The Week That Was: 2013-09-07 (September 7, 2013)
Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)
The Science and Environmental Policy Project

Quote of the Week: In wartime, truth is so precious that she should always be attended by a bodyguard of lies. – Winston Churchill

Number of the Week: 2.1 Million

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.

Save the Date: On Monday, September 23, Noon, Lead author Bob Carter and Co-author Willie Soon will be discussing the new NIPCC report at the Heritage Foundation on Capitol Hill, Washington. Details to follow.

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)
**The Hot Spot:** The supporters of the UN International Panel on Climate Changes (IPCC) have played elaborate statistical games in their efforts to explain away the fact that satellite and weather-balloon observations have failed to identify the Hot Spot. This is the volume of the atmosphere centered over the tropics at about 10 km (33,000 feet) where a surface warming trend, whatever the cause, should cause a more pronounced atmospheric warming trend. Note that warming trends in the two locations are the issue, not temperatures. IPCC supporters have mistakenly claimed the Hot Spot is the distinct human fingerprint.

SEPP Chairman Fred Singer presents an unusual explanation why the Hot Spot has not been detected by the most comprehensive measurements of the earth’s temperatures, the satellite observations. No doubt, it will be controversial. Please see Article # 1.

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

**Australia’s Hot Spot:** On September 7, Australia held parliamentary elections. The party in power, the Labor Party, was thoroughly defeated. The poor economy was one issue, another major issue was the carbon tax. After the carbon tax was implemented, the Carbon Sense Coalition and the No Carbon Tax Climate Skeptics Party were formed. These groups exposed to the public the preposterous climate claims being made by government agencies in the government’s efforts to justify the carbon tax.

TWTW reader Stefan Björklund analyzed the energy program of the victorious Liberal-National coalition, commenting how different it is from Germany’s energy plan. The Liberal-National coalition energy program features scrapping the CO2 tax, no emissions trading, support for increased use of domestic oil, natural gas and coal, thorium development for nuclear energy (thanks to David Archibald), and tougher environment standards for wind power with real time monitoring of noise and health effects.

Now if only the victorious party can avoid implementing foolish programs “to fight” largely naturally occurring global warming/climate change. Please see links under Questioning Green Elsewhere and Cap and Trade and Carbon Taxes.

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

**Germany’s Hot Spot:** A German federal election will be held on September 22 to determine the members of the Bundestag, the main federal legislative house. Almost unthinkable a year ago, members of the mainstream press, such as Der Spiegel, are severely criticizing the government’s green energy program with articles such as: “Germany's Energy Poverty: How Electricity Became a Luxury Good.” If the election is unfavorable to the government, perhaps some politicians will begin to notice that the public does not like being punished by higher energy costs stemming from politically egotistical efforts “to fight” global warming/climate change. Please see links under Questioning European Green.

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

**Another Piece to the Puzzle:** The CERN experiment demonstrated that high-energy cosmic rays can promote the formation of small clusters of molecules. This was another step in testing the cosmic-ray/cloud hypothesis advocated by Danish physicists, including Henrik Svensmark. The hypothesis is that high-energy cosmic rays influence the cloudiness on earth, but are modulated by the sun. When the sun is not active, the magnetic shield is reduced, and more high-energy rays hit the upper atmosphere resulting in more clouds. When the sun is active, fewer high energy cosmic rays hit the upper atmosphere resulting in less clouds. A small change in cloudiness can have a significant influence on surface temperatures. After the CERN experiment, the hypothesis ran into a snag. The numerical simulations of the prevailing chemical theory demonstrated that
the small particles will not grow to sufficient size to create clouds. The assumption is that once the sun goes down in a particular area, the particles stop growing.

The researchers at the Technical University of Denmark tested the theory in a series of experiments. In one set of experiments the particles stopped growing. In another set of experiments, they found that under exposure to natural cosmic rays and gamma-rays the small particles continue to grow after the daylight is removed. No doubt, there is much additional work needed and the Climate Establishment will find other objections. But the persistence of the Danish researcher to continue to test a politically unpopular scientific hypothesis is laudatory. If it proves to be correct, the claim that carbon dioxide emissions are the principal cause of global warming/climate change is wrong. Please see links under Science: Is the Sun Rising?

Hypothesis Testing: Last week’s TWTW discussed hypothesis testing as presented by the noted physicist Richard Feynman. The tested hypothesis is a positive assertion of a relationship between two or more phenomena. The null hypothesis is that there is no relationship, which is the default position. If the hypothesis fails direct testing, the default is tentatively accepted until another hypothesis survives testing.

Professor Emeritus Elliot Cramer of the Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina objected, stating this is wrong. You can only reject the null hypothesis, you can never accept it. By so doing, Professor Cramer brings up another form of hypothesis testing, an indirect form. The null hypothesis is tested to a certain level of confidence. If it fails, the positive assertion is tentatively accepted.

Without getting into the statistical techniques, each form has its advocates. The direct testing form is generally accepted in physical sciences. The indirect testing form is accepted in many social sciences and in many medical studies. As such, it has resulted in many false positives, which cannot be replicated.

If climate science is a physical science, then the generally accepted methods for physical sciences should be followed unless there is compelling evidence that they are unsatisfactory, which should be stated. In any event, the practice of testing models against the same data that was used to develop the models is unsatisfactory. Please see last week’s TWTW and the repeated links under Problems in the Orthodoxy.

Scientific Method: Following a long exchange among scientists on the scientific method, SEPP Director, Tom Sheahen neatly summed up the discussion. The conclusions are noteworthy.

A) A cornerstone of the scientific method, probably 500 years old, can be expressed as "data trumps theory." In the 20th century, Feynman said it elegantly a dozen times.
B) There really are subjects too complicated to describe easily, in which case computer modeling is required. That is perfectly okay, and indeed common in any field involving fluids in motion. However,
C) When the computer models don't agree with the observations, don't complain about the data, but instead go back and revise the models.
D) Don't begin trying to plan national policy until you've got the science right, as evidenced by agreement between theory and data. Otherwise it's just futile and expensive.
What is obviously logically flawed is to assert point B and then ask for blind trust in computer models, ignoring the need to observe point C.

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

**Social Benefits of Carbon:** A study asserted that soot emitted by the use of coal with the industrialization of Europe stopped the Little Ice Age, at least in Europe where glacial expansion threatening villages stopped. Luboš Motl comments that the paper talks about forcings between 9 and 35 watts per square meters. “This is vastly higher than the ‘dangerous’ forcing often attributed to the doubling of CO2, 3.7 watts per square meter.” If the paper is correct, we all should be thankful. Please see links under Social Benefits of Carbon.

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

**97% Consensus:** On his Bishop Hill blog, Andrew Montford announces his paper on the famed 97% of scientists … produced by John Cook, et al. and claimed by President Obama. Montford finds that: An analysis of the methodology used by Cook et al. shows that the consensus referred to is trivial: 1) carbon dioxide (CO2) is a greenhouse gas; and 2) human activities have warmed the planet to some unspecified extent. Please see link Challenging the Orthodoxy.

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

**Testimony:** Roger Pielke, Jr. downloaded the 1974 Senate testimony of Paul Ehrlich and John Holdren on the Limits to Growth and their Malthusian philosophy. Pielke intends to use it for a future course about the role of experts in policy making.

Ehrlich is now a Fellow of the Royal Society and Holdren is the science adviser to President Obama. A quote from each is in order. Ehrlich “I suspect you're aware, that the increased price of petroleum which is certainly related to the near depletion of petroleum resources-they're going to be gone by the end of the century . . .” Holdren: “The main point here is that, although there may be defects in any specific detailed model, the general conclusion is far more robust than any specific model.” Please see link under Lowering Standards.

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

**Number of the Week:** 2.1 Million. This is the number of direct and indirect jobs in the US created by the oil and gas revolution by the end of 2012, as estimated by HIS CERA Consulting. As with all such estimates, there are details that can be criticized. However, the Energy Information Administration estimates that from 2007 to 2012 jobs in the oil and gas industry increased by 40%, while jobs in the entire private sector increased by 1%.

Unlike the fabled green jobs that politicians are touting, no government subsidies, mandates, or specific tax breaks were required to create these jobs. They are sustainable as long as the oil and gas industry thrives. They were created on private and state owned lands. In 2012, the production of oil, natural gas, natural gas liquids and coal all fell on federally controlled lands. Please see links under Energy Issues – US.

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

**Quote of the Week:** Please see Andrew Montford’s application of this famous quote under Communicating Better to the Public – Make Things Up

#ARTICLES#

For the numbered articles below please see this week’s TW TW at: www.sepp.org. The articles are at the end of the pdf.

1 The UN Climate Panel's 'Hot Spot' is Missing in Action
By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, /Sep 5, 2013
http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/the_un_climate_panels_hot_spot_is_missing_in_action.html

2. It Was a Dark and Stormy Climate Study . . .
Would that all forward-looking global-warming research got such a skeptical reception.
Editorial, WSJ, Sep 4, 2013

3. Greenhouse-Gas Fight Escalates
Administration's Higher Estimate for Cost of Carbon Raises Ire of Critics
By Keith Johnson, WSJ, Sep 3, 2013
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324324404579040950076712782.html?mod=WSJ_hps_sections_news

4. Electric Losers, Round Two
The Energy Department hopes to revive an Obama clunker.
Editorial, WSJ, Sep 2, 2013

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Science: Is the Sun Rising?
Danish experiment suggests unexpected magic by cosmic rays in cloud formation
By Henrik Svensmark, Technical University of Denmark, Sep 4, 2013 [H/t WUWT]
http://www.dtu.dk/english/News/Nyhed?id=%7BABB2F1B4-F5F7-4452-BB39-9818EA7CB8F9%7D
Link to paper: Response of cloud condensation nuclei (>50 nm) to changes in ion-nucleation

Challenging the Orthodoxy
Consensus? What Consensus
By Andrew Montford, GWPF, No date

Cooks ‘97% consensus’ disproven by a new peer reviewed paper showing major math errors
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 3, 2013
Link to paper: Climate Consensus and ‘Misinformation’: A Rejoinder to Agnotology, Scientific Consensus, and the Teaching and Learning of Climate Change
By Legates, Soon, Briggs, and Monckton, Science and Education, Aug 2013

Garden shed tinkerers
By Andrew Montfort, Bishop Hill, Sep 6, 2013
http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2013/9/6/garden-shed-tinkerers.html
Man Made Climate Change Arguments Don’t Survive Scrutiny
By Art Horn, Energy Tribune, Sep 2, 2013

[SEPP Comment: Based on US government reports, SEPP estimates the US appropriations have been $150 Billion to $160 Billion from FY 1993 to FY 2012 and are ongoing at about $20 Billion per year.]

Defending the Orthodoxy
Climate science alarming, irrefutable: Kerry
By Staff Writer, AFP, Sep 2, 2013

Wildfires and Climate Change
By Kate Galbraith, NYT, Sep 4, 2013 [H/t Clyde Spencer]

Questioning the Orthodoxy
Another paper blames ENSO for global warming pause, calling it ‘… a major control knob governing Earth’s temperature.’
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 3, 2013

The Hiatus in Global Temperature Explained?
By David Whitehouse, GWPF, Sep 3, 2013
http://www.thegwpf.org/hiatus-global-temperature-explained/

Astounding discovery: World War II had low carbon footprint
By Tom Quirk and Jo Nova, Her Blog, Sep 3, 2013

Chemtrails or Contrails? Another Alarmist Issue Without Scientific Context
By Tim Ball, WUWT, Sep 2, 2013
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/02/chemtrails-or-contrails-another-alarmist-issue-without-scientific-context/

Climate scientists are wrong and here's why
By Larry Logan, Portland Tribune, Sep 5, 2013 [H/t NCTCS]
http://www.pamplinmedia.com/component/content/article?id=161053:climate-scientists-are-wrong-and-heres-why-&catid=49&Itemid=260

Global Warming Is A Fraud: Three More Pieces Of Evidence
Editorial, IBD, Sep 3, 2013
Where’s The Climate Warming? Nowhere To Be Found In Germany
By Josef Kowatsch, EIKE, Trans. P Gosselin, Sep 4, 2013

Social Benefits of Carbon
How soot killed the Little Ice Age
Industrial revolution kicked off Alpine glacier retreat fifty years before warming began.
By Quirin Schiermeier, Nature, Sep 2, 2013 [H/t Peter Salonius]
http://www.nature.com/news/how-soot-killed-the-little-ice-age-1.13650
[SEPP Comment: Now Nature admits that the Little Ice Age took place, contrary to Mr. Mann’s hockey-stick. When will they retract the paper?]

Did soot melt glaciers in the 19th century?
By Luboš Motl, The Reference Frame, Sep 4, 2013
http://motls.blogspot.com/2013/09/did-soot-melt-glaciers-in-19th-century.html#more

Black Carbon Soot shrunk the 19th century glaciers – but why isn’t it listed as a culprit today?
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 4, 2013

Problems in the Orthodoxy
Overestimated global warming over the past 20 years
By Judith Curry, Climate Etc., Aug 28, 2013
http://judithcurry.com/2013/08/28/overestimated-global-warming-over-the-past-20-years/
Link to paper: Overestimated global warming over the past 20 years
By Fyfe, Gillett, and Zwiers, Nature Climate Change, Aug 28, 2013

Can The IPCC Do Revolutionary Science?
By Barry Brill, WUWT, Aug 21, 2013
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/08/31/can-the-ipcc-do-revolutionary-science/
[SEPP Comment: A number of IPCC leading authors have produced papers that contradict the 2007 report. Will the upcoming IPCC report include these work?]

Now Dead And Extinct…Climate Issue Not Even Mentioned Once In Germany’s Televised National Election Debate!
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 2, 2013

Seeking a Common Ground
Climate of failure(?)
By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 1, 2013
http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/01/climate-of-failure/#more-12805
[SEPP Comment: Discussion on an early August article by Roger Pielke, Jr. stating that by making cleaner energy cheap, dirty energy will be displaced. The transition requires technological innovation and social adaption.]

Climate of Failure: how alternate energy dreams are pie in the sky solutions for emissions
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 1, 2013
[SEPP Comment: See link immediately above.]

Natural internal variability: sensitivity and attribution
By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 3, 2013
http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/03/natural-internal-variability-sensitivity-and-attribution/#more-12836
[SEPP Comment: More on attempting to explain the lack of warming using the Pacific Ocean.]

U.S. Republicans: critical thinking on climate change
By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 5, 2013
http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/05/u-s-republicans-critical-thinking-on-climate-change/#more-12844
[SEPP Comment: Largely unnoticed by the press, the presentation addresses some of the critical issues.]

Lowering Standards
1974 Ehrlich and Holdren Senate Testimony
By Roger Pielke, Jr. His Blog, Sep 3, 2013

NOAA goes full alarmist with new publication, seeing AGW in extreme weather events
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 5, 2013
Link to press release: Explaining Extreme Events of 2012
By Staff Writers, NOAA, No Date
Link to report: Explaining Extreme Events of 2012 from a Climate Perspective
Special Supplement to the Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society
By Peterson, Hoerling, Stott, and Herring, AMS, Sep 2013
[SEPP Comment: The cover with a propaganda photo of Breezy Point, NY, of multi-million homes or condos damaged or destroyed by Sandy is very effective. How does this compare with the 1938 Long Island Express that took a movie theater out to sea, with patrons?]}

Questioning European Green
Germany's Energy Poverty: How Electricity Became a Luxury Good
By Staff Writers, Spiegel, DE, Sep 4, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/high-costs-and-errors-of-german-transition-to-renewable-energy-a-920288.html
German Chamber Of Industry and Commerce: Renewable Energy Driving Out 25% Of Industrial Companies
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 6, 2013

Oettinger advises Germany on fracking, warns of climate overacting
Germany should not dismiss gas fracking technology that has boosted US industry, nor unilaterally overexpose itself to climate protection efforts, European Energy Commissioner Günther Oettinger said on Tuesday (3 September).
By Staff Writer, Euractiv, Sep 4, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
http://www.euractiv.com/energy/oettinger-advises-germany-fracki-news-530218
Oettinger said German industry could afford to pay 50% or 100% more for energy than rivals in the United States, "but not more than that”.

Mainstream German Media Lashes Out at Energiewende
By Walter Russell Mead, Via Media, Sep 5, 2013
http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2013/09/05/mainstream-german-media-lashes-out-at-energiewende/

£3,000-a-year bills on the way as energy prices rise again
HARD-UP families could see energy bills double to a -whopping £3,000 a year, experts warned last night.
By Nathan Rao, Express, Aug 31, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/425813/3-000-a-year-bills-on-the-way-as-energy-prices-rise-again

As Coal Plants Shut Down, United Kingdom Faces a Power Crunch
By Thomas Grose, National Geographic, Aug 29, 2013 [H/t Cooler Heads]
[SEPP Comment: Even the National Geographic sees a problem.]

Businesses protest over cost of green energy reforms
Businesses have voiced their concern over the costs of the £110bn “green” overhaul of Britain’s energy sector and believe it risks making the country uncompetitive.
By Emily Gosden, Telegraph, UK, Aug 31, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/newsbysector/energy/10278434/Businesses-protest-over-cost-of-green-energy-reforms.html

Handelsblatt Calls Germany’s Feed-In Act “Energy Madness”. Large Consumers Are Paid To Waste
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 5, 2013
[SEPP Comment: A publication formerly advocating of alternative energy now sees its abuses.]

Questioning Green Elsewhere
50 to 1 Video Project
By Topher, Video, Undated
[SEPP Comment: An amusing video explaining how destructive carbon taxes are as compared with adaption to address the false claim that taxes will stop climate change.]

It looks like a Rudd-bath: Poll says Labor is facing its worst primary vote since 1934
By Simon Benson, Telegraph, AU, Sep 6, 2013
&net_sub_uid=34869886

Funding Issues
The opportunity the Coalition/Tories/Republicans missed to solve climate dilemma, save money, save environment
How do we fund science?
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Aug 2, 2013

Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate, or be Vague?
Study: Warming Will Shift Tracks of Future Sandy-Like Tropical Storms Away from U.S. Northeast
By Marlo Lewis, Global Warming.org, Sep 3, 2013
http://www.globalwarming.org/2013/09/03/study-global-warming-will-shift-hurricane-storm-tracks-away-from-u-s-northeast/

The ‘Diffenbaugh Delusion’ – refuted with a single graph of temperature
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 5, 2013
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/05/the-diffenbaugh-delusion-refuted-with-a-single-graph-of-temperature/

Where can coral reefs relocate to escape the heat?
By Staff Writers, Bristol, UK (SPX), Sep 05, 2013
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Where_can_coral_reefs_relocate_to_escape_the_heat_999.htm
l
[SEPP Comment: Rather than use computer models, why not examine their location in past warm periods, 8,000 years ago, the last interglacial, etc.?]

Communicating Better to the Public – Make Things Up.
A bodyguard of woo
By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 1, 2013
http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2013/9/1/a-bodyguard-of-woo.html

The Keystone XL Pipeline and the Truth
By Sierra Rayne, American Thinker, Sep 3, 2013
http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/the_keystone_xl_pipeline_and_the_truth.html

Models v. Observations
New paper finds cloud assumptions in climate models could be incorrect by factor of 2
By Staff Writer, The Hockey Schtick, Aug 30, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.co.uk/2013/08/new-paper-finds-cloud-assumptions-in.html

New paper finds climate models have greatly exaggerated warming & finds no statistically-significant warming for past 20 years
By Staff Writer, The Hockey Schtick, Aug 28, 2013
http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.co.uk/2013/08/new-paper-finds-climate-models-have.html

New paper finds climate model assumptions on cloud-aerosol interactions may be off by ± 100%
By Staff Writer, The Hockey Schtick, Sep 5, 2013
Link to paper: The magnitude and causes of uncertainty in global model simulations of cloud condensation nuclei
By Lee et al. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, Sep 5, 2013
http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/13/8879/2013/acp-13-8879-2013.html
[SEPP Comment: But we are 95% certain we are right!]

Changing Seas
Australia turns back the climate tide!
By Tom Quirk, Quadrant, Sep 2, 2013
[SEPP Comment: Examining the claim that rains in Australia caused the sea levels to drop. A 2mm per year adjustment to reported sea levels may be more appropriate that the 3mm adjustment used. However, the conclusions remain.]

Bringing corals back from the brink
By Staff Writers, Brisbane, Australia (SPX), Sep 05, 2013
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Bringing_corals_back_from_the_brink_999.html
[SEPP Comment: Step 1, recognize the real threats, not the imagined ones.]

Changing Cryosphere – Land / Sea Ice
More settled science: The West Antarctic Ice Sheet is 20 million years older than thought
West Antarctica ice sheet existed 20 million years earlier than previously thought
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 4, 2013
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/04/more-settled-science-the-west-antarctic-ice-sheet-is-20-million-years-older-than-thought/

Changing Earth
Scientists confirm existence of largest single volcano on Earth – Massive underwater volcano rivals biggest in solar system
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 6, 2013
[SEPP Comment: Ian Plimer speculated that the Pacific warming events, El Nino, may be caused by undiscovered under seas volcanos. The discovery of such volcanos may add credibility to such an idea.]
Underwater volcano is Earth's biggest
Tamu Massif rivals the size of Olympus Mons on Mars.
http://www.nature.com/news/underwater-volcano-is-earth-s-biggest-1.13680

Acidic Waters
Carbon-sequestering ocean plants may cope with climate changes over the long run
By Staff Writers, San Francisco CA (SPX), Sep 05, 2013
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Carbon_sequestering_ocean_plants_maycope_with_climate_changes_over_the_long_run_999.html
[SEPP Comment: Animals adapt to changing conditions.]

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC
For a full list of articles see www.NIPCCreport.org
Modeling the Indian Ocean Dipole: A Progress Report (of Sorts)
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/3sep2013a1.html

Acidification of the Small Larvae of a Large Tropical Marine Fish
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/3sep2013a2.html

The Effects of Ocean Acidification on Octocorals
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/3sep2013a3.html
[SEPP Reducing the pH to as low as 7.3 had no noticeable effect.]

Ocean Acidification's Impact on Planktonic Community Fatty Acids
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/3sep2013a4.html

Modeling Southern Ocean Bottom Water Characteristics
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/4sep2013a1.html

Cap-and-Trade and Carbon Taxes
Deadweight Down Under: Australia’s Carbon Tax
By Staff Writers, IER, Sep 5, 2013
http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2013/09/05/deadweight-down-under-australias-carbon-tax/
Link to study: Australia’s Carbon Tax: An Economic Evaluation
By Alex Robson, Griffith University, Sep 2013
Australia’s Carbon Tax: Lessons for the United States
By Robert Murphy, IER, Sep 5, 2013
http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2013/09/05/australias-carbon-tax-lessons-for-the-united-states/
[SEPP Comment: And other countries.]

Pro-Carbon Tax Economists Lash Out at Australia Study
By Robert Murthy, IER, Sep 6, 2013 [H/t Cooler Heads]

Will Australians Vote to End the Carbon Tax?
By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, ,Sep 5, 2013
http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/2013/09/will-australians-vote-to-end-carbon-tax.html

EPA and other Regulators on the March
Obama's Stealth War on Global Warming
Stymied by Congress, President Obama is staffing his administration with appointees ready to take aggressive action on climate change.
By Coral Davenport, National Journal, Aug 29, 2013 [H/t Timothy Wise]
http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/obama-s-stealth-war-on-global-warming-20130829

An Environmentalist Deception
By Robert Smith, American Spectator, Sep 4, 2013
http://spectator.org/archives/2013/09/04/an-environmentalist-deception

EPA manipulates the FOIA to help Big Green
By Ron Arnold, Washington Examiner, Sep 6, 2013 [H/t Cooler Heads]
http://washingtonexaminer.com/epa-manipulates-the-foia-to-help-big-green/article/2535290

Energy Issues – Non-US
Best and Worst in Energy Arena
By Donn Dears, Power for USA, Sep 3, 2013

Best Energy Ideas for Tomorrow
By Donn Dears, Power for USA, Sep 6, 2013
http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2013/09/06/best-energy-ideas-for-tomorrow/

China to add 1,500 gigawatts of power capacity by 2030: study
By Staff Writers, Paris (AFP) ,Aug 28, 2013
http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/China_to_add_1500_gigawatts_of_power_capacity_by_2030_study_999.html
[SEPP Comment: Disagree with the Bloomberg assessment that about half of the new capacity will be generated from renewables. Perhaps, half of the name plate capacity will be in
renewables. But, renewables will not generate any amount near the electricity claimed to be usable, to meet consumption.

Energy Issues -- US
Need a Job? The Oil and Gas Industry is the Place to Go
By Staff Writers, IER, Sep 6, 2013
http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2013/09/06/need-a-job-the-oil-and-gas-industry-is-the-place-to-go/

American energy booming despite Obama's policies
Editorial, Washington Examiner, Sep 4, 2013

Booming oil production boosted GDP estimate, White House advisers say
By Zack Colman, The Hill, Aug 30, 2013
[SEPP Comment: Taking credit for economic success contrary to administration policy. Rather than taking credit for what the private sector has done, the advisers should be telling the administration to become pro-energy and use the resources controlled by the Federal government.]

Energy's unexpected jobs boom
By Daniel Yergin, Forbes, Sep 5, 2013
http://features.blogs.fortune.cnn.com/2013/09/05/energy-us-jobs/
Link to study: "America's New Energy Future: the Unconventional Oil and Gas Revolution and the Economy -- A Manufacturing Renaissance,
[SEPP Comment: Unexpected for those who did not expect the energy boom.]

Keystone XL and Gas Prices
By Sierra Rayne, American Thinker, Sep 2, 2013

Reminder: Energy Independence Still a Myth
By Walter Russell Mead, Via Meadia, Aug 30, 2013
http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2013/08/30/reminder-energy-independence-still-a-myth/
[SEPP Comment: Fails to distinguish between physical independence and independence from a global market economy. There is no need for the latter as long as the market is functioning. The former is important in case of large global war.]

U.S. energy lifting economy more than expected
By Tim Mullaney, USA Today, Sep 4, 2-13
Washington’s Control of Energy
Energy companies preparing for life without the Keystone XL pipeline
By Erika Johnsen, Hot Air, Sep 5, 2013 [H/t Timothy Wise]
http://hotair.com/archives/2013/09/05/energy-companies-preparing-for-life-without-the-keystone-xl-pipeline/
[SEPP Comment: The Administration sees no reason to build the pipeline. It would benefit our largest trading partner, Canada, make the US less dependent on Venezuela and Saudi Arabia for oil imports, lower the transportation cost of the oil placing downward pressure on petroleum products, and increase the safety of transporting the oil.]

Report: Canada offers Obama Keystone trade
By Ben Geman The Hill, Sep 6, 2013
http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/320783-report-canada-offers-obama-climate-trade-on-keystone-xl

Will Obama Approve Keystone? Does It Matter Anymore?
By Walter Russell Mead, Via Meadia, Aug 30, 2013 [H/t Timothy Wise]
http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2013/08/30/will-obama-approve-keystone-does-it-matter-anymore/

Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?
Global Echoes of the Shale Gas Revolution: “Still in the Pipeline”
By Staff Writers, Natural Gas Europe, Sep 2, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

A tutor for Cuomo
U.S. Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz makes the case for gas drilling
http://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/tutor-cuomo-article-1.1442114#ixzz2dpuADeLx

India's new LNG import terminal receives first delivery
By Staff Writers, New Delhi (UPI), Aug 26, 2013
http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Indias_new_LNG_import_terminal_receives_first_delivery_999.html
[SEPP Comment: A few problems such as a disagreement about price -- $4.5 per mmBtu or $14.5 per mmBtu.]

Return of King Coal?
China will soon have 40% more coal than the combined weight of the human population
By Gwynn Guilford, Quartz, Aug 26, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
[SEPP Comment: Interesting statistics on coal development in China.]

Nuclear Energy and Fears
Fukushima leak cleaned up
By Staff Writers, WNN, Aug 27, 2013
http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/RS_Fukushima_leak_cleaned_up_2708131.html

NRC seeks input on Yucca Mountain restart
By Staff Writers, WNN, Sep 2, 2013
http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/WR-NRC_seeks_input_on_Yucca_Mountain_restart-0209138.html
[SEPP Comment: Given the make-up of the NRC, this will be another “slow roll” – avoid approving.]

Nuclear Power’s Renaissance in Reverse
By Mycle Schneider and Antony Froggatt, Project Syndicate, Sep 5, 2013

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Solar and Wind
Non-Hydro Renewables Triple Output in a Decade
By Staff Writers, Washington DC (SPX), Aug 28, 2013
http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Non_Hydro_Renewables_Triple_Output_in_a_Decade_999.html
[SEPP Comment: If they are so successful, they do not need subsidies.]

Official policy: put kids in mortal danger
By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 5, 2013

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Energy -- Other
Biofuel blunder
By Douglas Auld, Financial Post, Sep 3, 2013 [H/t GWPF]
http://opinion.financialpost.com/2013/09/03/biofuel-blunder/
Lobbying trumped science as politicians lavished more than $100-billion in subsidies on morally suspect energy.
Globally, in 2011 Canada, the US, EU, China, India, Brazil and Australia spent more than $40 billion on biofuel subsidies. Since 2005 more than $100 billion has been allocated to biofuel programs.

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Vehicles
DOE to Lose Tens of Millions on Green Car Company
By Lachian Markey, Washington Free Beacon, Sep 6, 2013 [H/t Timothy Wise]
[SEPP Comment: Buy high, sell low – the Washington Way.]

California Dreaming
O Legacy, Where’s My Legacy?
By Peter Hannaford, American Spectator, Sep 5, 2013
http://spectator.org/archives/2013/09/05/o-legacy-wheres-my-legacy

Oh Mann!
Judge refuses to toss climate scientist Mann’s defamation lawsuit
Environmental Industry

Duke to Retire Four Coal Units Under New Edwardsport IGCC Settlement
By Staff Writers, Powernews, Sep 4, 2013
http://www.powermag.com/duke-to-retire-four-coal-units-under-new-edwardsport-igcc-settlement/?hq_e=el&hq_m=2740500&hq_l=8&hq_v=5e660500d0
[SEPP Comment: Does the consumer have a say?]

Wildlife service proposes change to endangered species management rules
By Julian Hattem, The Hill, Sep 3, 2013
[SEPP Comment: A causal link is too vague, or not too vague, for the Greens.]

Other Scientific News

Existence of new element confirmed
By Staff Writers, Lund, Sweden (SPX), Sep 05, 2013

A descent into the maelstrom – ‘black hole’ whirlpools seen for the first time in the South Atlantic
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 5, 2013

Other News that May Be of Interest

Shooting for the Stars: UH’s Larry Bell Discusses Space Architecture
By Audrey Grayson, Cullen College of Engineering, UH, Sep 3, 2013

Overgrazing turning parts of Mongolian Steppe into desert
Press Release, OSU, Sep 5, 2013 [H/t WUWT]
http://oregonstate.edu/ua/ncs/archives/2013/sep/overgrazing-turning-parts-mongolian-steppe-desert

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Guest Viewpoint: Fracking would hurt underground biosphere
http://www.ithacajournal.com/article/20130828/VIEWPOINTS02/308280090/Guest-Viewpoint-Fracking-would-hurt-underground-biosphere?nclick_check=1
[SEPP Comment: An amusing take on the hot, deep biosphere.]

Crop pests moving polewards through global warming
By Staff Writers, Paris (AFP), Sept 01, 2013
http://www.seeddaily.com/reports/Crop_pests_moving_polewards_through_global_warming_999.html
Reality TV jet skiers rescued in Northwest Passage
The Canadian Coast Guard rescued a group of Americans who attempted to travel through the Northwest Passage on jet skis as part of a reality television show.
By Staff Writers, MSN News, Sep 6, 2013

Sea ice, winds end rowers' Northwest Passage bid early
Vancouver rowers say they saw grizzly bears and beavers at the Arctic Ocean
By Staff Writers, CBC News (CA), Sep 3, 2013
'To see a beaver swimming around in the Arctic Ocean is, you know, just crazy.' — Denis Barnett, rower

ARTICLES:
1 The UN Climate Panel's 'Hot Spot' is Missing in Action
By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker. /Sep 5, 2013
http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/the_un_climate_panels_hot_spot_is_missing_in_action.html

The Second Assessment Report of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change, the UN's climate-science panel (IPCC-AR2, 1996), invented the Hot-Spot in the tropical atmosphere about 10 km above the earth's surface and assumed, mistakenly, it was proof of Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW). But the hotspot has never been demonstrated observationally. The Fifth IPCC Report (AR5, to be released on Sept 27, 2013) conveniently ignores this inconvenient fact.

The consequences of the IPCC mistake were very serious -- and are still with us. First, they concluded that the "balance of evidence" argued for AGW. This conclusion, in turn, provided the scientific basis for the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, which was designed to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide -- but never did, while wasting hundreds of billions and raising prices for energy substantially. Kyoto applied only to industrialized (OECD) nations. After many inducements, Russia finally ratified Kyoto; the United States, under Clinton-Gore (yes!), never even submitted the Protocol to the US Senate for ratification.
The hotspot issue started a long-running debate, which was only settled in the past few months, and has now led to a surprising conclusion (see below). Everyone agrees that current climate models predict the existence of a hotspot, a maximum of the warming trend in the tropical upper-troposphere, at around 10km (see top graph). But neither radiosondes (carried in weather balloons globally since 1958) nor weather satellites (since 1978) show evidence for the existence of such a hotspot (see bottom graph).

[According to theory, there should be an atmospheric amplification of any surface warming trend because of the existence of what text books call a "moist-adiabatic lapse rate." This comes about because cumulus clouds, driven by surface warming, mainly in the tropical zone, can carry water vapor into the upper atmosphere; its condensation into water droplets there releases latent heat and thereby warms the atmosphere.]

In 2004, and in more detail in 2007, several academic scientists described the disparity between model predictions and observations—thereby contradicting the IPCC-AR2 conclusions. [Full disclosure: I was co-author of the 2004 and 2007 papers published in Geophysical Research Letters (GRL) and International Journal of Climatology (IJC), respectively.]

The same result was also obtained by the US government-sponsored Climate Change Science Program (CCSP). In 2006, it published the graphs shown above, officially confirming the disparity between model predictions and observations. However, the Executive Summary of the same CCSP report managed to obscure this important result, which came from Chapter 5 of the report (BD Santer, lead author).

Rather inconsistently, a rather complicated and lengthy paper by Santer and 17 coauthors (in IJC 2008) attacked these conclusions and claimed that models and observations were consistent. We
responded, pointing out several errors, and published our results in *Energy & Environment* in 2011, and again in 2013.

We can now state confidently that after nearly 20 years of debate about the hotspot the matter is settled and accepted by all. *There is no consistency*; there is indeed a disparity between models that predict the hotspot and the actual observations that do not show one.

In the meantime, however, the Kyoto Protocol expired in December 2012 -- but not before first having wasted hundreds of billions of dollars (and counting). Government policies of OECD nations, including the United States, are in force as if the Protocol were still in existence; these policies are imposing further costly restrictions on the emissions of carbon dioxide. For example, President Obama has declared that Climate Change will have a high priority in his second term of office and has instituted what has been called a "War on Coal," using regulations by the Executive Branch of government to circumvent the intent of Congress.

As a result, the cost of energy is still rising in OECD nations -- but without slowing down the accelerating rise of atmospheric CO$_2$ levels. China, and soon India, are by now the leading emitters of CO$_2$, making OECD decisions increasingly irrelevant.

**A surprise conclusion**

Returning to climate science: How to interpret the lack of consistency between models and observations of the hotspot? There are three basic choices:

1. The atmospheric measurements could be in error -- favored by climate alarmists. This is very unlikely since radiosondes and independent satellite observations agree that the tropical atmospheric warming trends from 1978 to 2000 are essentially zero.

2. The models could be in error -- favored by most skeptics. This is also unlikely. While climate models are certainly far from perfect, they do follow faithfully the instructions given to them. Also, independent research indicates there is amplification shown (as expected) by atmospheric trends of *short-term* surface trends -- with the former up to double of the latter.

3. This leaves the possibility that the reported surface trends (covering the period 1978-2000) have been greatly over-estimated, and are in actuality close to zero. After all, if the atmospheric trend is ~zero and represents an amplification factor of ~2, then half of zero is still zero.

It turns out then that this third possibility is the most likely. Such near-zero surface trends are supported by independent ocean data and by 'proxy' data of tree rings, ice cores, stalagmites, etc.

In 2000, the National Academy of Sciences appointed a distinguished panel of atmospheric scientists under the chairmanship of Prof. Mike Wallace (Univ. of Washington) to try to discover why the reported surface warming from 1978 to 2000 was not amplified in the atmosphere. The panel published a learned report but could not reconcile the disparity between surface and atmosphere. This disparity disappears, however, if the surface trend is near-zero.

This conclusion implies that the surface observations, primarily from land-based weather stations greatly exaggerate a global warming trend -- perhaps because they measure *local* warming rather than global warming.

If that is the case, then the climate sensitivity for CO$_2$ is very low indeed -- and any future warming based on an increase of carbon dioxide will not be significant. Such a prediction seems to be borne out also by the global temperature data of the 21st century that show no surface warming to speak of during at least the past decade.
The forthcoming (Sept. 2013) IPCC report claims that the reported surface warming of 1978-2000 is sure (better than 95% -- by IPCC's own unsupported estimate) evidence for AGW. But the missing hotspot is sure (better than 96%, by my personal reckoning) evidence against the existence of any such warming. But before you dispose of the 2000-page-plus IPCC report, stop and consider: it makes a wonderful paper weight or door stop.

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

2. It Was a Dark and Stormy Climate Study . . .
Would that all forward-looking global-warming research got such a skeptical reception.
Editorial, WSJ, Sep 4, 2013

Longer growing seasons, a year-round trade route through the Arctic, fewer people freezing to death: These are just a few of the boons that global warming could have in store for humanity, assuming the planet is in fact warming.

We can now report one more happy possibility: fewer Sandy-like superstorms likely to hit land in the eastern U.S., according to a new study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. The research, which projects what the authors call an "extreme warming scenario" through 2100, is being met with skepticism from the climate-change crowd, for whom bad news is the only news worth reporting.

Activist-scientists lost no time last fall in declaring that Superstorm Sandy represented a "new normal," as one senior researcher at the U.S. National Center for Atmospheric Research put it. Noted climatologist Barack Obama followed up in his State of the Union address by invoking the devastation in New York and New Jersey and "the overwhelming judgment of science" as justification for new anti-carbon subsidies and regulations.

Part of what made Sandy so damaging was the near-perpendicular angle at which it hit the New Jersey coast. The new study suggests that, in an "extreme warming" scenario, a storm like Sandy would be more likely to blow safely out to sea.

The paper's authors note that "recent studies disagree on whether Atlantic hurricane frequencies will increase or decrease as the climate warms." In separate comments to the press, Elizabeth Barnes of Colorado State and Columbia University's Adam Sobel and Lorenzo Polvani are also emphasizing that other factors in a globally warming world may increase the intensity of storms and that rising sea levels would make them more damaging.

Even so, the paper has led a number of climate scaremongers to rediscover their inner skeptics. The same people who have spent two decades lobbying for multi-trillion-dollar global efforts to combat climate change on the basis of these computer models have responded to the good-news story by tut-tutting that atmospheric trends may be too complicated to be fully captured in any computer simulation. Now they tell us. Would that all new climate projections got the same reception.

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

3. Greenhouse-Gas Fight Escalates
Administration's Higher Estimate for Cost of Carbon Raises Ire of Critics
By Keith Johnson, WSJ, Sep 3, 2013
WASHINGTON—A quiet move by the Obama administration to put a higher price tag on greenhouse-gas emissions has sparked a big fight, prompting new legislation in Congress and sniping in academic circles.

Buried in new energy-efficiency standards the Department of Energy released in May for microwave ovens was an administration estimate that the cost to the country for each ton of carbon dioxide emitted was $36 in 2007 dollars—up from its 2010 estimate of $21 a ton.

The number is important because the more costly carbon pollution is deemed to be, the greater the apparent economic benefits of new environmental regulations. The climate plan hinges on such regulations, including restrictions on new power plants that the Environmental Protection Agency is set to release in late September.

House Republicans passed a bill in August that would bar the administration from using the new estimates.

Critics said administration officials calculated the numbers behind closed doors without transparency. "You can't just step in and change the number, especially to that level, without some kind of input," said Rep. James Lankford (R., Okla.), chairman of the House Oversight Subcommittee on Energy Policy. He said he would prefer that Congress determine the price of carbon emissions. U.S. officials and advocates of carbon pricing dismissed the criticism.

Howard Shelanski, who heads the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, told the House the revised estimate reflects new research on the impact of climate change.

Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz said the $36 figure is in line with or lower than estimates used by many corporations and national governments. Exxon Mobil Corp. assumes a carbon price of $80 per ton by 2040 for investment decisions, while BP PLC, another oil giant, assumes a $40 price today, according to the companies. The British government pegs the 2020 price at the equivalent of about $47 a ton.

The administration has used "the most mainstream, the most well-validated, the most broadly accepted methodology for assigning benefits," said Michael Livermore, a cost-benefit expert at the University of Virginia law school. He said "the entire process has been on the record."

Putting a price on carbon emissions assumes that increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will lead to greater climate change, which in turn is assumed to cause more hurricanes and rising sea levels. Not everyone agrees with those assumptions, which are shared by nearly all climate scientists. Even those who agree that climate change is bad disagree about how much it is worth today to prevent an additional hurricane in, say, 2050.

The effort to put a price tag on carbon emissions has been years in the making. Under the George W. Bush administration, a federal appeals court rejected new fuel-economy rules because they didn't put a price on greenhouse-gas emissions and, according to the ruling, understated the potential benefits of regulation. "We recognized the link between greenhouse gases and climate change, but the process of putting a dollar value on the impacts of climate change was extremely
uncertain," said John Graham, who headed the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs in the Bush administration.

Early in the Obama administration, officials from nearly a dozen agencies, including the Department of Energy and the EPA, took a first stab, using several computer economic models. The administration said the figure would be continually revised.

Critics maintain the whole question is too uncertain to be entrusted to computer models. They fear the higher $36-a-ton figure will be used to justify tighter regulation on coal-fired power plants, which could raise consumers' electricity costs.

Robert Pindyck, an economics professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, slams the models in a coming paper to be published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, saying they use essentially arbitrary inputs and give a misplaced illusion of scientific certainty.

Though his work has given ammunition to skeptics of global-warming science, Mr. Pindyck said his point is really about the difficulty of modeling possible catastrophic impacts of climate change. "We know there's a social cost of carbon, and we know it's above $0," he said. "If anything, the cost of carbon could be higher" than the administration's models suggest.

Creators of the models concede they aren't perfect. But Yale economics professor William Nordhaus, the creator of the best-known model, said they have improved and can provide a starting point for policy makers. Damage estimates from warming "are based on literally hundreds of studies of the impact of climate change on different sectors of the economy," he said.

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

4. Electric Losers, Round Two

The Energy Department hopes to revive an Obama clunker.

Editorial, WSJ, Sep 2, 2013


A leading candidate for the biggest government failure in recent years is the $25 billion Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Loan Program (ATVM), which stopped doling out loans in 2011 after funding such debacles as Fisker Automotive. But this is the Obama Administration, where nothing in government fails, so naturally new Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz wants to revive it.

The Energy Department said last week that it "plans to conduct an active outreach campaign to educate industry associations and potential applicants about the substantial remaining funds" in ATVM. The PR campaign appears to be the first step in what Mr. Moniz tells the Detroit News may be a "new solicitation" for loans. Hold on to your wallets.

Congress created this market-distorting program in 2008 to spur a green-car revolution, and President Bush went along for the ride in his unlamented late period. The Obama Administration made the program a highlight of its stimulus, committing some $9 billion to electric-vehicle and other projects. Two of the largest taxpayer loans went to global titans Ford and Nissan—not exactly needy but at least going concerns.
The biggest bust was the $529 million loan promise to Fisker, which planned to make luxury cars for the masses from a defunct GM plant in Joe Biden territory in Delaware. Despite this federal loan, state subsidies and more than $1 billion in private financing from Kleiner Perkins and other Silicon Valley investors, Fisker ceased production last year. It had already drawn some $193 million of its federal loan, which looks to be a taxpayer loss.

Energy is also trying to recoup its $50 million to the Vehicle Production Group, a maker of natural-gas powered wheelchair-accessible vans. VPG shut down in May, and the Energy Department recently announced it would auction off its promissory note on August 15. But the federal auction website (GovSales.gov) doesn't show that the event took place.

Secretary Moniz will no doubt tout the case of Tesla, another luxury-car company that earlier this year repaid its $465 million loan ahead of schedule. Tesla's stock price is soaring, and this is supposed to be the success story of government venture capital. But Tesla still benefits from other government subsidies—such as the $7,500 federal tax credit for electric-car buyers and the emissions credits Tesla has cashed in on at the expense of traditional car makers. Let's see how Tesla does when it takes off the taxpayer training wheels.

The $16 billion or so left in the auto-loan program seems to be burning a hole in Mr. Moniz's pocket, so taxpayers should be on the lookout for political favoritism. Congress's investigations into Fisker, Solyndra and other losers showed that the Energy Department passed out funds on the basis of political calculations and then was incapable of exercising due diligence over its portfolio.

Rather than let Mr. Moniz throw money at more companies that will go bust or become government dependencies, Congress ought to kill this monument to crony capitalism.
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