more than one million times in the U.S. over the past 60 years, environmental activists are hoping to ban the process or have it regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Opponents claim the process can harm groundwater even though drinking-

water aquifers are separated by as much as two miles of impermeable rock from the shales that are being targeted by the fracturing process.

New York currently has a moratorium on hydraulic fracturing. On May 31, New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman sued several federal agencies, claiming they had not done a proper environmental assessment on the possible effects of drilling in the New York City watershed. On June 6, the New York Assembly passed a bill that will ban all forms of hydraulic fracturing in the state until mid-2012. And the EPA has launched "a comprehensive research study" on the possible "adverse impact that hydraulic fracturing may have on water quality and public health" nationwide.

Despite the opposition, some of America's biggest industrial companies are evangelizing about the merits of natural gas. Among the most fervent advocates are John Surma, the CEO of U.S. Steel, and Dan DiMicco, the CEO of Nucor. Mr. Surma told me in an interview that the shale revolution is "the first bit of good news in U.S. manufacturing in two decades." Mr. DiMicco went further, telling me that "we could change the entire manufacturing base in the U.S. if we just embrace what's happening in natural gas."

In March, Nucor, America's biggest steel producer, broke ground on a new \$750 million direct-reduced-iron (DRI) plant in Louisiana. The plant's key commodity is low-cost natural gas, which will be superheated and then mixed with iron ore pellets and scrap in a furnace. The DRI process allows companies to produce about the same amount of steel with about a quarter of the capital they'd need to build a conventional integrated steel plant. And they can produce that steel with lower carbon-dioxide emissions because they are replacing metallurgical coal with methane.

Nucor may ultimately invest \$3 billion in Louisiana on plants that could create as many as 1,000 permanent, high-paying jobs. Meanwhile, U.S. Steel may soon build a DRI plant of its own.

Thanks to hydraulic fracturing, U.S. drillers are producing lots of ethane and propane, which are key feedstocks for the petrochemical sector. Last October, Chevron Phillips Chemical Company announced plans to build a new plant in Baytown, Texas that will provide components for the production of polyethylene, a plastic resin used to make milk jugs and beverage containers. A few months later, the company said it was examining the feasibility of building a major petrochemical plant on the Gulf Coast.

In April, Dow Chemical announced plant expansions at several facilities in Louisiana and Texas, including construction of a new ethylene plant on the Gulf Coast that will begin operating in 2017 and a new propylene production facility that will begin operating by 2015. Dow's reason for the expansions: "competitively priced ethane and propane feedstocks." And last week Shell announced that it is developing plans to build a large ethylene plant in the Appalachian region. Ethylene and propylene are building blocks for a wide variety of consumer products including plastics, fibers and lubricants.

The drilling industry itself is creating jobs. Over the past 12 months, some 48,000 people were hired in Pennsylvania by companies working in the Marcellus Shale, a massive deposit that underlies several Eastern states, including Pennsylvania and New York.

While the Pennsylvania economy is getting a much-needed lift from drilling, opposition in New York may mean that the state loses out on jobs and investment. A new study by Tim Considine, an energy economist at the University of Wyoming, estimates that drilling in the Marcellus Shale could add as many as 15,000 new jobs to the New York economy by 2015. The study, conducted for the Manhattan Institute (a think tank where I am a senior fellow), estimated that shale drilling in New York could add some \$1.7 billion to the state's economy by 2015 and increase the state's tax revenue by more than \$200 million.

Regardless of what happens in New York, hydraulic fracturing is unlocking huge quantities of oil from shale. In March, domestic crude production was 5.63 million barrels per day, the highest level since 2003. Amazingly, production is rising despite the Obama administration's de facto moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. And shale oil production will likely continue rising from deposits like the Bakken Shale in North Dakota, where state officials are predicting output will hit 700,000 barrels per day by 2018, double the state's current production.

A vibrant industrial base requires cheap, abundant and reliable sources of energy. The shale revolution now underway is the best news for North American energy since the discovery of the East Texas Field in 1930. We can't afford to let fear of a proven technology stop the much-needed resurgence of American industry.

Mr. Bryce is a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute. His fourth book, "Power Hungry: The Myths of 'Green' Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future" (PublicAffairs), was recently published in paperback.

#####