The Week That Was: 2013-09-14 (September 14, 2013)
Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)
The Science and Environmental Policy Project

# Quote of the Week: "What is wanted is not the will to believe, but the will to find out, which is the exact opposite." - Bertrand Russell [H/t William Ready]

# Number of the Week: 90%

# Major New Report on Climate Science -- Says Global Warming Is Not a Crisis

The Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) will release a major new report on climate-change science produced by an international team of 40 scientists at a press conference on September 17 at the James R. Thompson Center in downtown Chicago.

The new report, titled Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science, challenges what its authors say are the overly alarmist reports of the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), whose next report is due out later this month.

What: Press conference announcing release of Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science
When: 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, September 17.
Where: James R. Thompson Center
100 West Randolph Street
Press Room (15th Floor)
Chicago, Illinois USA

Who: Lead author S. Fred Singer, Ph.D., professor emeritus of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia, Chairman of the Science and Environmental Policy Project
Lead author Craig Idso, Ph.D., Chairman, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change
Co-author Willie Soon, Ph.D., Chief Science Advisor, Science and Public Policy Institute

Media: Open to all credentialed press

Copies of a Summary for Policymakers, an executive summary, and the entire book (unbound) will be available to reporters at the news conference. All three documents will be available for free online following the news conference.

# Book Launch Luncheon, Wednesday September 18, 11:30 to 1:30pm
Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science
Presenters: S. Fred Singer, Craig Idso, and Willie Soon
The Heartland Institute, One South Wacker Drive # 2740; Chicago, IL 60606
Cost: $15.00; Contact Tonya Houston at thouston@heartland.org or call 312-377-4000

# Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science
Science the U.N. Will Exclude from its Next Climate Report
September 23, Noon, Heritage Foundation Allison Auditorium
Lead authors Fred Singer and Bob Carter will be making presentations in Europe and in California. Details to follow.

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

IPCC: On September 27, the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is scheduled to release the first part of its Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), including the politically negotiated Summary for Policymakers (SPM), and the Working Group I section that contains the science supporting the SPM. This is a departure from prior releases when the SPM came out long before the scientific section was ready for release.

Much has happened since the last major report, AR4, was released in 2007. Numerous scientists exposed glaring IPCC mistakes, Climategate exposed game playing of many of the participants, etc. Probably most importantly, nature has undermined the credibility of the IPCC and the entire climate establishment and their models by refusing to allow the globe to warm, over 15 years on the surface and about a decade in the atmosphere. This failure to warm is in spite of human emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) continuing to increase, directly contradicting the prior claims of the IPCC and its followers that CO2 is the control knob of climate. Of the industrial countries, only the United States has significantly reduced CO2 emissions – without any governmental mandates to do so.

Writing in the Wall Street Journal and on the web site of Anthony Watts, Matt Ridley reports he has seen a key prediction in the new documents – the IPCC will reduce the most extreme projection of warming from a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide somewhat, 30%, as compared with its 2007 projections.

Writing on his web site, The Reference Frame, Luboš Motl is far from impressed. Motl thinks that based on the scientific [physical] evidence the warming from a doubling of CO2 would about 0.5 to 1.5 deg C. This is different than the values obtained by using computer models that have not been validated. Also, Motl is disturbed by the IPCC’s continued use of unsubstantiated probabilities in making its projections.

We shall have to wait to see what the final documents actually contain. Please see Article # 1 and links under Problems in the Orthodoxy.

SCC: Monday marks the last day for public comment to the Department of Energy on the Social Costs or Carbon (SCC) as recalculated by US government agencies, without legislative authority. The specific issue seems trivial – the electricity use by microwave ovens. But this is how some agencies now operate. Establish regulations on a trivial issue, then slowly expand such regulations to other non-trivial areas until no one dare question the authority of the agencies for asserting such questionable power. One can label it as industrial policy by bureaucracy. The strategy was successfully employed by the EPA and the Corps of Engineers in regulating privately owned properties, labeled wetlands, even though many of the labeled wetlands had no water.
Several Washington think-tanks are submitting comments, including the Heritage Foundation, CATO, and the Competitive Enterprise Institute. One issue is sea level rise. Is it proper for the government agencies to apply future sea level rise from projected global warming from CO2 emissions to US industries when US emissions are falling and countries such as China are the principal sources of increasing emissions?

Another main issues is the appropriate discount rate, how to value the possible future harm in today’s economy? The lower the discount rate the higher possible future harm is valued in today’s economy. The New York Times carried an interesting article presenting the issue as being a moral vs. business issue. The moral standpoint will be a low discount rate, thus a high present value assigned to future warming. The business standpoint is a high discount rate with a low present value.

This is the logical fallacy of a false dilemma. The real moral issue is what right do government agencies have for imposing costs on industry and the public for emitting CO2 when the government agencies have failed to produce a valid climate model that has been shown to successfully predict future global warming? At this point, it has not been scientifically established if CO2 emissions are a net cost or a net benefit. The NIPCC reports have reviewed thousands of studies showing increased atmospheric CO2 is a benefit. SEPP is submitting its comments on SCC, which will probably differ from most. Please see links under Social Cost of Carbon.

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

**Supreme Court:** The US Supreme Court begins its fall session on October 7. It may announce its decision of whether or not to hear the challenges to the EPA Endangerment Finding at that time, or sometime afterwards.

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

**Australia’s Election:** The coalition that opposed Australia’s carbon tax has announced the dismantling of significant climate change programs. But it does not have clear control of the Senate. Thus, the status of the carbon tax is not yet clear. Please see links under Questioning Green Elsewhere and Cap and Trade and Carbon Taxes.

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

**Benefits of Smart Drilling:** The Wall Street Journal has two articles on the great benefits to the poor from the US oil and gas revolution. The revolution can be described as obtaining oil and gas from dense shale, deep underground by applying precision directional drilling, multi-port hydraulic fracturing, insertion of sand or small ceramics to keep fractures open, and use of selected chemicals to promote continued oil gas flow.

Many politicians oppose the revolution, preferring to believe the false claims of the Sierra Club and other extreme environmental groups. The actions of these politicians and environmental groups demonstrates how insensitive they are to the plight of less fortunate humans. Please see Articles #2 and #3.

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

**Demolishing Icons?** On his web site, Bernard Lewin has begun a series to investigate the various depictions of temperatures over the past 1000 years, and longer, that have appeared in IPCC publications. The first of the series centers on the writings of H.H. Lamb, particularly the Medieval Warm Period. Lewin’s analysis may prove to be illuminating and controversial. Please see link under Seeking a Common Ground.

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

**Global Cooling?** Several articles and web posts have appeared proclaiming global cooling. The authors doing so are using the same logical fallacy as many global warming advocates – the hasty
generalizations. Very simply, the existing data has too short a term to declare a trend. Warming has stopped, we do not know if the warming will resume, or if temperatures will remain roughly steady, or if there will be definitive cooling. Certainly, the failure of the Arctic Ice to melt to the extent that it did last year is not a trend. That said, solar scientists may have theoretical reasons for stating the earth will cool. Please see links under Changing Cryosphere – Land / Sea Ice.

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

**Responsibility:** Judith Curry has two posts on responsible conduct in research enterprises and developing a standard for policy relevant science. In the latter post she quotes extensively from Ian Boyd, who is science advisor for the UK Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs. Boyd points out how bias often enters into government sponsored research, no matter how unintentional. Curry concludes her post with: *JC request of the IPCC: Please replace Rachendra Pachauri with Ian Boyd.*

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

**Additions and Corrections:** Last week, TWTW carried an article by Fred Singer in the American Thinker on data trends. Unfortunately, Singer omitted the clause that the spike in temperatures in 1998 should be discounted because it is widely accepted that it was the result of a strong El Nino. Otherwise, his argument stands, that surface temperature trends prior to around 2000 may be over-estimated.

Vincent Gray continued the discussion on hypothesis testing as stated by Feynman, which was challenged by Professor Cramer, who stated that the null (no association between two phenomena) must be tested. Gray writes:

“I object to the reformulation of Feynman’s argument on statistics by Professor Cramer. He does not explain how it is possible to test for a “level of confidence”.

*If a scientific theory is successful in predicting all possible future behaviour you are justified in rejecting the null hypothesis and to have confidence in it.*

*Sometimes a theory is only successful in a limited range of circumstances. You may have confidence within this range but not outside it where the null hypothesis is accepted.*

*The IPCC claims “levels of confidence” in its theories which are no more than the personal opinions of “experts” who usually have a conflict of interest. None of the models has been shown capable of successful prediction of future climate behaviour. The null hypothesis still stands.*

*Until the theories have been shown to successfully predict a range of future climate behaviour over all the circumstances for which they are claimed to be valid they need to be rejected and the null hypothesis accepted.”*

[Behaviour is spelled the New Zealand way.]

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

**Number of the Week:** 90% According to energy economist Mark Perry, data from the Energy Information Administration shows that in May the total energy produced in the US is was 90% of total consumption. The last time the percentage was that high was in September 1987. The change is dramatic from about 70% in 2006-7, when Washington refused to expand production in the Federal government controlled lands of Alaska, falsely claiming it would not help the US. Although the difference between production and consumption swings widely during the year, Perry’s five graphs illustrate the US oil and gas revolution – which many politicians and environmentalists desire to stop.
ARTICLES:
For the numbered articles below please see this week’s TWTW at: www.sepp.org. The articles are at the end of the pdf.

1. Dialing Back the Alarm on Climate Change
A forthcoming report points lowers estimates on global warming
By Matt Ridley, WSJ, Sep 13, 2013
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324549004579067532485712464.html

2. Fracking and the Poor
The natural gas boom may be America's best antipoverty program.
Editorial, WSJ, Sep 6, 2013
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323340578543613292394192.html?
mod=ITP_opinion_2

3. More on Fracking and the Poor
The U.S. oil and gas boom added $1,200 to disposable income in 2012.
Editorial, WSJ, Sep 10, 2013
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324094704579065432802151184.html

4. Japan and the Fate of Nuclear Power Radiation phobia prevents a rational response to Fukushima.
By Holman Jenkins, WSJ, Sep 10, 2013
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324094704579066751347436222.html

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Climategate Continued
IPCC and the end of summer
By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Sep 11, 2013
[SEPP Comment: A lengthy post on the improper use of proxy data including tree rings and certain lake sediments.]

Challenging the Orthodoxy
Climate Change Reconsidered II to be Released on September 17
By Jim Lakely, Somewhat Reasonable, Aug 29, 2013

The Earth’s Energy Imbalance,
By Vincent Gray, NZ Climate Truth Newsletter No 315, Sep 11, 2013

Beating the IPCC with Their Own Numbers
By Topher Field, American Thinker, Sep 13, 2013
http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/beating_the_ipcc_with_their_own_numbers.html
[SEPP Comment: An article by the producer of the amusing video 50 to 1.]
IPCC AR5 Renews Demand Governments Buy Their Climate Change Pig In A Poke
By Dr Tim Ball, A Different Perspective, Sep 12, 2013

Please, please, believe
By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 14, 2013
http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2013/9/14/please-please-believe.html
[SEPP Comment: The climate establishment is getting desperate to have the public believe it.]

How and why great news about Chukchi polar bears has been suppressed
By Susan Crockford, Polar Bear Science, Sep 8, 2013

Defending the Orthodoxy
Economic woes may mute impact of U.N. report saying warming manmade
By Alister Doyle and Nina Chestney, Reuters, Sep 6, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/06/us-ipcc-climate-idUSBRE9850JM20130906

IPCC Calls in Moral Philosopher as People Cool on Global Warming
By Ben Webster, Times, via GWPF, Sep 13, 2013

Questioning the Orthodoxy
An unequivocal rejection of the scientific method
By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 10, 2013

Selling Fear Is A Risky Business: Part Last
By William Brigs, His Blog, Sep 12, 2013
http://wmbriggs.com/blog/?p=9005
[SEPP Comment: A statistician’s assessment of risk. Somewhat technical.]

A science-based rebuttal to global warming alarmism
By Steve Goreham, Washington Times, Sep 10, 2013

Man Made Climate Change Arguments Don’t Survive Scrutiny
By Art Horn, ICECAP, Sep 11, 2013
http://icecap.us/index.php/go/political-climate/man_made_climate_change_arguments_dont_survive_scrutiny/

Global Warming To Cause New Crisis. What Will It Be?
By William Briggs, His Blog, Sep 9, 2013
http://wmbriggs.com/blog/?p=8981
[SEPP Comment: Makes the point that the use of the term global warming paused implies the belief that global warming will resume.]

The end of Sternonomics?
By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 12, 2013
http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2013/9/12/the-end-of-sternonomics.html
[SEPP Comment: An end to data manipulation by discount rate?]

Into the Dustbin
By Donna Laframboise, NFC, Sep 10, 2013
http://nofrakkingconsensus.com/2013/09/10/into-the-dustbin/
[SEPP Comment: See the three links immediately below.]

Laframboise’s new book on the IPCC
By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 9, 2013

A new book on the IPCC and Pachauri from Donna Laframboise
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 10, 2013

Chapter and verse on the Great Climate Con
By Tony Thomas, Quadrant, Sep 11, 2013

Reality intrudes on a hot dream
The globe cools, and Al Gore’s ‘Climate Reality’ does, too
Editorial, Washington Times, Sep 5, 2013 [H/t Timothy Wise]

United Nations' Panel Admits Global Cooling?
Editorial, IBD, Sep 9, 2013

Social Benefits of Carbon
Greens Anti-Coal War Turns Heat on World’s Poor
By Peter Glover, Energy Tribune, Sep 13, 2013
http://www.energytribune.com/79165/greens-anti-coal-war-turns-heat-on-worlds-poor#sthash.b93T0uDo.dpbf

Carbon Price Distorts
By Donn Dears, Power for USA, Sep 13, 2013
http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2013/09/13/carbon-price-distorts/

Social Costs of Carbon
Counting the Cost of Fixing the Future
By Eduardo Porter, NYT, Sep 10, 2013
A Further Look at the Social Cost of Carbon
By Paul Knappenberger and Patrick Michaels, CATO, Sep 13, 2013
http://www.cato.org/blog/further-look-social-cost-carbon
[SEPP Comment: See link immediately above.]

Research & Commentary: Social Cost of Carbon Dioxide
By James Taylor and Taylor Smith, Heartland, Sep 12, 2013
http://heartland.org/policy-documents/research-commentary-social-cost-carbon

Biz groups, GOP attack ‘social cost of carbon’ on multiple fronts
By Ben Geman, The Hill, Sep 13, 2013

Problems in the Orthodoxy
IPCC AR5 will reduce sensitivity by 30% or so
By Luboš Motl, The Reference Frame, Sep 14, 2013

Terrifying Flat Global Temperature Crisis Threatens To Disrupt U.N. Climate Conference Agenda
By Larry Bell, Forbes, Sep 10, 2013

Climate models wildly overestimated global warming, study finds
By Maxim Lott, Fox News, Sep 12, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
Link to paper previously discussed in TWTW: Overestimated global warming over the past 20 years
By Fyfe, Gillett and Zwiers, Nature Climate Change, Sep 2013
http://www.see.ed.ac.uk/~shs/Climate%20change/Climate%20model%20results/over%20estimate.pdf

The Climate Science Capitulation Begins…Hans von Storch: “We Definitely Have Seen Less Warming Than Expected”
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 11, 2013

PR Firm Enlisted to Convince Leaders to Ignore Public
By Donna Laframboise, NFC, Sep 12, 2013

Running on empty
Seeking a Common Ground
A standard for policy-relevant science
By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 12, 2013
http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/12/a-standard-for-policy-relevant-science/#more-12949

Responsible Conduct in the Global Research Enterprise
By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 11, 2013

Global Warming Without Fear
By Bjørn Lomborg, Project Syndicate, Sep 13, 2013

Millennium Idols: smash the Hockey Stick but smash the others too!
By Bernie Lewin, Enthusiasm, Scepticism, and Science [H/t Bishop Hill]

Lowering Standards
National Geographic and the Statue of Liberty
By Marita Noon and Michael Economides, Energy Tribune, Sep 10, 2013

Naomi Oreskes, Professor of the History of Science
Department of the History of Science, Harvard University
http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~hsdept/bios/oreskes.html
[SEPP Comment: How low can you go?]

Expanding the Orthodoxy
Teaching Climate Change to Skeptics
By Carmen Nobel, Harvard Business School, Sep 9, 2013 [H/t Cork Hyden]
http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/7319.html
[SEPP Comment: Harvard Business School finds the government money too rich to pass up. The analogy to the obesity problem is a complete joke.]

Questioning European Green
Australia’s U-Turn: Is Germany Next?
By Steven Hayward, Power Line, Sep 9, 2013

Environmentalism: The Road To A Primitive Existence
Editorial, IBD, Sep 11, 2013
Germany Could Face Electricity Customer Revolt
By Bill Sweet, IEEE, Sep 9, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

Brussels fears European 'industrial massacre' sparked by energy costs
Europe's industry is being ravaged by exorbitant energy costs and an over-valued euro, blighting efforts to reverse years of global manufacturing decline.
By Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, Telegraph, UK, Sep 8, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

Clean Energy Damaging Europe's Competitiveness
By Ante Batovic, Global Risk Insights, Oil Price.com, Sep 12, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

MPs Attack Impact of Climate Change Act on Families & Industry
By Staff Writer, GWPF, Sep 11, 2013
I urge the minister, in the light of all the evidence that has come out about the lack of any change in temperature over the past 15 years, to think again about the Climate Change Act and to revoke it, amend it and support home owners and British businesses. –David T. C. Davies, MP

Questioning Green Elsewhere
Australia liberated from their long national green nightmare
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 7, 2013

Australia rips up climate-change policies
By Michael Slezak, New Scientist, Sep 10, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn24173-australia-rips-up-climatechange-policies.html#UjBmHMa1Fc4
[SEPP Comment: Bad news for the climate? The climate supports a particular political party?]

Coalition takes axe to climate programs
By Sid Maher and Lauren Wilson, The Australian, Sep 11, 2013 [H/t Stefan Björklund]

Coalition starts axing Australia’s carbon-bureaucrat-machinery
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Sep 11, 2013

Climate Change and Property Rights
By Sierra Rayne, American Thinker, Sep 10, 2013
http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/climate_change_and_property_rights.html

97% Consensus
97% Climate consensus ‘denial’: the debunkers debunked
By Christopher Monckton, WUWT, Sep 9, 2013

‘Consensus’ on Climate Change just PR Campaign
By Andrew Montford, Austrailian, Via GWPF, Sep 13, 2013

Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate, or be Vague?
More settled science: Climate change/warming speeds up tree life cycles instead of causing migration
By Anthony Watts, Sep 12, 2013
[SEPP Comment: Could it be that global warming/climate change is not occurring as rapidly as many claimed?]

Spread of crop pests threatens global food security as Earth warms
By Staff Writers, Exeter, UK (SPX), Sep 10, 2013
http://www.seeddaily.com/reports/Spread_of_crop_pests_threatens_global_food_security_as_Earth_warms_999.html
[SEPP Comment: A warming Northern Hemisphere and enhanced atmospheric carbon dioxide allows for growing food crops further north. Is it surprising that crop pests follow?]

Communicating Better to the Public – Make things up.
Helping Out the [New York] Times
By Paul Knappenberger and Patrick Michaels, CATO, Sep 10, 2013
http://www.cato.org/blog/helping-out-times
[SEPP Comment: Reporting at the Gray Lady is not what it once was.]

A Curious Climate Analogy – Badly Reported by the NYT
By Kip Hansen, WUWT, Sep 8, 2013
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/08/noaas-curious-climate-analogy-badly-reported/
[SEPP Comment: More reporting of imagination rather than imaginative reporting.]

Making up historical tornado data
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 12, 2013
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/12/making-up-historical-tornado-data/

Global warming has increased risk of record heat
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Global_warming_has_increased_risk_of_record_heat_999.html
[SEPP Comment: Exaggerating the weather events in the US while ignoring the rest of the world. For weather stations with records dating earlier than the 1930, 2012 was not the hottest year on record.]
New Film Shows Hans Schellnhuber Claiming “Himalayan 2035 Glacier Melt Was “Very Easy To Calculate”
By P. Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 8, 2013

[SEPP Comment: Amazing statements from the director of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Hans-Joachim Schellnhuber.]

Changing Weather
Atlantic hurricane season: A record-breaking dud?
By Tom Brown, Reuters, Sep 9, 2013 [H/t Clyde Spencer]

Updated Major Hurricane Drought Figure
By Roger Pielke Jr. His Blog,

Missing Extreme Weather: German Meteorologists Confirm Global ACE 2013 Far Below Normal
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 13, 2013

Changing Climate
Siberian Arctic Is Not Warming After All – July-Temps Are Hardly Different From Those Thousands Of Years Ago!
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 7, 2013

Changing Seas
PDO, ENSO and sea level rise
By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 13, 2013

Breaking deep-sea waves reveal a potential mechanism for global ocean mixing
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 11, 2013

Insight into marine life's ability to adapt to climate change
By Staff Writers, (SPX) Sep 10, 2013
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Insight_into_marine_lifes_ability_to_adapt_to_climate_change_999.html
[SEPP Comment: Marine life has been adapting for hundreds of millions of years.]

Clues in coral bleaching mystery
Deep-ocean carbon sinks
By Gary Galluzzo, UI News, (SPX) Sep 11, 2013

Changing Cryosphere – Land / Sea Ice
Arctic sea ice up 60 percent in 2013
By Staff Writers, Fox News, Sep 9, 2013, [H/t Rob Sheldon]

And now it's global COOLING! Record return of Arctic ice cap as it grows by 60% in a year
Almost a million more square miles of ocean covered with ice than in 2012
BBC reported in 2007 global warming would leave Arctic ice-free in summer by 2013
Publication of UN climate change report suggesting global warming caused by humans pushed back to later this month
By David Rose, Mail, UK, Sep 7, 2013

Esa's Cryosat mission observes continuing Arctic winter ice decline
By Jonathan Amos, BBC, Sep 11, 2013

Global warming? No, actually we're cooling, claim scientists
A cold Arctic summer has led to a record increase in the ice cap, leading experts to predict a period of global cooling.
By Hayley Dixon, Telegraph, UK, Sep 8, 2013 [H/t WUWT]
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/10294082/Global-warming-No-actually-were-cooling-claim-scientists.html

Confirmed: Greenland reached hottest temperature in modern record this summer
By Jason Samenow, Washington Post, Sep 10, 2013 [H/t WUWT]
[SEPP Comment: The modern record started in 1958. The all-time record high was in 1915, at 4.2 deg C or about 7.4 deg F higher (rounding is not exact).]

Underlying ocean melts ice shelf, speeds up glacier movement
By Staff Writer, EurekAlert!, Sep 12, 2013 [H/t WUWT]

Agriculture Issues & Fear of Famine
Growing trees 40% faster with the help of the right bacteria and fungi
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Sep 12, 2013
The Climate-Grain Production Relationship Quantified
By David Archibald, WUWT, Sep 8, 2013
[SEPP Comment: Reviewing the concept that solar cycles influence grain prices.]

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC
For a full list of articles see www.NIPCCreport.org

Modeling the East Asian-Western North Pacific Monsoon & ENSO
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/10sep2013a1.html

The Fate of Peatland Carbon in a Potentially Warming World
Reference: Charman, D.J. et al. 2013. Climate-related changes in peatland carbon accumulation during the last millennium. Biogeosciences 10: 929-944
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/10sep2013a4.html

Southern Ocean Water Mass Circulation and Characteristics
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/11sep2013a2.html

The Future of Wheat Production on the North China Plain
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/11sep2013a3.html

Litigation Issues
ATI Files Suit to Compel the University of Arizona to Produce Records Related to So-Called “Hockey Stick” Global Warming Research
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 9, 2013

Cap-and-Trade and Carbon Taxes
A carbon tax would make no sense

Abbott government begins process to repeal carbon tax; says pressure on Labor to honour mandate
By Staff Writers, ABC, AU, Sep 9, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
Subsidies and Mandates Forever
Sequestration nation: DoD doles out $7 billion in wind-energy contracts
By Erika Johnsen, Hot Air, Sep 10, 2013 [H/t Timothy Wise]

EPA and other Regulators on the March
EPA to revise climate rule for new power plants; will still require carbon capture
By Juliet Eilperin, Washington Post, Sep 11, 2013

States accuse EPA of exceeding its authority with climate change plan
By Ben Goad, The Hill, Sep 13, 2013

Rep. Trey Gowdy Grills Lisa Jackson about ‘Contact me at home’ Email to Lobbyist
By Marlo Lewis, Global Warming.org, Sep 11, 2013

Energy Issues – Non-US
Basic Power Gen Cost Information
By Donn Dears, Power for USA, Sep 10, 2013
http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2013/09/10/basic-power-gen-cost-information/

Nominations for the Top 5 Energy Policy Shockers
By Staff Writers, Liberum Capital, Sep 13, 2013 [H/t Bishop Hill]
[SEPP Comment: Blunders may be a better word than shockers.]

Prepare for the Chinese Energy Juggernaut
By: Robert Rapier, Energy Tribune, Sep 11, 2013
http://www.energytribune.com/79147/prepare-for-the-chinese-energy-juggernaut#sthash.3pnW11Hh.dpbb

U.K. scientists say shale gas’ carbon footprint on par with others
By Staff Writers, London (UPI), Sep 9, 2013
http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/UK_scientists_say_shale_gas_carbon_footprint_on_par_with_others_999.html

Energy Issues -- US
Five charts that help put ‘Saudi America’s’ shale revolution into perspective
By Mark Perry, AEIdeas, Sep 6, 2013
[SEPP Comment: The US produces about 90% of the energy it uses.]
ACC's Dooley discusses impact of shale revolution on chemical industry profits, growth
Transcript by Staff Writers, EETV, Sep 10, 2013
http://www.eenews.net/tv/videos/1721/transcript

Groups: EIA Renewable Energy Data Doesn’t Reflect “Real World
By Sonal Patel, Power News, Sep 12, 2013
http://www.powermag.com/groups-eia-renewable-energy-data-doesnt-reflect-real-world/?hq_e=el&hq_m=2744804&hq_l=9&hq_v=5e660500d0
[SEPP Comment: EIA did not project as much growth in green power as the lobbyists want. But it all depends on government subsidies and mandates. The green power advocates are partially right, but not in what they claim. The EIA does not properly estimate the burden green power places on other producers of electricity.]

Washington’s Control of Energy
Obama's Keystone Pipeline Delay Boosts Energy Cost With No Benefit
Editorial, IBD, Sep 12, 2013

Return of King Coal?
China Bans New Coal-Fired Plants in 3 Regions
By Louise Watt, AP, Sep 12, 2013

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Solar and Wind
NREL Report: Cheaper Chinese Solar Panels Not Due to Low-Cost Labor, Subsidies
By Sonal Patel, Power News, Sep 12, 2013
http://www.powermag.com/nrel-report-cheaper-chinese-solar-panels-not-due-to-low-cost-labor-subsidies/?hq_e=el&hq_m=2744804&hq_l=7&hq_v=5e660500d0
Link to paper: Assessing the drivers of regional trends in solar photovoltaic manufacturing:
http://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlelanding/2013/ee/c3ee40701b#!divAbstract

Chinese Zombies Emerging After Years of Solar Subsidies
By Staff Writers, Bloomberg, Sep 9, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Energy -- Other
Report: $603 million in Energy Dept. biofuels funding fails to meet goals
By Ben Geman, The Hill, Sep 12, 2013
Link to Report, Audit Report
By Inspector General, DoE, Sep 2013
As of March 2013, the Department had obligated over $929 million, including $561 million from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, for the 29 projects, and had expended approximately $603 million (65 percent) of those funds.

**BIO's Greenwood discusses timeline for EPA proposal on 2014 volume limits**
Transcript by Staff Writers, Sep 9, 2013
http://www.eenews.net/tv/videos/1720/transcript

**Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Vehicles**
**Unwanted Exotics**
By Eric Peters, America Spectator, Sep 12, 2013
http://spectator.org/archives/2013/09/12/unwanted-exotics

**California Dreaming**
**California’s Middle Class Faces Slow Death by Green Laws**
By Walter Russell Mead, Via Meadia, Sep 11, 2013

**Environmental Industry**
**Same Old: Procter & Gamble bans two ingredients— but not based on science**
By Staff Writers, ACSH, Sep 12, 2013

If Greenpeace USA (né Ozone Action) is Proud of its old ███████████ Work, Why do they Feel a Sudden Need to Hide It?
By Russell Cook, Gelbspan Files, Sep 6, 2013
http://gelbspanfiles.com/?p=890

**Other Scientific News**
**Alaska tundra shows surprising resilience after unprecedented fire**
By Staff Writers, Fairbanks AK (SPX), Sep 10, 2013
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Alaska_tundra_shows_surprising_resilience_after_unprecedented_fire_999.html
[SEPP Comment: Doubtful the fire was unprecedented.]

**Eleven Spacecraft Show Interstellar Wind Changed Direction Over 40 Years**
By Karen C. Fox for Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, MD (SPX) Sep 10, 2013
http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Eleven_Spacecraft_Show_Interstellar_Wind_Changed_Direction_Over_40_Years_999.html

**NASA's Voyager first spacecraft to exit solar system**
By Staff Writers, Washington (AFP), Sept 12, 2013
http://www.space-travel.com/reports/NASAs_Voyager_first_spacecraft_to_exit_solar_system_999.html

**New paper says ‘No evidence of planetary influence on solar activity’**
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 7, 2013

UH Professor Offers Insight Into Saharan Dust Migration
By Staff Writers, Houston TX (SPX), Sep 10, 2013
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/UH_Professor_Offers_Insight Into_Saharan_Dust_Migration_999.html
[SEPP Comment: Does the EPA interpretation of the Clean Air Act include control of dust from the Sahara?]

Other News that May Be of Interest
How people argue with research they don’t like
By Dylan Matthews, Washington Post, Sep 12, 2013 [H/t Tom Sheahen]
[SEPP Comment: Clever graphic.]

Flights over Pacific highest-producers of ozone
By Staff Writers, Cambridge, Mass., (UPI) Sep 5, 2013

New data reveals that the average height of European males has grown by 11cm in just over a century
By Staff Writers, Essex, UK (SPX), Sep 10, 2013
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/New_data_reveals_that_the_average_height_of_European_males_has_grown_by_11cm_in_just_over_a_century_999.html
[SEPP Comment: Is global warming the cause?]

Water-purification plant the size of a fast-food ketchup packet saves lives
By Staff Writers, Indianapolis IN (SPX), Sep 13, 2013
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Water_purification_plant_the_size_of_a_fast_food_ketchup_packet_saves_lives_999.html

Wanted: Remedial education for museum curators
By Tony Thomas, Quadrant, Sep 13 2013

############################################################################

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:
Goofed Skyscraper Architect Rafael Vinoly Blames Climate Change For Building Design Woes!
By P. Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 7, 2013
[SEPP Comment: The photos in the article in Mail, linked, are quite striking.]

############################################################################

ARTICLES:
1. Dialing Back the Alarm on Climate Change
A forthcoming report points lower estimates on global warming
By Matt Ridley, WSJ, Sep 13, 2013
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324549004579067532485712464.html

Later this month, a long-awaited event that last happened in 2007 will recur. Like a returning comet, it will be taken to portend ominous happenings. I refer to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) "fifth assessment report," part of which will be published on Sept. 27.

There have already been leaks from this 31-page document, which summarizes 1,914 pages of scientific discussion, but thanks to a senior climate scientist, I have had a glimpse of the key prediction at the heart of the document. The big news is that, for the first time since these reports started coming out in 1990, the new one dials back the alarm. It states that the temperature rise we can expect as a result of man-made emissions of carbon dioxide is lower than the IPPC thought in 2007.

Admittedly, the change is small, and because of changing definitions, it is not easy to compare the two reports, but retreat it is. It is significant because it points to the very real possibility that, over the next several generations, the overall effect of climate change will be positive for humankind and the planet.

Specifically, the draft report says that "equilibrium climate sensitivity" (ECS)—eventual warming induced by a doubling of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, which takes hundreds of years to occur—is "extremely likely" to be above 1 degree Celsius (1.8 degrees Fahrenheit), "likely" to be above 1.5 degrees Celsius (2.4 degrees Fahrenheit) and "very likely" to be below 6 degrees Celsius (10.8 Fahrenheit). In 2007, the IPPC said it was "likely" to be above 2 degrees Celsius and "very likely" to be above 1.5 degrees, with no upper limit. Since "extremely" and "very" have specific and different statistical meanings here, comparison is difficult.

Still, the downward movement since 2007 is clear, especially at the bottom of the "likely" range. The most probable value (3 degrees Celsius last time) is for some reason not stated this time.

A more immediately relevant measure of likely warming has also come down: "transient climate response" (TCR)—the actual temperature change expected from a doubling of carbon dioxide about 70 years from now, without the delayed effects that come in the next century. The new report will say that this change is "likely" to be 1 to 2.5 degrees Celsius and "extremely unlikely" to be greater than 3 degrees. This again is lower than when last estimated in 2007 ("very likely" warming of 1 to 3 degrees Celsius, based on models, or 1 to 3.5 degrees, based on observational studies).

Most experts believe that warming of less than 2 degrees Celsius from preindustrial levels will result in no net economic and ecological damage. Therefore, the new report is effectively saying (based on the middle of the range of the IPCC's emissions scenarios) that there is a better than 50-50 chance that by 2083, the benefits of climate change will still outweigh the harm.

Warming of up to 1.2 degrees Celsius over the next 70 years (0.8 degrees have already occurred), most of which is predicted to happen in cold areas in winter and at night, would extend the range of farming further north, improve crop yields, slightly increase rainfall (especially in arid areas), enhance forest growth and cut winter deaths (which far exceed summer deaths in most places). Increased carbon dioxide levels also have caused and will continue to cause an increase in the
growth rates of crops and the greening of the Earth—because plants grow faster and need less water when carbon dioxide concentrations are higher.

Up to two degrees of warming, these benefits will generally outweigh the harmful effects, such as more extreme weather or rising sea levels, which even the IPCC concedes will be only about 1 to 3 feet during this period.

Yet these latest IPCC estimates of climate sensitivity may still be too high. They don't adequately reflect the latest rash of published papers estimating "equilibrium climate sensitivity" and "transient climate response" on the basis of observations, most of which are pointing to an even milder warming. This was already apparent last year with two papers—by scientists at the University of Illinois and Oslo University in Norway—finding a lower ECS than assumed by the models. Since then, three new papers conclude that ECS is well below the range assumed in the models. The most significant of these, published in Nature Geoscience by a team including 14 lead authors of the forthcoming IPCC scientific report, concluded that "the most likely value of equilibrium climate sensitivity based on the energy budget of the most recent decade is 2.0 degrees Celsius."

Two recent papers (one in the Journal of the American Meteorological Society, the other in the journal Earth System Dynamics) estimate that TCR is probably around 1.65 degrees Celsius. That's uncannily close to the estimate of 1.67 degrees reached in 1938 by Guy Callendar, a British engineer and pioneer student of the greenhouse effect. A Canadian mathematician and blogger named Steve McIntyre has pointed out that Callendar's model does a better job of forecasting the temperature of the world between 1938 and now than do modern models that "hindcast" the same data.

The significance of this is that Callendar assumed that carbon dioxide acts alone, whereas the modern models all assume that its effect is amplified by water vapor. There is not much doubt about the amount of warming that carbon dioxide can cause. There is much more doubt about whether net amplification by water vapor happens in practice or is offset by precipitation and a cooling effect of clouds.

Since the last IPCC report in 2007, much has changed. It is now more than 15 years since global average temperature rose significantly. Indeed, the IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri has conceded that the "pause" already may have lasted for 17 years, depending on which data set you look at. A recent study in Nature Climate Change by Francis Zwiers and colleagues of the University of Victoria, British Columbia, found that models have overestimated warming by 100% over the past 20 years.

Explaining this failure is now a cottage industry in climate science. At first, it was hoped that an underestimate of sulfate pollution from industry (which can cool the air by reflecting heat back into space) might explain the pause, but the science has gone the other way—reducing its estimate of sulfate cooling. Now a favorite explanation is that the heat is hiding in the deep ocean. Yet the data to support this thesis come from ocean buoys and deal in hundredths of a degree of temperature change, with a measurement error far larger than that. Moreover, ocean heat uptake has been slowing over the past eight years.

The most plausible explanation of the pause is simply that climate sensitivity was overestimated in the models because of faulty assumptions about net amplification through water-vapor...
feedback. This will be a topic of heated debate at the political session to rewrite the report in Stockholm, starting on Sept. 23, at which issues other than the actual science of climate change will be at stake.

Mr. Ridley is the author of "The Rational Optimist" and a member of the British House of Lords.

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

2. Fracking and the Poor
The natural gas boom may be America's best antipoverty program.
Editorial, WSJ, Sep 6, 2013
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323734304578543613292394192.html?mod=ITP_opinion_2

By now even the Obama Administration has recognized that the natural gas drilling boom has led to more high-wage jobs, more secure energy supplies and lower manufacturing costs. But one of the biggest benefits from fracking and other new drilling technologies is often overlooked: the windfall to American consumers, especially the poor.

A new study by the Colorado-based energy broker Mercator Energy quantifies the multibillion-dollar annual savings to American households through lower utility bills from the fall in natural gas prices.

From 2003-08, shortly before the fracking revolution took hold, the price of natural gas averaged about $7.20 per million BTUs. By 2012 after new drilling operations exploded across the U.S.—from West Texas to Pennsylvania to North Dakota—the increase in natural gas production had slashed the price to $2.80 per million BTUs.

Mercator examined Department of Energy data on natural gas usage to find out how this 61% price decline translated into lower home-heating and electricity bills. According to the federal Energy Information Administration, American households use about 7.4 billion MMBTUs for home heating and residential electricity each year.

Thanks to the lower price for natural gas, families saved roughly $32.5 billion in 2012. (That's 7.4 billion MMBTUs of residential use of natural gas times the $4.40 reduction in price.) The windfall to all U.S. natural gas consumers—industrial and residential—was closer to $110 billion. This is greater than the annual income of all of the residents in 14 states in 2011.

Mercator's most notable finding is that the income group helped the most by this bonanza is the poor because energy is a big component of their family budgets. Data from the annual report of the federal Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (Liheap) show that poor households spend four times more of their income on home energy (10.4%) than do non-poor households (2.6%). That same report says that roughly 40 million households, or 36% of U.S. households, are eligible for Liheap. Though the poor on average spend less overall on heating and electricity, lower natural gas prices have still shaved about $10 billion a year from the utility bills of poor families.

To put it another way, fracking is a much more effective antipoverty program than is Liheap. In 2012, Liheap provided roughly $3.5 billion to about nine million low-income households to subsidize their home-heating costs. New drilling technologies saved poor households almost three
times more. Low gas prices benefit nearly all poor households, while Liheap helps fewer than one in four.

These energy savings are especially impressive compared to what residents of other industrialized nations are paying. The natural gas price this summer increased to about $3.70 per million BTUs, but that compares to the roughly $10 that consumers pay in Spain or $13 in China. According to the Mercator analysis, if natural gas prices were that high in the U.S., average home heating bills for millions of Americans would be almost 75% higher.

You'd think that good liberal egalitarians would welcome these financial savings to poor households. Yet most green groups, in particular the Sierra Club, continue to oppose fracking and are using lawsuits and political lobbying to stop it. Rich Hollywood types like Matt Damon propagandize against it. No one is doing more to increase income inequality in America than the affluent environmentalists who oppose natural gas drilling.

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

3. More on Fracking and the Poor
The U.S. oil and gas boom added $1,200 to disposable income in 2012.
Editorial, WSJ, Sep 10, 2013
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324094704579065432802151184.html

Last week we reported on a study showing that the U.S. oil and natural gas revolution may be the country's best antipoverty program, and the evidence keeps coming. A new report from IHS Global Insight estimates that fracking added the equivalent of a cool $1,200 to real household disposable income on average in 2012.

Lower costs for raw materials were passed on to consumers via lower home heating and electricity bills and lower prices for other goods and services. Wages also increased from a surge in industrial activity. On present trend, IHS predicts that unconventional oil and gas will contribute more than $2,000 a year by 2015 and $3,500 by 2025.

Overall the industry lifted economic growth by $283 billion last year—$533 billion in 2025—and was responsible, ahem, for $74 billion in federal and state tax payments. The politicians should be doing cartwheels that the figure will rise to $138 billion in 2025.

IHS's particular focus is on what the study calls a growing manufacturing renaissance aided by the boom in affordable energy. It's a classic American story of innovation, human ingenuity, risk-taking and capital investment, not subsidies or the 47 federal job-training programs. The irony Washington will never appreciate is that fracking has done more for the less fortunate in the Obama years that all of its ministrations combined.

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

4. Japan and the Fate of Nuclear Power Radiation phobia prevents a rational response to Fukushima.
By Holman Jenkins, WSJ, Sep 10, 2013
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324094704579066751347436222.html

Nuclear power might well be a competent civilization's solution to its theoretical carbon-dioxide problem. Now if only humans had a competent civilization.
Japan's government, in its latest solution for the stricken Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear plant, will do what it likes doing anyway: spend money on extravagant public works projects. A network of supercooled pipes will freeze the ground around the plant. This presumably will stop groundwater from flowing through the partially melted-down reactors and draining into the Pacific. Water from coolant operations, which are preventing a more serious meltdown, would also remain contained on-site.

Even so, contaminated water would continue to accumulate in rickety tanks. A necessary solution will be emptying this water into the Pacific, after filtering out as many radioactive particles as possible. Unfortunately, not only does Japan's fishing lobby, which like just about any lobby in Japan is entitled to paralyze action, refuse to countenance such a step. It won't even let the plant operator use an existing system to route non-contaminated groundwater past the plant into the sea. Thereby hangs a stalemate that may doom any hope of a nuclear revival in our world.

As long as Fukushima wastewater contains radioactive elements, particles would end up in fish, causing some number of hypothetical human malignancies according to the questionable theory that radiation is dangerous in direct proportion to dose.

In fact, a considerable body of research holds that increased cancer risk becomes statistically perceptible only at a dose level of 100 millisieverts. This is five times the standard Japan used to order local evacuations, and in many evacuated areas the practical exposure risk was far less than the standard—just a fraction above natural background radiation.

Amazingly, Japan actually cut its allowable food-exposure limits in half in response to the crisis. Oxford University physicist Wade Allison, who has written and spoken widely against exaggerating radiation risks, estimated that one could eat a ton of such slightly contaminated food—or even drink 12 gallons of contaminated groundwater directly from the Fukushima site right after the accident—before getting a single CT scan's worth of radiation.

Alas, Japan is unlikely to abandon its supercaution anytime soon. Prime Minister Shinzo Abe has quietly begun restarting a handful of the country's 54 reactors shut down after Fukushima. The last thing he wants is to court public controversy by hinting the government has gone soft on radiation risks.

Now with Tokyo's victory this week to host the 2020 Olympics, expect, if anything, a doubling down on crazy cleanup priorities. Japan won't be accused of trying to give cancer to visiting athletes.

Blame or credit is typically charged to Hiroshima and Nagasaki for the country's hypersensitivity. A more relevant culprit may be the well-meaning campaigners against atmospheric bomb testing in the 1950s, who embraced what's known as the Linear, No Threshold hypothesis—the idea that radiation is unhealthy at any level.

Belatedly, an authority on such matters, the U.N.'s Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, has tried to lead a climbdown from a dubious risk formula that it once championed. Perhaps trying to rescue nuclear energy to fight global warming, the group last year warned against "multiplying low doses by large numbers of individuals to estimate numbers of radiation-induced health effects within a population."
Even more annoying to anti-nuke activists, the agency also declared that no radiation-caused illness had appeared even in Fukushima plant workers, and none was expected. The result: a deluge of vilification upon the U.N.

The U.S., of course, has nothing to brag about in this regard. Yucca Mountain, the waste repository on which Washington has spent $12 billion, likely has been permanently blocked by Nevada politicians whose imagined heroism on behalf of local voters is the precise corollary of exaggerated radiation risk models. Hooray for Harry Reid, but is this any way to make nuclear policy?

Nuclear power would not exist, let's remind ourselves, without government cosseting. In the U.S., Washington provides accident insurance without which nuclear power plants never would have gotten built. Waste storage, or better yet fuel reprocessing, is far from insoluble, especially if we adjust our radiation fears in a more pragmatic direction. This is another problem only government likely would be willing to meet the expense of solving.

But here's a question: Two of the most capable governments in the world—which the U.S. and Japan surely are—can't muster the coherence and consistency of purpose to manage a nuclear power industry effectively. How would the world ever rise to the challenge of managing the chemical processes of the atmosphere in order to give us the climate we think we want?