

## The Week That Was 2010-04-17 (April 17, 2010) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####

The Heartland Institute's Fourth International Conference on Climate Change will be held in Chicago, Illinois on May 16-18, 2010 at the Chicago Marriott Magnificent Mile Hotel, 540 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. It will call attention to new scientific research on the causes and consequences of climate change, and to economic analyses of the cost and effectiveness of proposals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To register, click [here](#).

#####

**Next Week's TWTW:** Due to travel commitments next week's TWTW will come out earlier than usual, probably Thursday or Friday.

#####

### Quote of the Week

*It is far easier to perpetuate error than to correct it, especially when the error concerns a cherished myth. ... We do not surrender our myths easily, and scholars no less than generals have the urge to slay the messenger bearing bad news.* Maury Klein "The Life and Legend of Jay Gould."

\*\*\*\*\*

### THIS WEEK:

The Climategate cover-up continues. It is becoming increasingly obvious that the panels that are investigating the Climategate emails are avoiding investigating the actual science and the effect that activities revealed by Climategate had on the science. Many reasons, valid or not, can be given for this failure. But until the scientific issues are fully addressed, the cover-up remains.

The latest effort was by an "International Panel" carefully selected by University of East Anglia and headed by Lord Oxborough. The frailty of this investigation is discussed fully in the articles below.

In preparing the road to Cancun for next fall's IPCC grand festival, last weekend the UN held a Climate and World Government Conference in Bonn, Germany. The delegates from the 175 countries spent most of their time scheming how to extort monies from Western nations to give to the governments of underdeveloped nations. No doubt many delegates were reminiscing about the glory days of Copenhagen not so long ago. The Conference ended with a scarcely noticed whimper.

Last week's TWTW, contained an explanation of how the 2007 IPCC Assessment Report 4 (AR-4) covered-up the Holocene Climate Optimum. As this was being prepared, Steve McIntire was posting more detailed and technical explanations of this effort to disguise physical evidence. Steve's postings are referenced below.

A number of independent researchers have discovered that about one-third of the "peer-reviewed" references found in IPCC AR4 are not peer-reviewed. Many of the references are outright propaganda efforts by special-interest groups. For years, a Swiss based international special-interest conglomerate garnered in tens of millions of dollars by using the false claim that polar bears are threatened. This false claim was included in the IPCC report, and subsequently the US government declared it to be so. Using this technique, the activists successfully denied the development of American oil fields off Alaska.

It should be noted that in the independent review of references, the critical science section from Working Group I received high marks for its citations. However, many references contradicting the conclusions were not cited and the summary of this group's effort greatly overstated the quality and certainty of the science.

Noises are being emitted from the US Senate that a new cap-and-tax bill by some any other name will be forthcoming shortly. In the great democratic spirit of opaqueness, the very nature of the proposed bill is being held secret not to mention the details. In the House, promoters of cap-and-tax are perplexed why the US coal industry is not supporting them as they promise great hand-outs. Perhaps some industries are beginning to realize that free hand-outs can come at a great cost.

The volcano that erupted in Iceland at the end of the week has already produced speculation as to the effects it will have on climate change. A study in the Scientific American suggests that global warming will cause many such eruptions by melting the ice above volcanoes. Could it be that global warming will cause the next ice age by causing volcanoes to erupt and blacken the skies?

Last week we posed the question as to the ability of government entities and entities receiving government support to investigate inappropriate behavior by government-funded scientists. The government entities trusted to rigorously maintain the global surface-air datasets failed to do so and did not disclose such failure to the public' this is one such example. We have received a number of thoughtful comments and will endeavor to summarize them in an upcoming TWTW.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **SCIENCE EDITORIAL #12-2010 (April 17, 2010)**

**By S. Fred Singer, President, Science and Environmental Policy Project**

#### **Due Diligence on the IPCC Assessment Report #4 [2007]**

I know it's a tough job – but let's just check the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Changes (IPCC 2007) iconic, widely-quoted conclusion and parse its meaning:

*“Most of the observed increase in globally-averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic GH gas concentrations.”*

How should one interpret this ex cathedra declaration to the faithful?

IPCC helpfully defines 'very likely' as '90-99% certain', but they don't tell us how they reached such well-defined certainty.

What remarkable unanimity! Just how many and whom did they poll? No word.

IPCC doesn't define the word 'most.' We may assume it means anything between 51 and 99%. That's quite a spread.

But a footnote informs us that solar forcing is less than 10% of anthropogenic [0.12/ 1.6 W/m<sup>2</sup>]; so 'most' must be closer to 99% than to 51%.

OK; let's check out the data since 1958. But we don't want to rely on contaminated surface data – which IPCC likely used (although they omitted to say so).

However, atmospheric data were readily available to the IPCC in the CCSP-SAP-1.1 report (Fig 3a, p.54; convening lead author John Lanzante, NOAA), with independent analyses by the Hadley Centre and NOAA that agree well. And further, according to GH models, atmospheric trends should be larger than surface temperature trends.

1958 – 2005: Shows a total warming of +0.5 C . But how much of that is anthropogenic? (The IPCC ascribes pre-1958 warming to natural forcings.)

So let's break it down:

- 1958 – 1976: Cooling
- 1976 – 1977: Sudden jump of +0.5 C (Cannot be due to GH gases)
- 1979 – 1997: The satellite data show only a slightly positive trend
- 1998 – 1999: El Nino spike
- 2000 – 2001: No detectable warming trend
- 2001 – 2003: Sudden jump of +0.3 C (Cannot be due to GH gases)
- 2003 – present: No trend, maybe even slight cooling

In conclusion: The IPCC's 'most' is not sustained by the best observations; the surface data (1979 to 1997) are suspect – until the raw data and algorithms of CRU are examined.

Therefore, the human contribution is very likely only 10% of observed warming --or even less.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**ARTICLES:** [For the numbered articles below please see the attached pdf.]

### **1. ClimateGate Whitewash**

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Apr 15, 2010  
[http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/04/climategate\\_whitewash.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/04/climategate_whitewash.html)

### **2. Climategate whitewash**

By Peter Foster, Financial Post, Apr 15, 2010  
<http://network.nationalpost.com/NP/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2010/04/15/peter-foster-climategate-whitewash.aspx>

### **3. Global Cooling: The Next Great Threat?**

By Roger Helmer, MEP, Apr 16, 2010  
<http://rogerhelmermep.wordpress.com/2010/04/16/global-cooling-the-next-great-threat/>

### **4. America The Also-Ran**

IBD Editorial, Apr 13, 2010  
<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=530172>

### **5. A Natural Event, With Extreme Global Consequences**

By Gautam Naik, WSJ, Apr 16, 2010  
[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052702304628704575186443969314372.html#mod=to\\_days\\_us\\_page\\_one](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052702304628704575186443969314372.html#mod=to_days_us_page_one)

### **6. EPA choking freedom**

By Mark Landsbaum, Orange County Register, Apr 12, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]  
<http://www.ocregister.com/opinion/-243422--.html>  
*"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government, are few and defined."* – James Madison

\*\*\*\*\*

**NEWS YOU CAN USE:**

***ClimateGate Continues***  
**A letter from Phil Willis**

By Bishop Hill, Apr 7, 2010, [H/t Calvin Beisner]

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2010/4/7/a-letter-from-phil-willis.html>

*“But wait! I hear you cry. There is an IPCC inquiry too isn't there? Well, yes, except that the IPCC inquiry is looking at institutional design and not scientific matters, so once again, the allegation will be out of scope.*

*Clever eh?”*

### **A chat with Graham Stringer**

Bishop Hill, Apr 10, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2010/4/10/a-chat-with-graham-stringer.html>

*“It is not that Jones has been found innocent; on many charges he just hasn't been tried yet.”*

**‘Climategate’ scientists criticized for not using best statistical tools: Climate change scientists at the centre of an ongoing row over man-made global warming have been criticised for being "naive" and "disorganised".**

By Louise Gray, Telegraph, UK, Apr 14, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7589715/Climategate-scientists-criticised-for-not-using-best-statistical-tools.html>

### **ClimateGate: the Official Whitewash Continues**

By Myron Ebell, Global Warming.org, Apr 14, 2010

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2010/04/14/climategate-the-official-whitewash-continues/>

### **Climate scientists at East Anglia University cleared by inquiry**

By Ben Webster, Times Online, Apr 14, 2010, [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7097234.ece>

### **Climate-Gate Gets A Whitewash**

IBD Editorial, Apr 15, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=530423>

### **Oxburgh’s Trick to Hide the trick**

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Apr 14, 2010

<http://climateaudit.org/2010/04/14/oxburghs-trick-to-hide-the-trick/>

*“The Oxburgh [report](#) is a flimsy and embarrassing 5-pages.”*

### **Top scientists rush to defend discredited theory of ‘runaway’ global warming**

By Kirk Myers, Seminole County Environmental News Examiner, Apr 16, 2010 [H/t ICECAP.US]

<http://ww.examiner.com/x-32936-Seminole-County-Environmental-News-Examiner~y2010m4d16-Top-scientists-rush-to-defend-discredited-theory-of-runaway-global-warming>

### **Climate Model Magic: Washington Post Today, Gerald North Yesterday (Part IV in a series)**

By Robert Bradley, Master Resource, Apr 13, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/04/>

### ***Defending the Orthodoxy***

**British campaigner urges UN to accept ‘ecocide’ as international crime: Proposal to declare mass destruction of ecosystems a crime on a par with genocide launched by lawyer**

By Juliette Jowit, Guardian, UK, Apr 9, 2010 [H/t Climate Depot]  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/apr/09/ecocide-crime-genocide-un-environmental-damage>

### **Academic experts clear scientists in ‘climate-gate’**

By Karla Adam and Juliet Eilperin, Washington Post, Apr 15, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/14/AR2010041404001.html>

### ***The Fine Art of Eliminating History***

#### **“Dealing a Mortal Blow” to the MWP**

By Steve McIntyre, Apr 8, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]  
<http://climateaudit.org/2010/04/08/dealing-a-mortal-blow-to-the-mwp/>

#### **“More and more concerned about our statement”**

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Apr 8, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]  
<http://climateaudit.org/2010/04/08/more-and-more-concerned-about-our-statement/>

### ***On the Way to Cancun***

#### **Climate treaty realities push leaders to trim priority lists**

By Juliet Eilperin, Washington Post, Apr 13, 2010  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/12/AR2010041203822.html?sub=AR>

### ***Debunking Myths***

#### **UN’s Climate Bible Gets 21 ‘F’'s on Report Card**

By Donna Laframboise, Noconsensus.org, Apr 14, 2010  
<http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/press-release.php>

#### **Surface Temperature Records: Policy-Driven Deception?**

By Joseph D’Aleo and Anthony Watts, SPPI Original Paper UPDATED Apr 13, 2010  
[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/policy\\_driven\\_deception.html](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/policy_driven_deception.html)

#### **Moralizing Twaddle: James Hansen’s Vision of Presidential Greatness**

By Marlo Lewis, Master Resource, Apr 15, 2010  
<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/04/philosopher-of-climate-certitude/#comments>

#### **Brilliantly Exposing Climategate**

By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, Apr 13, 2010  
<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/2010/04/brilliantly-exposing-climategate.html>

#### **An All Kidding-Aside Critique**

Desoggyblog.com  
<http://desoggyblog.com/an-all-kidding-aside-critique.php>

### ***Government on the March***

#### **Dems pressure coal execs to drop opposition to climate legislation**

By Jim Snyder, The Hill, Apr 14, 2010

<http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/92341-dems-pressure-coal-execs-to-back-climate-legislation>

[SEPP Comment: Rio Tinto is a London based international conglomerate supporting US cap and tax. US coal interests oppose it. Many in the US Congress cannot understand why. “The bill would give an estimated \$60 billion in subsidies to the sector over the next two decades to develop cleaner technologies through a new fee on transmission lines and also from the sale of pollution allowances in a market the bill creates. “We don’t give \$60 billion to al Qaeda,” [Rep.] Inslee said. “We don’t give \$60 billion to industries we are at war with.” Perhaps the Congressman can explain the source of the \$60 Billion he is so willing to spend to bribe the coal industry.]

### ***And Where Does This Get Us?***

#### **China Sets Ambitious Space Goals**

By Andy Pasztor, WSJ Asian News, Apr 14, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304159304575184442226504292.html?mod=todays-us-page-one>

### ***Miscellaneous Articles***

#### **Flowrate of World’s 4<sup>th</sup> Largest River Linked to Solar Cycle**

By David Whitehouse, The Observatory, Apr 5, 2010

<http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/769-flowrate-of-worlds-4th-largest-river-linked-to-solar-cycle.html>

#### **Quiet sun puts Europe on ice**

By Stuart Clark, NewScientist, Apr 14, 2010 [H/t ICECAP.US]

<http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20627564.800-quiet-sun-puts-europe-on-ice.html?DCMP=NLC-nletter&nsref=mg20627564.800>

[SEPP Comment: Measurement of irradiance, the only solar change the IPCC considers began in 1977. Although irradiance has been dropping since 1985, has it dropped below what it was during the cooling period between 1940 and 1975?]

\*\*\*\*\*

### **BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:**

#### **Climate change row over the mystery of the shrinking sheep: Scientists have questioned claims that global warming is causing sheep to change size and colour in the latest row to engulf climate change science.**

By Louise Gray, Telegraph, UK, Apr 7, 2010

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7559596/Climate-change-row-over-the-mystery-of-the-shrinking-sheep.html>

#### **It’s true!**

By Bishop Hill, Apr 13, 2010

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2010/4/13/its-true.html>

[SEPP Comment: Given big subsidies for electricity from alternative sources, eventually someone would develop a way to generate solar power at night.]

#### **We knew, it was only a matter of time**

By Alister Doyle, Reuters, Apr 16, 2010 [H/t Watts Up With That]

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/16/we-knew-it-was-only-a-matter-of-time/>

“A thaw of Iceland’s ice caps in coming decades caused by climate change may trigger more volcanic eruptions by removing a vast weight and freeing magma from deep below ground, scientists said on Friday.”

**Reply to: “Ice cap thaw may awaken Icelandic volcanoes”**

By Steven Goddard, Wattsupwiththat. Apr 16, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/16/reply-to-ice-cap-thaw-may-awaken-icelandic-volcanoes/#more-18562>

**Studies agree on a 1 meter rise in sea levels**

Niels Bohr Institute, Apr 13, 2010, [H/t Watts Up With That]

[http://www.nbi.ku.dk/english/news/news10/1\\_meter\\_rise\\_in\\_sea\\_levels/](http://www.nbi.ku.dk/english/news/news10/1_meter_rise_in_sea_levels/)

[SEPP Comment: No matter how many models they run, no matter how many countries are involved, if the datasets are bad, the predictions are without value.]

**U.S. Postal Service cites global warming as a reason to cut Saturday delivery**

By Tony Hake, Washington Examiner, Apr 9, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.examiner.com/x-25061-Climate-Change-Examiner~y2010m4d9-US-Postal-Service-cites-global-warming-as-a-reason-to-cut-Saturday-delivery>

#####

**1.ClimateGate Whitewash**

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Apr 15, 2010

[http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/04/climategate\\_whitewash.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/04/climategate_whitewash.html)

There is now a desperate effort afoot by assorted climate alarmists to explain away the revelations of the incriminating e-mails leaked last year from the University of East Anglia (UEA). A concerted whitewash campaign is in full swing to save the IPCC and its questionable conclusion that the warming of the last thirty years is anthropogenic. But ongoing investigations so far have avoided the real issue, namely whether the reported warming is genuine or a manufactured result by scientists in England and the United States who manipulated temperature data.

Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) has repeatedly characterized anthropogenic global warming (AGW) as a "hoax" -- and he may soon be vindicated. Certainly, the remedies invoked to "fight" AGW are a cruel hoax -- mainly a [tax burden](#) on low-income households who will pay more for electricity, food, transportation, and other necessities of life.

The UEA's "internal" investigation has largely absolved Dr. Philip Jones, the head of its Climate Research Unit (CRU) and author of most of the e-mails, of any misdeeds. (The UEA has also commissioned an "independent" investigation by Sir Robert Muir-Russell, due in August.) Pennsylvania State University (PSU) has merely slapped the wrists of Dr. Michael Mann for various ethical offenses but sees nothing wrong with the science. The United Nations, at the urging of the Royal Society and U.S. [National Academy of Sciences](#), has launched a supposedly independent investigation of IPCC procedures to be conducted by the InterAcademyCouncil (IAC), a creature of the science academies. It is likely to backfire and lower further the public's opinion of the academies -- and indeed of science generally.

The latest report, by the British [House](#) of Commons' Science and Technology Committee, received testimony from many sources, conducted hearings, and largely absolved Jones. How can we tell that it's a whitewash? Here are some telltale signs:

- It refers to the e-mails as "stolen."
- It did not take direct testimony from scientifically competent skeptics,
- Yet it concludes that there is nothing wrong with the basic science and that warming is human-caused -- essentially endorsing the IPCC.

These investigations have focused mainly on procedural issues and scientific ethics, including the withholding of data, preventing skeptical scientists from publishing their results, pressuring editors of scientific journals (often with their ready connivance), and generally misusing the peer review process. None of the investigations have gone into any detail on how the data might have been manipulated -- nor were any of the panels competent enough to do so. But this is really the most important task for any inquiry, since it deals directly with the central issue: Is there an appreciable human influence on [climate change](#) in the past decades?

Instead, much of the attention of newspapers, and of the public, has focused on secondary issues involving climate impacts, not causes: the melting of Himalayan glaciers, the possible inundation of the Netherlands, deforestation of the Amazon, crop failures in Africa, etc. While these issues are important and demonstrate the sloppiness of the IPCC process, they cannot decide the cause of warming: natural or anthropogenic.

So what do the e-mails really reveal? We know that Jones and his gang largely succeeded in "hiding the decline" of temperature by using what he termed "Mike [Mann]'s trick." Most assume that this refers to CRU tree-ring data after 1960, which do show a decline in temperature. However, I believe that it refers to Michael Mann's "trick" in hiding the fact that his multi-proxy data did not show the expected warming after 1979. So he abruptly cut off his analysis in 1979 and simply inserted the thermometer data supplied by Jones, which do claim a strong temperature increase. Hence the "hockey-stick" graph in his Nature (1998) paper suggesting a sudden major warming period since the late '70s.

Only a thorough investigation will be able to document that there was really no strong warming after 1979, that the instrumented record is based on data manipulation involving the selection of certain weather stations (and the omission of others that showed no warming), plus applying insufficient corrections for local heating.

How to confirm this? The only possibility may be an investigation by the U.S. Congress. Not this Congress, of course. But after the November 2010 elections, control of important committees like Science may change. Hearings that use real experts can then unravel ClimateGate, demonstrate the manipulation of temperature data, and once and for all destroy the "warming trend" on which the IPCC has based its fanciful conclusion of anthropogenic [global warming](#).

Once accomplished, it will become possible to do away with the myth that CO<sub>2</sub> is a pollutant and all of the controls and regulations that are based on this mistaken notion. Yes, that includes EPA's Endangerment Finding on CO<sub>2</sub> and all cap-and-tax legislation. The nation, and indeed the world, will be better off.

\*\*\*\*\*

## 2. Climategate whitewash

By Peter Foster, Financial Post, Apr 15, 2010

<http://network.nationalpost.com/NP/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2010/04/15/peter-foster-climategate-whitewash.aspx>

*CRU scientists who removed caveats from IPCC reports are praised for warning of uncertainties in their published work*

Climategate scientists cleared of wrongdoing” read the headline in yesterday’s *Post*. Who expected anything else? The two self-inquiries launched by the University of East Anglia into its Climatic Research Unit (CRU) were always destined to produce whitewashes, as did a recent UK parliamentary inquiry, and as will an “independent” review by the UN.

The first of the UEA reports, from a committee headed by ardent warmist and anti-carbon profiteer Lord Oxburgh, appeared this week. As Lawrence Solomon points out elsewhere on this page, the choice of Lord Oxburgh indicated that the fix was always in for an inquiry which fails to address, let alone probe, most of the major issues. And yet there is a mountain of condemnation-by-faint-exoneration between the lines of the report’s ridiculously slim five pages.

Its attempt to present CRU head Phil Jones, and his beleaguered band, as unworldly boffins who were blindsided by all this attention is ridiculous. The report claims that it found a “small group of dedicated if slightly disorganised researchers.” The key question is: dedicated to what? Certainly, they weren’t expecting to be outed quite so spectacularly, but to paint them as innocents in the big bad world of climate realpolitik is nonsense.

After reviewing a cherry-picked group of eleven CRU studies, the report gently raps the knuckles of the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC, for failing to note the reservations that CRU researchers so assiduously attached to their peer-reviewed work. “All of the published work was accompanied by detailed descriptions of uncertainties and accompanied by appropriate caveats,” notes the report.

Global warming alarmists relentlessly chant that there is scientific “consensus” that the “science is settled.” Yet now we are told that somehow the main body for promoting the climate change agenda “neglected” to tell the world that the science wasn’t settled. What we are not told is that the scientists who removed the caveats in the IPCC reports were lead IPCC authors Mr. Jones and his CRU colleague Keith Briffa!

The CRU is concerned with temperature data. Indeed it is one of the principal sources for claims that the earth warmed alarmingly in the 20th century after 900 years of alleged climatic calm (Medieval Warm Period? Little Ice Age? Never happened).

Data from the distant past is reconstructed from problematic “proxies” such as tree rings; but even assembling readings for more recent periods is difficult due to the thin coverage of weather stations and, more seriously, to the impact of the “urban heat island effect” on readings from stations where development has encroached. There, temperature increases may be due to traffic, tarmac and local barbecues rather than global climate.

The CRU’s data has appeared in two forms: raw and cooked. Much of the raw variety, unfortunately, has been “lost.” This is treated by the review as infinitely excusable due to the pressures of the academic life. You know, tedious admin meetings, the pressure to publish, the need to get in those applications for multi-million dollar grants attached to proving man-made global warming. But how can ditching the fundamental data on which your science depends be dubbed mere carelessness with “non-essential record keeping?”

As for the cooked data, the CRU has been accused of “manipulation” not in the legitimate statistical sense, so that different data sets may be comparable, but in support of the results required by government-funded, highly politicized science. Without data suggesting rising temperatures due to anthropogenic emissions, there would be no justification for massive global programs such as cap-and-trade, redistributionist “clean development,” or the hefty subsidization of alternative energy.

The CRU is also gently fingered for its lack of statistical sophistication. As the report admits, “It is regrettable that so few professional statisticians have been involved in this work because it is fundamentally statistical.”

But hang on. Draconian global policies have been made on the basis of dodgy data handled by those who are less than expert? This is surely a little more than “regrettable.” If statistics are so important, why didn’t the IPCC make sure the CRU, and itself, had the world’s greatest statistical minds on tap? Could that be because the data and science are there to support the political position rather than guiding it?

The report does dish out some harsh criticisms, but only to the unnamed CRU critics whose “tone” it “deplores.” They presumably refer to the likes of Canadians Steve McIntyre and Ross McKittrick, whom Lord Oxburgh and his team assiduously avoided. Meanwhile the emphasis on “tone” is farcical, particularly when compared with the kind of anti-skeptic vitriol exposed in the Climategate emails.

According to the report “some of these criticisms show a rather selective and uncharitable approach to information made available by CRU.” So skeptics such as Messrs. McIntyre and McKittrick might have been stonewalled, insulted, undermined and threatened by the CRU cabal, but apparently it was they who should have been more “charitable.”

Lord Oxburgh suggested this week that attacks on the CRU had come from people who do not like the “implications” of their conclusions. If by “implications” he means suicidal and pointless policies, then that might have been the one thing he got right. Otherwise, his report is a travesty.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **3. Global Cooling: The Next Great Threat?**

By Roger Helmer, MEP, Apr 16, 2010

<http://rogerhelmermep.wordpress.com/2010/04/16/global-cooling-the-next-great-threat/>

We’ve now seen the second report on the CRU leaked e-mails scandal, and guess what – it says much the same as the first one, and exactly what we’d predicted. Lord Oxburgh and his committee found that Phil Jones and his CRU colleagues had been disorganised and naïve, and had used unsophisticated statistical techniques, but that their conclusions were sound.

Anyone who has followed the Wattsupwiththat website on the urban heat island effect, or compared ground station results with satellite results, or followed the wholesale demolition of Michael Mann’s Hockey Stick Graph (perhaps the most discredited scientific artefact in history), may be rather surprised that the Oxburgh Committee endorses the CRU conclusions. (Recall that Phil Jones was very much part of the “Hockey Team” which proposed and sought to defend the Hockey Stick). It is apparently OK to graft together two totally unrelated data sets (proxy data and current terrestrial measurements) when you don’t like the direction in which the proxy data is heading, and you want to “hide the decline” (their words, not mine). And it’s OK to do so without explaining what you did, or why you did it.

Any fair-minded person reading the leaked e-mails would conclude that the CRU scientists had not sought to follow the data wherever they might lead, in a spirit of open-minded scientific enquiry. By no means. Rather, they had deliberately and selectively mined the data for any nuggets which might be presented as supporting their preconceived hypothesis. And that hypothesis was, of course, the Great Carbon Myth.

But then if you take a group of distinguished public figures, all of whom are themselves committed to the “consensus” view of global warming, and ask them to assess the CRU’s work, there is simply no possibility that they would reach any other conclusion.

I noticed that yesterday’s Daily Telegraph placed its report on the CRU scandal alongside another climate-related report, headlined “*Wrap up for a return of 17th Century winters*”, and illustrated with a contemporary painting of the Thames Frost Fair of 1684, which shows half a dozen carriages and thirty or so pavilions on the ice, along with hundreds of pedestrians. It seems that an “International Team of Scientists”, including Prof. Mike Lockwood, a space physicist from Reading University, has published a paper in the journal *Environmental Research Letters* arguing that low solar activity could lead to a period of exceptionally cold winters in Northern Europe, comparable to the well-known “Maunder Minimum” at the heart of the Little Ice Age.

I am not sure why this is considered news, or is worth publishing in a learned journal, because it has been commonplace amongst climate sceptics for years. There have been books published about it. Most climate sceptics believe that the Sun is far-and-away the greatest influence on the Earth’s climate, and that global temperatures correlate rather well with solar activity, and rather poorly with atmospheric CO2. Admittedly CO2 and temperature rose in lockstep over the last two decades of the twentieth century. But from 1945 to 1975, temperatures fell while CO2 rose, and since 1998 temperatures have levelled off and turned down, while CO2 has continued its inexorable rise (despite all the talk of limiting emissions). Professor Fred Singer of the University of Virginia argues that while atmospheric CO2 may have some marginal effect on climate, any signal from that effect is lost in the noise of other factors.

Prof. Lockwood fails to explain why a quiet sun would particularly affect Northern Europe: most scientists would argue that it would create cooling on a global scale. And he includes the ritual genuflection to orthodoxy: “Temperatures will not fall as low as they did in 1684, because of global warming”. But it is difficult to see governments and voters accepting the huge and damaging costs of climate mitigation policies while facing decades of bitter cold. Stock market tip: buy ski resorts.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### 4. America The Also-Ran

IBD Editorial, Apr 13, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=530172>

**Leadership:** In yet another example of this administration's rejection of American exceptionalism, science adviser John Holdren says the U.S. can't be expected to always be on top. How uninspiring. How wrong.

A little more than a year ago, the president himself said much the same thing at a NATO conference. "I believe in American exceptionalism," Barack Obama said, "just as I suspect that the Brits believe in British exceptionalism and the Greeks believe in Greek exceptionalism." In other words, America might think it's special, but so do other countries. And there's no reason to believe they're wrong. It's all relative.

American exceptionalism is the idea that this country is set apart by our liberty and independence, our strength of character and our dedication to family, work, fairness and decency. America, more than any nation in history, is the "shining city" that Ronald Reagan described, and the best hope for the future of mankind.

Many on the left seem to dismiss this concept, believing it reflects a narrow, jingoistic, even dangerous world view and that those who are convinced this country is special are arrogant.

Blemishes on the American record — brutality against American Indians and a past with institutional and individual racism — are cited as evidence the U.S. is a nation undeserving of any honor. And instead of advantages resulting from an economic system that has been nothing short of miraculous in what it has achieved, our wealth and influence are considered blights.

So it doesn't surprise us that Holdren told science students last Friday while speaking at the American Association for the Advancement of Science that "we can't expect to be number one in everything indefinitely." We do find it discouraging, however.

We don't believe America is perfect. All countries, like all human beings, have their flaws. This is inescapable.

In no nation, however, have the people had the freedom we have. No other nation has ever worked so hard for justice, so long for equality and so earnestly for openness. No nation has ever been as welcoming to foreigners or as protective of dissenters. None has ever been as selfless and charitable.

Nowhere on this planet is upward mobility as unencumbered as it is here. Opportunity is woven tightly into the American fabric. From the world over, people arrive at our door wanting what we have. Many of them are dumbfounded when those of us who've been here since birth don't realize how fortunate we are.

America is indeed exceptional, and those who say it isn't are guilty of an ugly form of wishful thinking.

\*\*\*\*\*

## 5. A Natural Event, With Extreme Global Consequences

By Gautam Naik, WSJ, Apr 16, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052702304628704575186443969314372.html#mod=to\\_days\\_us\\_page\\_one](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052702304628704575186443969314372.html#mod=to_days_us_page_one)

The eruption of a volcano in Iceland is a stark reminder of how these dramatic events can affect people and places thousands of miles from the actual explosion and, in some cases, for years to come.

Some of the biggest eruptions have killed thousands of people who got caught in their lava flow. Other eruptions have caused acid rain, depleted the earth's ozone layer and even temporarily cooled the planet.

The event in Iceland is relatively small—but if the eruptions continue, the effects could get worse.

Though Iceland has plenty of volcanoes, few actually erupt. The current one started to show worrisome levels of activity around March 21, spewing out gases and ash. Flash-flood risks have forced hundreds of people to flee from near the glacier.

Volcanic ash isn't really ash; it is composed of tiny bits of jagged rock and glass. It is hard and abrasive; it doesn't dissolve in water, and can be spread by the wind.

Ash from the Icelandic eruption was picked up by winds accompanying the Gulf Stream.

Winds at a height of between 30,000 to 36,000 feet—just below the cruising elevation for jets—then carried the ash toward the U.K. and elsewhere in Europe.

If the volcano continues to erupt, and if its ash has a high proportion of sulfur, it can mix with the water vapor in the air and form a weak broth of sulfuric acid, coming down as acid rain.

"But it's hard to say whether that's a problem right now," said Robert Trombley, a former Air Force pilot and now director and of the International Volcano Research Centre, a private organization in Apache Junction, Ariz., which monitors the activity of more than 500 volcanoes every day.

While a large-scale eruption may last only a few days, the tremendous outpouring of gas and ash can have a long-term impact on the climate.

In what is known as the "haze effect," the sulfuric gas gets converted into sulfate aerosols—extremely tiny droplets that reflect more of the incoming solar radiation back into space, thus cooling the lower atmosphere.

There's a countervailing effect, too. Because volcano-produced aerosols can absorb terrestrial radiation, they can act in the opposite manner, to raise the temperature. Both the cooling and warming outcomes can last for several years.

Scientists often find it easier to predict a volcanic eruption, based on certain tell-tale signs, than an earthquake.

There was little warning, however, from under Iceland's Eyjafjallajokull glacier, where the volcano came to life last month after being dormant for nearly 200 years.

\*\*\*\*\*

## 6. EPA choking freedom

By Mark Landsbaum, Orange County Register, Apr 12, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

<http://www.ocregister.com/opinion/-243422--.html>

*"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government, are few and defined."* – James Madison

Unfortunately, the ultimate discussion on global warming may require talking to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. If you thought zealots and celebrities-turned-politicians could be difficult to persuade, you ain't seen nothin' yet.

Those who would remake the economy in their own image and conform your lifestyle to their vision of a globally cooler utopia are advancing their quasiholy mission with the heavy hand of the unaccountable, unelected bureaucracy at the EPA.

Call it government by, of and for the bureaucracy. Where's James Madison when we need him?

There's nothing as insulated, nothing as isolated, nothing as arrogant as a federal bureaucracy. Think this thought: "I'd like to have a reasonable discussion with someone who will consider my point of view." Now think: "IRS. FBI. Homeland Security." Ouch. The EPA epitomizes the aloof, authoritarian worst of all federal bureaucracies. Don't expect a warm reception.

Several key decisions begin this spring, not the least of which is the beginning of EPA enforcement. With this in mind, here are some EPA talking points, in case you're able to get a word in edge-wise:

### Presumptions

We start with the understanding that this nation's founders never intended a massive government bureaucracy to dictate how Americans must live, what they can and cannot consume or manufacture, let

alone how much of the stuff they exhale may legally be emitted. The EPA begins with the assumption that we've got all of this 100 percent wrong.

### **Change of venue**

Congress, bless its misguided hearts, at least is a representative body held accountable by voters. That's why Congress, once hell-bent on shoving down our throats an economy-killing, freedom-squashing carbon cap-and-trade law, has backed off. Politicians still can be cowed by public outrage. That's also why global warming alarmists shifted the venue from the comparatively responsive Congress to the utterly insulated EPA. Faceless bureaucrats don't stand for election.

### **Changing rules**

Once upon a time this overbearing regulatory agency restricted its intrusions to matters that pretty much everyone agreed needed attention. Air pollution was a serious problem not long ago. It's debatable whether the might of the federal government was the only, let alone the best, solution. But at least real pollution was a real problem. The EPA has changed that game, perhaps forever, by declaring CO<sub>2</sub> to be a harmful pollutant that must be regulated.

### **Quasiscience**

The excuse the EPA uses to exert its regulatory version of martial law over everyday activities is that the globe allegedly is dangerously warming, and manmade greenhouse gas emissions are to blame. Nevermind, that temperatures are, at most, flat over the past 15 years. The only place a cause-and-effect relationship exists between rising greenhouse gases and rising global temperatures is in manmade computer models. Looking beyond the problem of garbage in and garbage out, history tells us a quite different story. As for blaming mankind for rising temperatures, there were far fewer people and absolutely no smokestacks or Hummers centuries ago when temperatures were higher and CO<sub>2</sub> levels much higher.

### **Building on sand**

The EPA, incapable of distinguishing pollutants from harmless air, based its war on global warming on findings of the U.N.'s [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#), a *governmental* body, not a *scientific* body. The IPCC drew on scientific studies, except for those it excluded. IPCC hand-picked representatives, some of them scientists, summarized the findings, selectively including and excluding from the already-screened conclusions. The IPCC came up with an unsurprisingly political document drawn from sometimes one-sided, other times flatly flawed, research, while ignoring inconvenient contrary evidence. Since last year, there's been news aplenty about the IPCC report's frauds and mistakes. Good enough for government work, apparently.

### **Real science**

The EPA's declaration of CO<sub>2</sub> as a pollutant ignores its amply demonstrated benefits. Even if manmade emissions did cause higher temperatures, the consequences are likely beneficial not dire. The Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change is a network of scientists not funded by governments that stand to gain control. It was established to examine the same climate data used by the U.N.'s panel. But the nongovernmental panel reached "the opposite conclusion – namely, that natural causes are very likely" responsible for whatever changes have occurred in global temperatures. Even so, its conclusion was: "[T]he net effect of continued warming and rising carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere will be beneficial to humans, plants and wildlife."

## Arbitrariness on steroids

The 1970 [Clean Air Act](#), which was improperly invoked to regulate CO2, is explicit in determining the level at which atmospheric pollutants trigger mandatory government regulation. As a result of extending Clean Air Act authority to CO2, 41,900 previously unregulated small entities will require preconstruction permits, and 6.1 million previously unregulated small entities will need operating permits. It's impossible for the feds to clamp down on every car, tractor, lawnmower, commercial kitchen or other mom-and-pop establishment. So here's what will happen: Bureaucrats arbitrarily will decide where to draw the line. A line drawn today doesn't mean it won't be redrawn tomorrow. Authority creep is inevitable, except, of course, in the cases of the well-connected, who game the system or grease the skids. Instead of quoting Madison, we should quote [George Orwell](#): "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others."

## 'It's too late' defense

It can be argued that the EPA is acting rashly based on wrong-headed legal interpretations, and justified this with rigged research with a blind eye to contrary evidence. It might be argued that the EPA should hold off regulating until underlying scientific claims can be verified. Don't hold your breath. "It is impossible to independently test or verify (England's Climate Research Unit's) calculations because raw temperature data sets have been lost or destroyed," noted [Greg Abbott](#), the [Texas](#) attorney general, who has sued to block the EPA diktats.

## Fix is in

The EPA's power grab officially began at the end of March with press releases declaring the agency's "final decision" that issuing "construction and operating permit requirements for the largest emitting facilities will begin." Today, the "largest." Tomorrow "the not-so-large?" The next day, who knows? At this rate you might want to hold your breath. Exhaling soon may be an emission law violation.

## Nearly last ditch

Congress will have a chance this spring to reassert authority over the bureaucracy when it considers reining in the EPA. A pending resolution by Sen. [Lisa Murkowski](#), R-[Alaska](#), would veto the EPA's "endangerment finding" that declared CO2 to be a harmful pollutant. Stay tuned.

## Last ditch

The EPA's unprecedented claim to sovereignty over things that move and many that remain stationary is being challenged in court by no fewer than 15 states' attorneys general, and private plaintiffs, including 500 scientists, who dispute the IPCC's science. The nut of the challenges is that the government exceeded its authority in declaring CO2 a harmful pollutant, and that underlying science is fatally flawed.

## Forecast

We're usually optimistic, but the short-term outlook is bleak, and the long-term is bleaker yet – unless someone derails the high-speed, runaway EPA. Otherwise, James Madison's homeland and yours is in for a stormy climate of arbitrary bureaucrats picking and choosing winners and losers, allowing you less and less to say about it as the government expands its control over American life even further.

#####

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.  
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.