

which greenhouse gas emissions continue to rise, environmental groups have warned.]

But the chief U.S. delegate urged negotiators from 175 countries to think of longer-term objectives rather than focus on short-range targets that would be difficult to meet. "We are actively working to move forward aggressively," Jonathan Pershing told hundreds of delegates on the final day of talks before the negotiations adjourned for two months. *SEPP comment: Yeah, sure.*

SEPP Science Editorial #13-2009 (4/18/09)

The IPCC's 'Evidence' for Anthropogenic GW deconstructed #2

The IPCC claims, with near certainty, that the temperature history of the 20th century can be explained in terms of a combination of anthropogenic and natural forcings. This claim is entirely based on curve fitting with the use of adjustable parameters. It is also based on the forcings shown by IPCC that do not include, e.g., the forcing due to changing solar activity – a major influence on climate. [IPCC-AR4 shows solar forcing since 1750 as only 0.1 W/m², compared to GH gases of >2.1 W/m²] Quoting Dr Norman Rogers:

"The IPCC has tried very hard to convince us that the climate models can reproduce the 20th century climate. They have to. If the models can't do that, how good are they? Allowing each modeling group to customize forcing to make its model show a good fit is unscientific. It is not a minor error. It is very bad science and there is no excuse for trying to fool people with fudged graphs. Adding speculative solar forcing in the early 20th century suggests cherry-picking in order to make the fit look better.

Clearly, the IPCC is engaging in slanting the presentation for propaganda reasons. This is not the first time that the IPCC has engaged in this type of behavior. The well-known hockey-stick scandal associated with the 2001 report is another. This is far from being the only defect in the IPCC reports. Dozens of commentators have pointed out many more inconsistencies."

The IPCC claim that models [which one of the more than 20?] can uniquely match the (global mean surface) temperatures of the 20th century is just not credible. I view it purely as an exercise in 'curve fitting,' achieved by arbitrarily choosing several adjustable parameters. I note with some amusement that IPCC partisans still maintain this claim --even after the recent discovery that Black Carbon aerosols account for much of observed warming. Will the IPCC now adjust their choice of parameters to match the observed temperature record by including this new forcing?

- 1. Carol Browner set to trump cap&trade legislation with EPA regulation – Tom Randall**
- 2. Energy-and-Climate bill advances in Congress – Kevin Bullis
Marlo Lewis on Waxman-Markey**
- 3. Obama, who vowed rapid action on climate change, turns more cautious -- John Broder**
- 4. Biofuels cause nitrous oxide leakage**
- 5. Wind power is a complete disaster -- Michael J. Trebilcock**
- 6. Federal feed-in tariff legislation: a thoroughly bad idea**
- 7. Oil giants loath to follow Obama's green lead -- Jad Mouawad**
- 8. Fire and ice -- Investor's Business Daily**

9. Arctic ice shrinking – again? – SFS

10. An inconvenient film -- Peter Foster

NEWS YOU CAN USE

EPA chief Lisa Jackson: "This pollution problem has a solution -- one that will create millions of green jobs and end our country's dependence on foreign oil."

SEPP comment: Yes, and we will all become environmental lawyers and no longer need the trillion-dollar economic stimulus program. We wonder what she's been smoking?

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/17/AR2009041701453_pf.html

WashPost story quotes SEPP: Fred Singer, who heads the Arlington, Va.-based Science and Environmental Policy Project and has repeatedly questioned the idea that humans contribute to climate change, said in a statement that the EPA proposal "is based on shoddy science and would impose a huge economic burden on American households. . . . Congress must stop this unwarranted action by means of legislation, but without committing the same errors as EPA."

Climate bill could trigger lawsuit landslide. *The Washington Times 10 April 2009*

Self-proclaimed victims of global warming or those who "expect to suffer" from it - from beachfront property owners to asthmatics - for the first time would be able to sue the federal government or private businesses over greenhouse-gas emissions under a little-noticed provision slipped into the House climate bill. Environmentalists say the measure was narrowly crafted to give citizens the unusual standing to sue the U.S. government as a way to force action on curbing emissions. But the U.S. Chamber of Commerce sees a new cottage industry for lawyers.

(CNSNews.com) An environmental news Web site that creators say will be the most comprehensive information center for climate and energy news and information, was just launched. **ClimateDepot.com**, owned by the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), is intended to be an information clearinghouse featuring investigative reports alongside policy briefs aimed at lawmakers, teachers, parents, and the general public, according to its managing editor, Marc Morano. He said that the Web site wouldn't be just another home for climate change skeptics; it would expose readers to the entire spectrum of climate change debate. See NYT story <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/10/us/politics/10morano.html?hpw>

Good reads from spiked: Climate blasphemy <http://www.spiked-online.com/index.php?/site/article/5490/>

Is climate realism a 'mental disorder'? <http://www.spiked-online.com/index.php?/site/printable/6320/>

John Coleman Congressional testimony of April 7, 2009

http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Testimony_of_John_Coleman.pdf

President Obama recently signed the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act, placing an additional *two million* acres of public land under the federal government's most stringent use restrictions. Based on the federal government's track record regarding stewardship of some of America's most amazing assets, PERC executive director, Terry Anderson, and PERC director of applied programs, Reed Watson, explain why this legislation is grounds for concern for the environment and the economy.

<http://www.forbes.com/2009/04/07/public-land-mismanagement-opinions-contributors-perc.html>

California Wants to Ban Big Screen TVs: A California energy commission says your television is causing global warming. So the state is looking to ban some big screen TVs. Reason Foundation's Steve Titch writes, "*The energy commissioners are really concerned about our prosperity. They fret that too*

many people are buying bigger TVs, hooking them up to Digital Video Recorders (DVRs), cable boxes, computers and digital cameras. We simply can't have that. These home electronics now consume about 10 percent of household electricity, according to PG&E. So here comes the state's nanny to tell taxpayers how they should be using electricity and to tell us we are using too much of it watching big-screen TVs. Ironically, these nanny-state tactics are unnecessary. Bureaucrats don't have to browbeat consumers into saving energy. The cost of power isn't getting any less expensive. You don't have to buy into the global warming doctrine to want to lower your electricity bills. Many television manufacturers, well aware that their customers want to save money, are developing organic light-emitting diode (OLED) televisions that are much more power efficient than today's sets."

UNDER THE BOTTOM LINE

This Easter, Help This Bunny Survive Global Warming! That's exactly the predicament the American pika finds itself in. Global warming is posing a serious threat to this cousin of the rabbit and it's running out of options, we're told.

In fact, the tiny pika has already disappeared from over one-third of their previously known habitat in Oregon and Nevada. Now, the situation is so dire that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is considering the pika for protection under the Endangered Species Act. They need your help today.



1. CAROL BROWNER SET TO TRUMP CAP-AND TRADE LEGISLATION WITH EPA REGULATION

By Tom Randall, WinninggreenLLC, April 17, 2009

Issue: While Congress dithers, in its typically dysfunctional way, about whether to pass a cap-and-trade tax to control carbon dioxide emissions, White House energy and environment Czar Carol Browner is preparing to make legislation irrelevant by taking the first step toward having the Environmental Protection Agency regulate CO2 emissions.

The agency will declare today that carbon emissions are an endangerment to human health. The announcement, originally scheduled for the April 22 anniversary of the birth on Vladimir Lenin, celebrated in this country as Earth Day, has been moved to today according to reports. With this proclamation Ms. Browner, a member of Socialist International and prominently featured on their web site until her appointment to the Obama White House, will then be free to impose whatever restrictions to energy use she wishes.

Comment 1: Ms. Browner has been recently quoted as saying the agency wouldn't interfere with small businesses, only electricity generation and the auto industry. Of course, none of us uses electricity or mechanical devices for travel.

Comment 2: For years now, many naive energy industry executives, misled by their "government relations" people, have endorsed cap-and-trade legislation as a way to avoid the uncertainty of regulations. To those executives we would suggest that *there* is an area where they can cut substantial payroll.

Comment 3: It is tempting to think energy companies are getting what they richly deserve except we, the people, are the ones who will get it -- in the end (apologies for the pun).

SEPP Comment: Browner vs Waxman will be fun to watch. Anyone care to place a bet?

2. ENERGY AND CLIMATE BILL ADVANCES: Fear of EPA regulation could help it pass, says Congressman Markey.

By Kevin Bullis, Technology Review, April 14, 2009

<http://www.technologyreview.com/energy/22429/>

Congress is moving forward on legislation that would address both energy efficiency and climate change in a single bill, creating requirements for the use of renewable energy and introducing a cap on carbon dioxide emissions. [A draft](#) of the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 was released at the end of March. Congressman [Edward Markey](#) from Massachusetts, one of the sponsors of the bill, said that hearings on the legislation will begin next Tuesday to help shape the bill into its final form.

Representatives from the Obama administration and one of the authors of the draft bill discussed it at a forum held at MIT on Monday. They said that two things have brought a sense of added urgency to the process. The first is that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is moving toward regulating carbon dioxide emissions even if Congress does not act. The second is the United Nations Conference on Climate Change, which will be held in Copenhagen in December. At the event, countries will meet to negotiate a new global climate-change treaty. Congressional leaders hope to have the bill passed by the House of Representatives by August, and have the finished version ready for the president to sign before the conference. President Obama has said that he hopes to make the United States a leader in addressing climate change at the meeting.

"The positions we can take at Copenhagen will be driven by what we're prepared to do domestically," said [Carol Browner](#), who oversees policy on energy and climate change across federal agencies as a special assistant to the president, at the MIT forum. The bill and the hearings in the next weeks are "absolutely essential to our position and what we ultimately hope to achieve."

In its current form, the bill includes a [renewable-energy](#) standard, which would require states to produce one-quarter of their energy from sources such as solar panels or wind turbines by 2025. It also includes incentives for developing technologies for capturing and permanently storing carbon dioxide, improving the electrical grid, and reducing overall energy consumption. Furthermore, the bill outlines [a cap-and-trade system](#) for reducing carbon dioxide emissions from major industries by 83 percent by 2050, compared with 2005 levels. Under the cap-and-trade system, a set number of allowances for carbon dioxide emissions will be issued for each year. Companies that emit more than their allowance will need to buy more from companies that emit less than their allowance.

One key element conspicuously absent from the bill, however, is a description of how the allowances will be distributed. President Obama [has said](#) that he supports a system where 100 percent of the allowances are auctioned off to polluters to ensure that each company pays for all its carbon emissions. But many in Congress and industry are concerned that the cost of these permits could hurt the steel and paper industries, among others, by [putting them at a disadvantage](#) compared with countries that don't regulate carbon dioxide emissions. At the MIT forum, Congressman [Markey](#) said that to protect these industries, some of the allowances will be given away rather than auctioned off.

Eventually, he said, the goal is to auction off all of the allowances, but achieving this could first require ensuring that China and India are also limiting carbon dioxide emissions. Other participants in the forum emphasized that bringing technologies for reducing emissions to these countries could require research and development to lower the cost of renewable energy and of capturing and storing carbon dioxide.

Cap-and-trade legislation has failed in the past. But this year, the possibility of the EPA regulating carbon emissions could push legislators to pass a bill that would give them more control over how such emissions are regulated, Markey said. In 2007, a Supreme Court decision paved the way for the EPA to regulate greenhouse gases. "The only way to avoid that is to have Congress act," he said. "Industries across the country will have to gauge how lucky they feel, if they kill the legislation, in terms of how the EPA will treat them."

=====

[Marlo Lewis on Waxman-Markey](#)

<http://www.openmarket.org/2009/04/09/waxman-markey-litigation-shell-game/>

What a difference one presidential election can make! Back in July 2008, [Waxman](#) and [Markey](#) bashed Bush's EPA for responding to *Mass v. EPA* by issuing an [Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#) (ANPR). EPA's purpose was to inform and solicit public comment on the administrative, legal, and

economic repercussions of greenhouse gas regulation under the CAA. Waxman denounced the ANPR as a transparent delaying tactic. Markey called it a shameful display of political interference with potential regulation of global warming pollution. They demanded that EPA simply declare global warming pollution a menace to society, and propose regulations to combat it.

Yet today, Waxman and Markey are peddling legislation that would exempt greenhouse gases from several CAA regulatory authorities. It's as if they actually learned something from the ANPR and the comments free-market and industry analysts submitted to EPA spotlighting the perils of CO2 regulation under the CAA. Or maybe they knew all along that *Mass v. EPA* created a Pandora's Box; pretending otherwise gave them another stick to beat Bush with: but now that Obama is in the hot seat, they have to sober up and avoid a politically-damaging regulatory debacle.

3. OBAMA, WHO VOWED RAPID ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE, TURNS MORE CAUTIOUS

By JOHN M. BRODER http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/11/us/politics/11climate.html?_r=1&hpw

WASHINGTON -- [President Obama](#) came to office promising swift and comprehensive action to combat global [climate change](#), and the topic remains a surefire applause line in his speeches here and abroad. Yet the administration has taken a cautious and rather passive role on the issue, proclaiming broad goals while remaining aloof from details of climate legislation now in Congress.

The president's budget initially included roughly \$650 billion in revenue over 10 years from a cap-and-trade emissions plan that he wants adopted. But the administration, while insisting that its health care initiative be protected, did not fight to keep cap-and-trade in the budget resolutions that Congress passed last week, and it wound up in neither the House's version nor the Senate's.

Overseas, American officials are telling their counterparts that they need time to gauge the American public's appetite for an ambitious carbon reduction scheme before leading any international effort. Has the administration scaled back its global-warming goals, at least for this year, or is it engaged in sophisticated misdirection?

Maybe some of both. While addressing climate change appears to be slipping down the president's list of priorities for the year, he is holding in reserve a powerful club to regulate carbon dioxide emissions through executive authority. That club takes the form of [Environmental Protection Agency](#) regulation of the gases blamed for the warming of the planet, an authority granted the agency by the Supreme Court's reading of the [Clean Air Act](#). Administration officials consistently say they would much prefer that Congress write new legislation to pre-empt the E.P.A. regulatory power, but they are clearly holding it in reserve as a prod to reluctant lawmakers and recalcitrant industries, and as evidence of good faith to other nations.

Industry lobbyists and members of Congress who are engaged in writing energy and global warming bills say they are well aware of the E.P.A. process bearing down on them. Once the Supreme Court declared carbon dioxide to be a pollutant under the Clean Air Act, E.P.A. had no choice but to act, said Representative Rick Boucher, a moderate Democrat from a coal-producing region of Virginia. Most people would rather have Congress act. We can be more balanced; we can take into account the effects on the economy. But if we don't undertake this, E.P.A. certainly will.

Still, the agency's regulations would take months to write and years to become fully effective. Meanwhile, Congress is already starting work on energy and climate legislation, though without significant guidance from the White House, at least in public. [Carol M. Browner](#), the White House coordinator of energy and climate policy, issued a surprisingly bland statement last week when two top House Democrats unveiled a far-reaching plan to cap greenhouse gases and move the nation toward an economy less dependent on carbon-rich fuels like coal and oil. Ms. Browner stopped short of endorsing that plan, issued by Representatives [Henry A. Waxman](#) of California and [Edward J. Markey](#) of Massachusetts, saying instead that Mr. Obama looks forward to working with members of Congress in both chambers to pass a bill that would transition the nation to a clean-energy economy. She gave little clue as to what she and the president believe such a measure should say.

At an international climate conference in Germany that ended Wednesday, some delegates said they were disappointed in the Obama administrations lack of robust leadership. The explanation offered by Jonathan Pershing, a leader of the American delegation, was that the administration was waiting to measure the American technological and political capacity to address climate change and was looking to Congress to set specific targets for reducing carbon pollution.

Business lobbyists welcome the White Houses go-slow approach, saying the issue is too complicated and too costly to be rushed, especially in a recession. We have not until now had a national debate on a climate change proposal, period, said Karen A. Harbert, a former senior Energy Department official who now heads the United States Chamber of Commerce's energy institute. That has to happen for any piece of legislation to achieve broad support across the country.

Ms. Harbert and other business lobbyists also welcomed the administrations hesitancy to undertake regulation of climate-altering gases under E.P.A. authority, saying the matter should be fully aired before Congress so that all interests and regions could be heard.

Keith McCoy, vice president for energy and resources policy at the [National Association of Manufacturers](#), said his organization was strongly opposed to an E.P.A. regulatory process for greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act. Mr. McCoy said his members would prefer a binding international treaty that would cover all nations, particularly those whose industries compete with energy-intensive American manufacturers. Absent that, he said, we would prefer a robust and transparent debate within Congress.

The administrations caution leaves many environmental advocates frustrated, although most are reluctant to speak on the record for fear of alienating their allies inside government. One environmental and energy lobbyist with close ties to the White House said the administration had been inhibited by a number of factors, including vacancies in many top policy jobs, an intense early focus on the financial and economic crises, and an unwillingness to alienate business and Congressional leaders with a heavy-handed approach.

"With those realities, coupled with the fact that the president himself realizes this is harder to do in the midst of recession, they are basically content to see what Congress will do, this lobbyist said. Plus, Henry Waxman has put together a very serious piece of legislation, and that in my mind justifies their lack of forceful intervention. That's just where they are now."

4. BIOFUELS CAUSE NITROUS OXIDE LEAKAGE - A BAD GREENHOUSE GAS.

The Economist,| April 8, 2009

Farming biofuels produces nitrous oxide. This is bad for climate change:

The latest come from a report produced by a team of scientists working on behalf of the International Council for Science (ICSU), a Paris-based federation of scientific associations from around the world.

The ICSU report concludes that the production of biofuels has aggravated rather than ameliorated global warming. In particular, it supports some controversial findings published in 2007 by Paul Crutzen of the Max Planck Institute for Chemistry in Mainz, Germany. Dr Crutzen concluded that most analyses had underestimated the importance to global warming of a gas called nitrous oxide (N2O) by a factor of between three and five. The amount of this gas released by farming biofuel crops such as maize and rape probably negates by itself any advantage offered by reduced emissions of CO2.

=====

Platt's reports| Apr 8, 09 that US ethanol producer Aventine has filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection amid poor margins and product oversupply.

5. WIND POWER IS A COMPLETE DISASTER

By Michael J. Trebilcock, Financial Post, 8 April 2009

<http://network.nationalpost.com/np/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2009/04/08/wind-power-is-a-complete-disaster.aspx>

There is no evidence that industrial wind power is likely to have a significant impact on carbon emissions. The European experience is instructive. Denmark, the world's most wind-intensive nation, with more than 6,000 turbines generating 19% of its electricity, has yet to close a single fossil-fuel plant. It requires 50% more coal-generated electricity to cover wind power's unpredictability, and pollution and carbon dioxide emissions have risen (by 36% in 2006 alone).

Flemming Nissen, the head of development at West Danish generating company ELSAM (one of Denmark's largest energy utilities), tells us that wind turbines do not reduce carbon dioxide emissions. The German experience is no different. *Der Spiegel* reports that Germany's CO2 emissions haven't been reduced by even a single gram, and additional coal- and gas-fired plants have been constructed to ensure reliable delivery.

Indeed, recent academic research shows that wind power, because of its intermittent character, may actually increase greenhouse gas emissions in some cases, depending on the carbon-intensity of back-up generation required. On the negative side of the environmental ledger are adverse impacts of industrial wind turbines on birdlife and other forms of wildlife, farm animals, wetlands and viewsheds. *H/T CCNet*

6. FEDERAL FEED-IN TARIFF LEGISLATION: A THOROUGHLY BAD IDEA

President Barack Obama has touted a robust green energy sector as our best chance of jump-starting the economy, putting Americans back to work, and securing our nation's standing in a post-carbon world. Yet the renewable energy industry has been among the hardest hit by the current downturn.

How can America revive this vital sector, transforming it into an engine of economic growth? *The Washington Monthly* has found a promising answer in an unlikely place: Gainesville, Florida, which is in the midst of a solar-power boom, thanks to a bold incentive known as a feed-in tariff. Under this policy, the local power company is required to buy renewable energy from all producers, no matter how small, at above-market rates. This means anyone with a cluster of solar cells on their roof can sell the power they produce at a profit.

While Gainesville is the first to take the leap, other U.S. cities and at least eleven U.S. states are moving toward adopting the policy. There is also a bill for a nationwide feed-in tariff before Congress. The surge of interest stems from the dramatic results the policy has delivered in other countries, most notably Germany, where it has given rise to the world's most vibrant green energy sector. In America, however, an aging electrical grid and fractured utility market could make feed-in tariffs problematic.

SEPP comment: Can you guess where the profit comes from in this less- than- zero- sum game?

Rep. Jay Inslee, D-Wash, is the sponsor of federal feed-in tariff legislation.

7. OIL GIANTS LOATH TO FOLLOW OBAMA'S GREEN LEAD

By *JAD MOUAWAD*, April 8, 2009

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/08/business/energy-environment/08greenoil.html?ref=science>

The Obama administration wants to reduce oil consumption, increase renewable energy supplies and cut carbon dioxide emissions in the most ambitious transformation of energy policy in a generation. But the world's oil giants are not convinced that it will work. Even as Washington goes into a frenzy over energy, many of the oil companies are staying on the sidelines, balking at investing in new technologies favored by the president, or even straying from commitments they had already made.

[Royal Dutch Shell](#) said last month that it would freeze its research and investments in wind, solar and hydrogen power, and focus its alternative energy efforts on [biofuels](#). The company had already sold much of its solar business and pulled out of a project last year to build the largest offshore wind farm, near

London.

[BP](#), a company that has spent nine years saying it was moving 'beyond petroleum,' has been getting back to petroleum since 2007, paring back its renewable program. And American oil companies, which all along have been more skeptical of alternative energy than their European counterparts, are studiously ignoring the new messages coming from Washington.

In my view, nothing has really changed, [Rex W. Tillerson](#), the chief executive of [Exxon Mobil](#), said after the election of [President Obama](#). "We don't oppose alternative energy sources and the development of those. But to hang the future of the country's energy on those alternatives alone belies reality of their size and scale."

The administration wants to spend \$150 billion over the next decade to create what it calls a clean energy future. Its plan would aim to diversify the nation's energy sources by encouraging more renewables, and it would reduce oil consumption and cut carbon emissions from fossil fuels.

8. FIRE AND ICE

By INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY editorial, April 08, 2009

An ice shelf in Antarctica begins to break apart, and the global warming hysterics immediately blame human activities for the crackup. Is it possible that there is some other cause? The Wilkins Ice Shelf, a 25-mile bridge that once covered about 6,000 square miles, has split off from the Antarctic coast. Floating untethered, the Connecticut-size ledge — a mere 0.39% of all Antarctic ice — could eventually melt as it drifts northward toward warmer waters.

Naturally, activists both in and out of the scientific community, the media and political figures on the left blame human-caused emissions of carbon dioxide for warming the Earth, particularly the Antarctic peninsula, where temperatures have increased 4.5 degrees Fahrenheit in the last 50 years. Before we panic, there are a few things we should remember that will help us to put this less-than-catastrophic event in perspective.

First, the melting of the Wilkins Ice Shelf, or any other ice shelf, will not raise ocean levels. Antarctica has lost seven shelves in the last two decades and there have been no disastrous effects. Ice displaces more volume than water because water expands when it freezes. There is no net gain in water when an ice shelf or iceberg melts, or, in other words, contracts.

Second, much of Antarctica, particularly near the South Pole, has been through a recent cooling trend. According to NASA: "Although Antarctica warmed around the perimeter from 1982 to 2004, where huge icebergs calved and some ice shelves disintegrated, it cooled closer to the pole."

Third, there's an active volcano beneath the West Antarctic Ice Sheet. A little more than a year ago, the British Antarctic Survey noted, "Heat from the volcano creates melt-water that lubricates the base of the ice sheet and increases the flow toward the sea." That volcano is on the southernmost edge of the Pacific Ring of Fire, a chain of volcanoes that continue through the Antarctic Peninsula, which the Wilkins Shelf had been attached to, down the continent's west side.

Maybe the news is the fact that more Antarctic ice hasn't melted, not that a relatively small shelf has torn away from the coast. The mainstream media has its global warming narrative, though, and it's not going to abandon its commitment to one-sided journalism. Exploring the possibility that climate variations are beyond man's CO2 emissions is not a service they're willing to perform.

9. ARCTIC ICE SHRINKING – AGAIN?

Letter to Editor, Wash Post SFS/4/7/2009

The news that Arctic sea ice is shrinking “more rapidly than scientists had expected” [news story Wash Post, April 7] should evoke several responses from thoughtful readers:

- “Scientists don’t know what to expect” – or more properly, the models they use are not only worthless but they still haven’t learned what’s wrong with them. How many times have we been told that ice cover, glacier melting, etc is “worse than expected”? I have stopped counting – and so have most readers, I guess.
- “How can one tell the cause of shrinking?” Wouldn’t ice melt no matter what may be causing climate to warm? Surely, SUVs couldn’t have caused the documented disappearances of Arctic ice in past centuries.
- And while we are on the topic of climate warming, does anyone doubt that **there has been no net global warming for the past ten years** and that many official climate projections expect further cooling for at least another decade?
- And isn’t it a strange coincidence that the not-so-startling news about Arctic ice was released “on the day that international ministers gathered in Washington to address issues facing Earth’s polar regions.”

Hmm

10. AN INCONVENIENT FILM

By Peter Foster, Financial Post

Al Gore is about to feature in a new movie, but he's not going to like it very much. Titled "*Not Evil Just Wrong: The True Cost of Global Warming Hysteria*," the film presents a devastating account of the shaky foundations and hefty price of Mr. Gore's brand of self-interested and hypocritical alarmism.

Created by the Irish film-making duo of Phelim McAleer and Ann McElhinney -- who made another excellent documentary about the "dark side of environmentalism" called "Mine Your Own Business"-- *Not Evil* provides the perfect rebuttal to Mr. Gore's An Inconvenient Truth.

Despite being chock-a-block with inaccuracies and misrepresentations, Mr. Gore's movie has frightened schoolchildren all over the world, driven the public policy debate, and garnered both an Academy Award and a Nobel Peace Prize for its star.

Not Evil -- which is due to be released later this year -- will appear at a crucial time. The world's crisis-beset nations are due to meet in Copenhagen in December to concoct a new policy straitjacket to succeed the meddlesome but utterly failed Kyoto Accord. If global warming's U. N.-based ringmasters have their way, this will lead to a slashing of industrial production in developed countries and to a huge extension of boondoggle redistributionist schemes to fund "green" technologies in developing countries.

Such policy represents a triple threat: it will destroy economic activity; it will cripple trade; and it will hurt the poorest the most. Nevertheless, President Obama appears to be on-board this ship of fools, having bought into the notion that there are net "green jobs" to be had from a massive increase in taxation and regulation of industrial activity.

The impact on Canada could be horrendous, and not merely on the oil sands, which have been targeted by environmental non-governmental organizations. This week, Environment Minister Jim Prentice admitted that Canada could be forced to adopt more draconian regulation if it is not to be hit by threatened U. S. carbon tariffs.

The truly astonishing feature of this policy fandango is that it will have little or no effect on the climate, the science of which is still only dimly understood. However, alarmists such as Mr. Gore have successfully sold the notion that the science is "settled." This is just one of the claims to which *Not Evil Just Wrong* puts the lie.

Alternating credible skeptics with arresting imagery, the film makes clear that the science, far from being settled, has been comprehensively misrepresented by the likes of NASA's James Hansen, who is to Al Gore and climatology what Trofim Lysenko was to Joseph Stalin and agronomy.

There is a wonderful scene of Mr. Hansen becoming almost discombobulated at the very mention of Stephen McIntyre, the maverick Canadian who, with the help of Guelph economist Ross McKittrick, took on the UN climate-change establishment over the so-called "hockey stick" temperature graph, and won. Mr. Hansen claims that paying attention to such inconvenient truths amounts to just "clouding the issue."

The film dramatically outlines the dreadful damage already done by environmental hysteria, in particular the millions of unnecessary deaths caused by the campaign against DDT. That campaign started with Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, which was at the root of the modern environmental movement in every sense. Despite the World Health Organization's lifting of the DDT ban, Al Gore remains devoted to Ms. Carson's memory. And methods. As Patrick Moore, one of the founders of Greenpeace, but now a skeptic, points out, radical environmentalists "care more about fish eggs than they do about children." Meanwhile, kids are shown fretting about imminent global inundation and the deaths of polar bears.

Just as *Mine Your Own Business* showed how opposition to mining in developing countries comes often not from the "grassroots" but from well-funded multinational NGOs with as little concern for local employment as they have for truth, so *Not Evil Just Wrong* further demonstrates environmentalists' disregard for humanity, and in particular the poor.

Perhaps the most memorable scene in *Mine Your Own Business* was that of the WWF's local representative in Madagascar who was leading opposition to a development by Rio Tinto. The appalling Mr. Fenn, who owned a \$35,000 catamaran and was building a local luxury home, claimed that poor people were happier, and that if the locals had more money they would "just spend it."

The film makers have come up with similar buffoons for their new movie, including a Bible-thumping environmentalist in Uganda who opposes using DDT and claims that the U. S. never experienced malaria, and Hollywood actor Ed Begley, who suggests that Fijians are "happy with nothing."

Not Evil Just Wrong, which will be released later this year, is an important film that deserves the widest possible distribution, both in theatres and schools. The only quibble that I have with it is that its title might be too generous to those it exposes.

(To find out more about the movie and the fundraising campaign to help its distribution visit its website: www.noteviljustwrong.com).