

The Week That Was: 2011-06-25 (June 25, 2011)

Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

The Science and Environmental Policy Project

#####

PLEASE NOTE: The complete TWTW, including the articles, can be downloaded in an easily printable form at the SEPP web site: www.sepp.org.

#####

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

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

To watch the program live go to: <http://climateconference.heartland.org/watch-live/>

#####

Quote of the Week:

“...it was clear that the first and greatest need was to establish the facts of the past record of the natural climate in times before any side effects of human activities could well be important.” HH Lamb on establishing the Climatic Research Unit at University of East Anglia [H/t Tim Ball]

#####

Number of the Week: \$106.8 Billion

#####

THIS WEEK:

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

The Supreme Court released its decision on the lawsuit brought by various states, and others, against public utilities for emissions of carbon dioxide under the concept that carbon dioxide is a public nuisance. In a surprisingly strong 8 to 0 decision (one judge abstaining), the Court ruled against the plaintiffs (those who bring the suit) declaring that the courts are not the appropriate venue for regulating carbon dioxide, whereas the legislature and the properly empowered executive are.

This decision, with appropriate spins, gives something to everyone and nothing to all. Global warming activists and certain newspapers declared that it reinforced the EPA’s authority of regulating greenhouse gases [GHG] and demonstrated the need for EPA’s action. Others were relieved that the nuisance principle cannot be so broadened to apply to GHG. Even business newspapers were split on the issue, with the *Investor’s Business Daily* calling it a big win for the EPA and the expanding regulatory bureaucracies that are damaging the economy, while the *Wall Street Journal* pointed out that Federal courts lack the expertise and the resources to address such issues and that Congress never expressly granted to EPA the power to regulate carbon dioxide.

At this time, it is impossible to state what the effect will be on the litigation appealing EPA’s ruling that GHG, particularly carbon dioxide, endanger public health and the environment. No doubt, the new court ruling will increase the pressure on the Appeals Court that is now considering the litigation. Will the Appeals Court decide that EPA is properly empowered to regulate GHG and that its endangerment ruling is based on solid science? Or will it decide that EPA is not properly empowered and/or that it failed to perform the independent scientific analysis that was required to make the endangerment ruling?

Those, who are a bit optimistic that the new court ruling may slightly tilt against the EPA, point to several footnotes in the new ruling indicating the uncertainty of the science. Among other revelations is a footnote in the ruling referencing a cover story in the *New York Times Magazine* about Freeman Dyson, who is very skeptical that GHG emissions are causing unprecedented and dangerous global warming. The referenced article ran before Climategate. Clearly, the Court realizes that the science is not as well established as the alarmists, including the *New York Times*, have proclaimed.

Further, the court stated: “The Court, we caution, endorses no particular view of the complicated issues related to carbon dioxide emissions and climate change.” This statement is significantly different than the 2007 decision in which the Court ruled that carbon dioxide is a pollutant, based upon, in part, claims that it was causing dangerous global warming, in turn, it was causing sea levels to rise.

Whatever the outcome, no doubt the losing parties in the Appeals Court decision will appeal to the Supreme Court, which can decide whether or not it takes the case.

Sea Level Rise: The climate alarmists released another study claiming accelerating sea level rise. In a twist from past claims, many alarmists now claim that sea level rise is the major threat of global warming. The new study, published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Science (PNAS), was immediately greeted with comments on various blogs, pointing out the inadequacies of the study. As William Gray suggested in his article carried in TWTW last week, the internet blogs provide a more rigorous analysis of questionable climate science studies than the “peer review” process does. (Please note that the articles in the Proceedings are not necessarily rigorously peer reviewed.)

Among the many interesting revelations is that one of the co-authors was none other than Michael Mann of hockey-stick fame. Yet, the study asserted a Medieval Warm Period and a Little Ice Age – contrary to the hockey-stick. The study claimed to establish a global sea level model for the past 2000 years, which it validated by using studies of microfossils from sediment cores taken in the coastal salt water marshes of mainland North Carolina. These were then compared with North Carolina tidal gage records going back only 80 years. From this 80 year record, the researchers extrapolated back 2000 years!

According to the study, the area was selected because it is not rebounding from being burdened by ice during the last Ice Age.

Environmentalists generally refer to these coastal salt water marshes as “fragile wetlands” and these wetlands have a number of interesting characteristics. They are broad, flat, generally marshy lands made of plants, silt, and sand which were formed by sediments from the long term erosion of the Appalachian Mountains and other uplands. As one can see by looking at a road map, these wetlands may stretch as far as 50 miles deep into main part of the state. As with most coastal areas built up by sediments, they are probably subject to subsidence, sinking in relation to the surrounding land or water.

During the last Ice Age, streams and rivers cut channels through these sediments, but as the sea levels rose by about 400 feet after the last Ice Age, the channels became tidal estuaries resulting in wide rivers and bays. The areas are subject to erosion and accretion caused by the tides and storms such as hurricanes and northeasters.

The areas are partially protected from ocean waves by a series of barrier islands made of sand which shift over the years. As the islands shift, they change the influence that tidal currents and storms have on these wetlands. To suggest that a model of global sea levels can be based on studies of such unstable lands is highly questionable.

The natives of these areas call land that is suitable for farming and building “fast” (stable) land. It appears this study is not built on fast land.

Given the difficulty that Richard Lindzen, a Member of the National Academy of Sciences, had with the editors of the Proceedings who refused to publish an article without almost impossible restrictions, as described in last week’s TWTW, one must wonder about the standards used when this new study is readily published. Please see referenced articles under “Change Seas” and “Climategate Continued.”

Number of the Week is \$106.8 Billion. According to a May 2011, report to Congress by the US General Accountability Office, the total Federal Government funding for climate change from 1993 to 2010 amounts to \$106.7 Billion. This does not include the revenues lost to the Federal Government for special deductions and tax credits (including grants in lieu of tax credits) of \$16.1 Billion. These bring the total to \$122.8 Billion.

The 2009 “Stimulus Bill” provided \$26.1 Billion of this amount, with \$25.2 Billion to the Department of Energy, including \$16.8 Billion for energy efficiency and alternative energy. In the Fiscal Years (FY) 2009 and 2010 (which ended on September 30, 2010), the Federal government provided \$52.8 Billion in climate change funding.

In terms of four stated general categories (without regard to agency) of the total funding, not including the Stimulus Bill, \$43.0 Billion is categorized as technology, \$31.3 Billion is categorized as science, \$5.0 Billion is categorized as international aid, and \$65 Million is categorized as wildlife adaption.

One of the benefits of this funding may have been new satellites to better understand the earth and its weather, yet, including the Stimulus Bill, of \$21.6 Billion to NASA only \$1.1 Billion fell in the category of Direct Technology / Exploration. Under the general category of Science, NASA received \$20.6 Billion for science, aeronautics and technology (note there may be errors due to rounding). The Department of Energy is the agency that has received the most funding -- \$58.7 Billion.

Global warming / climate change is big business in the US, courtesy of the taxpayer. Apparently, Washington is unaware of the high unemployment rate and economic stagnation in the rest of the country. Please see referenced article under “Expanding the Orthodoxy”

Global Climate Change Initiative (GCCCI): 557% Increase: President Obama’s proposed budget for FY 2012 includes \$1,328 Million for the Global Climate Change Initiative, representing a 557% increase since FY 2008 of \$202 Million. “The GCCCI is implemented through programs at the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and is funded through the Administration’s Executive Budget...”

“The President’s FY2012 budget request follows on the December 2010 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) negotiations in Cancun, Mexico, which formulated a package of ‘nationally appropriate’ measures toward the goal of avoiding dangerous climate change.” This is part of “...a commitment to near-term and long-term climate financing for the least developed countries amounting to near \$30 billion for the period 2010-2012 and \$100 billion annually by 2020.”

The referenced agreement has not been approved by Congress and there is no reason why Congress should fund such a program. Please see referenced article under “Expanding the Orthodoxy.”

“Clean Energy” \$243 Billion in 2010: On her web site, Jo Anne Nova picked up an announcement by the warming alarmist and alternative energy promoter, Pew Environment Group that calculated that the world investment in “clean energy” for 2010 was \$243 Billion.

“The clean energy sector is emerging as one of the most dynamic and competitive in the world, witnessing 630 percent growth in finance and investments since 2004,” said Phyllis Cuttino, director, Pew Clean Energy Program. “In 2010, worldwide finance and investment grew 30 percent to a record \$243 billion.”

If the poorly defined clean energy sector is so dynamic and so competitive, why does it continue to need subsidies and mandates from Western governments? These subsidies and mandates are nothing but raw political patronage to a few selected industries courtesy of the taxpayers. Is it not time that these dynamic industries be set free of the need for government funding and oversight? Please see referenced articles under “Subsidies and Mandates Forever.”

Continued Flooding: Daily, the US news bombards the public with reports of flooding. Flooding is always serious, but is to be expected in towns build on relatively low lying lands near rivers, bays or oceans. Meteorologist Joseph D’Aleo explains that the flooding is due to record snows and a prolonged cold winter.

The town of current concern, Minot, ND, is built on the Souris (Mouse) River which has interesting characteristics. The river starts from marshes in Canada and flows south into North Dakota then swings north and east back into Canada, eventually flowing into the Red River which empties into Lake Winnipeg in Manitoba. The generally low-laying Red River basin is notorious for flooding after hard winters because the ice and snow melts in the south before it melts in north. The slow melt in the north dams and restricts river flows, backing up the river.

Contrary to the alarmist claims, the current US floods are not the result of global warming. Please see referenced articles under “Changing Weather.”

#####

ARTICLES:

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

1. Science and Smear Merchants

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Jun 21, 2011

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/06/science_and_smear_merchants.html

2. Why Do We Pretend to Understand Climate Change

By Ross Clark, Express, UK, Jun 17, 2011 [H/t Tom Harris]

<http://www.express.co.uk/posts/view/253210/Why-do-we-pretend-to-understand-climate-change->

3. That Footnote in Yesterday’s Global Warming Ruling

By Sam Kazman, Global Warming.org, June 21, 2011

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2011/06/21/that-footnote-in-yesterday%E2%80%99s-global-warming-ruling/>

4...And the Climate Tort Cashiered

Justice Ginsburg’s finest hour

Editorial, WSJ, Jun 21, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303936704576397673915105838.html?mod=ITP_opini on_2

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Science: Is the Sun Rising?

Solar Science, Little Ice Ages and Journalism

By David Whitehouse, The Observatory, Jun 20, 2011

<http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/3259-solar-science-little-ice-ages-and-journalism.html>

[SEPP Comment: Excellent overview of the news relating to last week's announcement of the possibility of the sun entering a prolonged period of inactivity.]

Claim; Sunspots to Disappear, Global Cooling May Enure

By Matt Peckham, Time, Jun 15, 2011 [H/t John Cribbes]

<http://techland.time.com/2011/06/15/claim-sunspots-to-disappear-global-cooling-may-ensue/>

[SEPP Comment: Another example calculations based on a false interpretation of IPCC science.]

Climategate Continued

PNAS Reviews: Preferential Standards for Kemp (Mann) et al

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Jun 22, 2011

<http://climateaudit.org/2011/06/22/pnas-reviews-preferential-standards-for-kemp-mann-et-al/#more-13934>

Peer Review and 'Pal Review' in Climate Science

By Patrick Michaels, Forbes, Jun 16, 2011

<http://blogs.forbes.com/patrickmichaels/2011/06/16/peer-review-and-pal-review-in-climate-science/>

U.N. climate propaganda exposed

Industry lobbyists behind 'scientific' claims in IPCC press release

Editorial, Washington Times, Jun 17, 2011

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jun/17/un-climate-propaganda-exposed/>

Challenging the Orthodoxy

Is the PDO real or a skeptic invention

By Joseph D'Aleo, ICECAP, Jun 19, 2011

[http://icecap.us/images/uploads/THE_PDO\(1\).pdf](http://icecap.us/images/uploads/THE_PDO(1).pdf)

Is 'Global Cooling' Happening?

By David Whitehouse, The Observatory, Jun 24, 2011

<http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/3289-is-global-cooling-happening.html>

Dear Prime Minister

By the Fair Farming Group, Quadrant, AU, June 23, 2011 [H/t Tom Quirk]

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/06/dear-prime-minister>

The Rubber Duckies: Two United Nations giants of junk

By Peter Foster, Financial Post, Jun 17, 2011

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/06/17/the-rubber-duckies-two-united-nations-giants-of-junk/>

Defenders of the Orthodoxy

NOAA: U.S. unprepared for changes in Arctic ice

By Renee Schoof, Sacramento Bee, Jun 20, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.sacbee.com/2011/06/20/3714900/noaa-us-unprepared-for-changes.html>

Oceans in distress foreshadow mass extinction

By Staff Writers, AFP, June 20, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Oceans_in_distress_foreshadow_mass_extinction_999.html

Climate change disasters could be predicted

By Sarah Hoyle, Eurekalert, Jun 19, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2011-06/uoec-ccd061711.php

[SEPP Comment: To do so would require abandoning the IPCC science and models.]

Questioning the Orthodoxy

Things can only get worse

By Martin Livermore, Scientific-Alliance, Jun 23, 2011

<http://www.scientific-alliance.org/scientific-alliance-newsletter/things-can-only-get-worse>

Atmospheric carbon dioxide buildup unlikely to spark abrupt climate change

By Vince Stricherz, Univ. of Washington, Jun 19, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.washington.edu/news/articles/atmospheric-carbon-dioxide-buildup-unlikely-to-spark-abrupt-climate-change>

New Paper “Recent Wind Driven High Sea Ice Export In The Fram Strait Contributes To Arctic Sea Ice Decline” By Smedsrud Et Al 2011

By Roger Pielke, Sr, Pielke Climate Science, Jun 21, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2011/06/21/new-paper-recent-wind-driven-high-sea-ice-export-in-the-fram-strait-contributes-to-arctic-sea-ice-decline-by-smedsrud-et-al-2011/>

Ask and ye shall receive NOAA

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Jun 18, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/18/ask-and-ye-shall-receive-noaa/>

Questioning the European Green

Poland blocks bolder EU climate emissions cut

By Staff Writers, AFP, Jun 21, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Poland_blocks_bolder_EU_climate_emissions_cut_999.html

Message from the International Gas Union to European policymakers: Let’s get serious (about gas)!

By Reiner Gatermann, European Energy Review, Jun 20, 2011

<http://www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3066>

Expanding the Orthodoxy

Climate Change: Improvements Needed to Clarify National Priorities and Better Align Them with Federal Funding Decisions

By Staff Writers, Summary, GAO-11-317, May 20, 2011 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-11-317>

The Global Climate Change Initiative (GCCCI):

Budget Authority and Request, FY2008-FY2012

By Richard K. Lattanzio, Congressional Research Service, US Government, June 1, 2011

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41845.pdf>

Problems within the Orthodoxy

Alarm as EU Budget chief questions global warming

By Andrew Willis, EU Observer, Jun 22, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://euobserver.com/9/32534>

As climate talks sputter, UN scientists vet 'Plan B'

By Staff Writers, AFP, June 18, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/As_climate_talks_sputter_UN_scientists_vet_Plan_B_999.html

Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate?

Why the End is Always Near, but Never Arrives

By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, Jun 22, 2011

<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/>

Saving the world and the ocean, one activist opinion at a time – another NGO flap, this one duped global media

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Jun 21, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/21/saving-the-world-and-the-ocean-one-activist-opinion-at-a-time-another-greenpeace-flap-this-one-duped-global-media/>

Oceans heading for mass extinctions, experts warn

Scientist: Situation is 'more dire' than any of us thought

By Staff Writers, MSNBC, Jun 21, 2011

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/43479398/>

[SEPP Comment: Following the IPCC formula – publish a preliminary report “summary” with extreme claims first, then publish the full report that may or may not support earlier claims.]

Changing Weather

Flooding due to record snows and second fastest decadal cooling period in the record not warming

By Joseph D’Aleo, ICECAP, Jun 24, 2011

<http://www.icecap.us/>

Florida - La Nina Spring 2011 Drought

By Joe D’Aleo, Weather Bell, Jun 20, 2011

<http://www.weatherbell.com/newsletter-6-21-2011-g>

Minot Forced to Evacuate Early

By Christine McEnrue, Weather Bell, Jun 23, 2011

<http://www.weatherbell.com/weather-news/minot-forced-to-evacuate-early/>

Changing Climate

Did climate change cause Greenland's ancient Viking community to collapse?

By Staff Writers, SPX, Jun 22, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Did_climate_change_cause_Greenland_ancient_Viking_community_to_collapse_999.html

[SEPP Comment: Asked and answered decades ago.]

Changing Seas

Penn researchers link fastest sea-level rise in 2 millennia to increasing temperatures

By Evan Lerner, U. Pennsylvania, Jun 20, 2011 [H/t Ken Jorgensen]

http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2011-06/uop-prl061711.php

Sea Level Study Leads to Divisions

By Markus Becker, Spiegel, Jun 21, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,769687,00.html>

Riggs' Geological Perspective on North Carolina Sea Level

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Jun 23, 2011

<http://climateaudit.org/>

Leading German Meteorologist: Michael Mann's Sea Level Story Is "A Quack"

By P. Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Jun 23, 2011 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://notrickszone.com/2011/06/23/leading-german-meteorologist-michael-manns-sea-level-story-a-quack/>

The Political Games Continue

What's the great hurry?

By Garth Paltridge, Quadrant, AU, Jun 19, 2011

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/06/what-s-the-great-hurry>

Labor's Euro vision provides the smoke and mirrors for a carbon tax

Greg Sheridan, The Australian June 18, 2011 [H/t Des Moore]

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/commentary/labors-euro-vision-provides-the-smoke-and-mirrors-for-a-carbon-tax/story-e6frgd0x-1226077328365>

Litigation Issues

U.S. Supreme Court Rejects Climate-Change Public Nuisance Suit

By Staff Writers, Power News, Jun 22, 2011

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3816.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2226491&hq_l=4&hq_v=5e66050d0

The Carbon Ruling

Editorial, NYT, Jun 21, 2011

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/22/opinion/22wed2.html?_r=1&nl=todaysheadlines&emc=th211

[SEPP Comment: The slant from the NYT is that the EPA is one of the few "remaining regulatory weapons the government can use to combat global warming" and that the Court reaffirmed the law and the government's obligation to regulate carbon dioxide.]

Regulator State Wins Big In Court

Editorial, IBD, Jun 20, 2011

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/575943/201106201904/Regulatory-State-Wins-Big-In-Court.htm>

Supremes retreat from climate panic

Ruling returns environmental rules to politicians, not courts

By Steve Milloy, Washington Times, Jun 21, 2011

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jun/21/supremes-retreat-from-climate-panic/>

Supreme Court delivers win to power companies in greenhouse gas emissions case

By Robert Barnes, Washington Post, Jun 20, 2011 [H/t Conrad]

http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/supreme-court-says-epa-not-federal-judges-is-responsible-for-regulating-greenhouse-gases/2011/06/20/AGcoUSdH_story.html

Supreme skeptics

By Lawrence Solomon, Financial Post, Jun 23, 2011

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/06/23/lawrence-solomon-supreme-skeptics/>

Conservative group sues NASA for climate scientist's records

By Ben Geman, The Hill, Jun 22, 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/167873-conservative-group-sues-nasa-for-climate-scientist-hansens-records>

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

Clean energy "investments" just a tiny \$243 Billion in 2010

By Jo Nova, her blog, Jun 25, 2011

<http://joannenova.com.au/>

[SEPP Comment: A guide to easy money.]

Investing in Clean Power

PEW Environmental Group, May 29, 2011

<http://www.pewenvironment.org/news-room/other-resources/investing-in-clean-power-329295>

[SEPP Comment: A race that many developed nations would be better off if they lose.]

New England's Renewable Energy Mandate: Reality Anyone?

By Lisa Linowes, Master Resource, June 24, 2011

<http://www.masterresource.org/2011/06/new-england-renewable-proble/#more-15514>

"Onshore wind in New England currently demands between 9-11 cents per KWh, more than twice the wholesale price of natural gas. Offshore wind is even more expensive starting at over 18 cents a KWh. More wind energy in the fuel mix will cause upward pressure on energy prices for the life of the power purchase agreements."

New coalition hopes to jump-start Obama's 'clean energy standard'

By Ben Geman, The Hill, Jun 20, 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/167363-new-coalition-hopes-to-jumpstart-obamas-clean-energy-standard>

Retire the kernel, release the gas

Era of fuel subsidies should end

Editorial, Washington Times, Jun 20, 2011

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jun/20/retire-the-kernel-release-the-gas/>

EPA and other Regulators on the March

EPA Extends Public Comment Period for Proposed Toxic Air Rule

By Staff Writers, Power News, Jun 22, 2011

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3819.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2226491&hq_l=5&hq_v=5e66050d0

Energy Issues

Nuclear Fears & Responses

Analysis: Germany goes back to black in snub to green power
By Peter Dinkloh and Christoph Steitz, Reuters, Jun 20, 2011 [H/t GWPF]
<http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/20/us-germany-energy-idUSTRE75J42J20110620>
[SEPP Comment: *Ideals hit costs*]

Fukushima raises questions about new Finnish reactor

By Staff Writers, AFP, June 21, 2011
http://www.nuclearpowerdaily.com/reports/Fukushima_raises_questions_about_new_Finnish_reactor_999.html

TVA progresses with mPower project

By Staff Writers, World Nuclear News, 17 June 2011
http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/NN-TVA_progresses_with_mPower_project-1706115.aspx
[SEPP Comment: *Planning for small “packaged” nuclear plants.*]

Nuke agency official: Yucca work politicized

By Ben Geman, The Hill, 06/24/11
<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/168297-uke-agency-official-alleges-yucca-work-politicized-manipulated-under-jaczko>

Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?

Environmentalists push to keep U.S., others from oil drilling in Arctic

By Jason Welsh, Washington Times, Jun 21, 2011
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jun/21/environmentalists-keep-us-others-oil-drill-artic/>

Energy: What’s All the Fracking Fuss About?

By Larry Bell, Forbes, Jun 21, 2011
<http://blogs.forbes.com/larrybell/2011/06/21/energy-whats-all-the-fracking-fuss-about/>

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Energy

Three Gorges tarnishes new hydropower?

By Staff Writers, UPI, Jun 21, 2011
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Three_Gorges_tarnishes_new_hydropower_999.html
[SEPP Comment: *Four new dams with twice the capacity of the Three Gorges – two to open by 2013. Western nations are losing this race for alternative energy.*]

How green is my energy?

By Geoffrey Luck, Quadrant, AU, Jun 24, 2011
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/06/how-green-is-my-energy>

Rare earth prices surge as China tightens grip

By Staff Writers, AFP, June 20, 2011
http://www.spacemart.com/reports/Rare_earth_prices_surge_as_China_tightens_grip_999.html

Solar Dawn will be Largest Plant of its Kind in the World

By Staff Writers, SPX, Jun 22, 2011
http://www.solardaily.com/reports/Solar_Dawn_will_be_Largest_Plant_of_its_Kind_in_the_World_999.html

PSC Allows Installation of Largest Land-Based Wind Turbines in NY

By Staff Writers, SPX, Jun 21, 2011

http://www.winddaily.com/reports/PSC_Allows_Installation_of_Largest_Land_Based_Wind_Turbines_in_NY_999.html

[SEPP Comment: 492 feet – about as tall as a 50 story concrete office building.]

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

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

Cardiovascular Deaths and the Weather in Budapest

Reference: Toro, K., Bartholy, J., Pongracz, R., Kis, Z., Keller, E. and Dunay, G. 2010. Evaluation of meteorological factors on sudden cardiovascular death. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine* 17: 236-242.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jun/22jun2011a5.html>

Precipitation Extremes Along North America' West Coast

Reference: Mass, C., Skalenakis, A. and Warner, M. 2011. Extreme precipitation over the west coast of North America: Is there a trend? *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 12: 310-318.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jun/22jun2011a4.html>

The Future of North American Wheat Production

Reference: Olmstead, A.L. and Rhode, P.W. 2011. Adapting North American wheat production to climatic challenges, 1839-2009. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 108: 480-485.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jun/21jun2011a4.html>

Summer Temperatures in the Northern French Alps

Reference: Millet, L., Arnaud, F., Heiri, O., Magny, M., Verneaux, V. and Desmet, M. 2009. Late-Holocene summer temperature reconstruction from chironomid assemblages of Lake Anterne, northern French Alps. *The Holocene* 19: 317-328.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jun/21jun2011a3.html>

Environmental Industry

Browner, former White House climate czar, joins green group board

By Ben Geman, The Hill, Jun 23, 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/168061-browner-former-white-house-climate-czar-joins-green-group-board>

Other Scientific News

Surprises from the ocean: Marine plankton and ocean pH

By Staff Writers, SPX, Jun 23, 2011

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Surprises_from_the_ocean_Marine_plankton_and_ocean_pH_999.html

[SEPP Comment: Apparently at least one group of phytoplankton can regulate their internal pH to build calcium carbonate. This calls into question the simplistic studies funded by EPA, and others, on the impact of increases of dissolved carbon dioxide in the oceans – the so-called ocean acidification.]

Teeming with life, Pacific's California current likened to Africa's Serengeti Plain

Decade of electronic tagging, tracking of 23 top Pacific Ocean predators reveals remarkable homing by marine animals, well-defined highways

By Terry Collins, Eurekalert, Jun 22, 2011

http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2011-06/com1-tw1061711.php

Cryosat produces its first Arctic ice thickness map

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Jun 21, 2011

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/21/cryosat-produces-its-first-arctic-ice-thickness-map/#more-42018>

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Princess of whales: How a naked female scientist tries to tame belugas in the freezing Arctic

By Daily Mail Reporter, Jun 16, 2011

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2004042/Naked-female-scientist-tries-tame-beluga-whales-arctic.html#ixzz1PqG517vG>

American Cancer Society Declares Poverty a Carcinogen

By Susan Campbell, Hartford Courant, Jun 21, 2011 [H/t Best of the Web]

<http://www.courant.com/health/connecticut/hc-campbell-cancer-0621-20110621,0,5156569.column>

Study: Biodegradable plastics can release methane

By Helen Chappell, News Observer, Jun 20, 2011 [H/t Paul Chesser]

<http://www.newsobserver.com/2011/06/20/1285717/maybe-a-little-too-biodegradable.html>

[SEPP Comment: When products made from hydrocarbons degrade they release hydrocarbons?]

#####

ARTICLES:

1. Science and Smear Merchants

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Jun 21, 2011

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/06/science_and_smear_merchants.html

Professor [Naomi Oreskes](#), of the University of California in San Diego, claims to be a science historian. One can readily demonstrate that she is neither a credible scientist nor a credible historian; the best evidence is right there in her recent book, *"Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming,"* coauthored with Eric Conway. Her science is faulty; her historical procedures are thoroughly unprofessional. She is, however, an accomplished polemicist, who has found time for world lecture tours, promoting her book and her ideological views, while being paid by the citizens of California. Her book tries to smear four senior physicists -- of whom I am the only surviving one. I view it as my obligation to defend the reputations of my late colleagues and good friends against her libelous charges.

Oreskes is well-known from her 2004 article in *Science* that claimed a complete scientific consensus about manmade global warming; it launched her career as a polemicist. Her claim was based on examining the abstracts of some 900 published papers. Unfortunately, she missed more than 11,000 papers through an incorrect Internet search. She published a discreet "Correction"; yet she has never retracted her ideologically based claim about consensus. Al Gore still quotes her result, which has been contradicted by several, more competent studies (by Peiser, Schulte, Bray and von Storch; Lemonick in *SciAm*, etc).

Turning first to the her science, her book discusses acidification, as measured by the pH coefficient. She states that a pH of 6.0 denotes neutrality (page 67, MoD). Let's be charitable and chalk this off to sloppy proofreading.

Elsewhere in the book (page 29), she claims that beryllium is a "heavy metal" and tries to back this up with references. I wonder if she knows that the atomic weight of beryllium is only 9, compared to, say, uranium, which is mostly 238. A comparison of these two numbers should tell anyone which one is the heavy metal.

Her understanding of the Greenhouse Effect is plain comical; she posits that CO₂ is "trapped" in the troposphere -- and that's why the stratosphere is cooling. Equally wrong is her understanding of what climate models are capable of; she actually believes that they can predict forest fires in Russia, floods in Pakistan and China -- nothing but calamities everywhere -- and tells climate scientists in a recent lecture: *If the predictions of climate models have come true, then why don't people believe them* [see [this](#)]? Perhaps because people are not gullible.

But the most amazing science blunder in her book is her hypothesis about how cigarette-smoking causes cancer (page 28). She blames it on oxygen-15, a radioactive isotope of the common oxygen-16. I wonder if she knows that the half-life of O-15 is only 122 seconds. Of course, she does not spell out how O-15 gets into cigarette smoke, whether it is in the paper or in the tobacco itself. If the latter, does she believe that the O-15 is created by the burning of tobacco? If so, this would be a fantastic discovery, worthy of an alchemist. Perhaps someone should make her aware of the difference between radioactive and "reactive" oxygen; the two words do sound similar.

I am sure one would find more examples of scientific ignorance in a careful reading of the rest of the book. But why bother?

Having demonstrated her scientific "expertise," let's turn to her historical expertise. Any careful historian would use primary sources and would at least try to interview the scientists she proceeds to smear. There is no trace of that in Oreskes' book. She has never taken the trouble to interview Dr. Robert Jastrow, founder of the NASA-Goddard Institute for Space Studies, and later Director of the Mt. Wilson Astronomical Observatory and founding president of the renowned George C Marshall Institute in Washington, DC. I can find no evidence that she ever interviewed Dr. William Nierenberg, director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, who actually lived in San Diego and was readily accessible. And I doubt if she ever even met Dr. Frederick Seitz, the main target of her venom.

Seitz was the most distinguished of the group of physicists that are attacked in the book. He had served as President of the US National Academy of Sciences and of the American Physical Society, and later as President of Rockefeller University. He had been awarded numerous honorary degrees from universities here and abroad, as well as the prestigious National Medal of Science from the White House.

Instead of seeking firsthand information in the tradition of historical research, Oreskes relies on secondary or tertiary sources, quoting people who agree with her ideology. A good example of this is her discussion of acid rain and of the White House panel (under Reagan, in 1982) chaired by Bill Nierenberg, on which I also served. Here she relies on what she was told by Dr. Gene Likens, whose research funding depends on portraying acid rain as a very serious environmental problem. It most definitely is not -- and indeed disappeared from view as soon as Congress passed legislation designed to reduce the effect.

An amazing discovery: I found that Oreskes gives me credit (or blames me) for inventing "cap-and-trade," the trading of emission rights under a fixed cap of total emissions (see pp. 91-93). I had never claimed such a priority because I honestly don't know if this idea had been published anywhere. It seemed like the natural thing to suggest in order to reduce total cost -- once an emission cap had been set. My example involved smelters that emit SO₂ copiously *versus* electric utilities that burn coal containing some sulfur. I even constructed what amounts to a "supply curve" in which the bulk of the emission control is borne initially by the lowest-cost units. Of course, Likens and some others on the panel,

antagonistic to coal-burning electric utilities, objected to having my discussion included in the panel report. Nierenberg solved the problem neatly by putting my contribution into a signed Appendix, thereby satisfying some panel members who did not want to be responsible for a proposal that might let some electric utilities off the hook.

We have established so far that Oreskes is neither a scientist of any sort nor a careful professional historian. She is, however, a "pop-psychologist." It seems she has figured out what motivates the four senior physicists she libels in her book; it is "anti-communism." Really! This is not only stated explicitly but she also identifies them throughout as "Cold Warriors."

Well, now we know at least where Oreskes stands in the political spectrum.

2. Why Do We Pretend to Understand Climate Change

By Ross Clark, Express, UK, Jun 17, 2011 [H/t Tom Harris]

<http://www.express.co.uk/posts/view/253210/Why-do-we-pretend-to-understand-climate-change->

THE winter of 1684 stands out as the most extreme in a spell of cold weather in the late 17th and early 18th centuries now known as the Little Ice Age.

The frost, records the diary of Londoner John Evelyn, had started in mid-December and by January 2 the Thames at London Bridge had begun to freeze over. By the 11th there were "streets of booths set up upon the Thames". By February 3 "coaches plied the ice from Westminster to the Temple" and all London had taken to the ice. There were horse races, puppet shows and bull-baiting in a "Bacchanalian carnival on the water".

The cold weather experienced in Europe and North America in the late 17th and early 18th centuries is all the more fascinating for having coincided with a period in which astronomers noted an almost complete absence of sunspots.

According to the US National Solar Observatory we may be entering another such period, raising the question: will we again be plunged into a mini ice age?

Sunspots, which are small dark patches on the surface of the sun, were known to astronomers in ancient China. But it wasn't until Galileo began observing the sun by telescope in 1611 that their cause became understood. The dark spots are patches where the sun's surface has cooled to between 2,700 and 4,200C compared with around 5,500C for the surrounding surface and are caused by bursts of increased solar activity.

For the past three centuries the number of sunspots has risen and fallen on an 11-year cycle, with peaks and troughs varying in amplitude. In the half century from 1950 sunspots were especially common with thousands appearing every year.

Since 2006, however, something strange has happened. Instead of reaching a predicted peak this year the number of sunspots has tailed off, leading scientists to wonder whether we are heading towards a repeat of the Maunder Minimum, the period between 1645-1715 with hardly any sunspots.

The US National Solar Observatory's report this week has, unsurprisingly, aroused interest on both sides of the global warming debate. Some sceptics have long believed that sunspots rather than carbon emissions lay behind the rise in global temperatures at the end of last century. The global warming lobby, though, argues that the 0.5C fall in European temperatures that occurred during the Little Ice Age will

easily be cancelled out by the rise of between 2.4 and 4C which has been predicted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to occur by 2100.

Scientists battling it out over sunspots and carbon emissions, however, prove the great global warming debate of the past 20 years shows how little we really understand about Earth's climate and the influences upon it. It is pure hubris to pretend otherwise.

For years the global warming lobby has acted as if there was only one thing which drives climate change: man-made carbon emissions. This is the basis of all the mathematical models that have tried to predict the climate 100 years and more into the future. The IPCC report treats Earth's climate as if it can be controlled like a thermostat: if we cut carbon emissions by such a percentage we will limit the rise in global temperatures to 2C and so on.

It ought to be obvious that this is nonsense: Earth has undergone huge changes in climate, many of which such as the onset of ice ages have occurred incredibly rapidly – and all before mankind started burning fossil fuels. We don't understand why these ice ages occurred, nor why Earth seems to have warmed up for a few centuries during the Middle Ages so why does anyone preclude the possibility that the recent global warming has a natural cause?

We should be sceptical too of the theory that the sunspot cycle drives Earth's climate. Accurate temperature records only go back a century or so. Neither do we have a great deal of data on sunspots before 1611. While climate scientists naturally know more about the climate than the rest of us do the truth is that they too know next to nothing.

After all not even with a super-computer can the Met Office give us much of a clue as to what the weather will be like in five days' time.

Although climate is not the same as weather it is a similarly chaotic system and will always defy scientists' attempts to model it on computers.

Why can't climate scientists just bring themselves to admit that we haven't even yet begun fully to understand the cause of climatic change?

To be fair to the scientists, though, their papers do tend to be peppered with uncertainties and unanswered questions.

It is politicians and policymakers who are the worst offenders when it comes to making over-confident statements on climate change.

Former environment secretary David Miliband foolishly told us: "I think that the scientific debate has now closed on global warming." Not to be outdone his brother Ed, who was energy and climate change secretary before becoming Labour leader, also told us that the debate was now "settled".

Oh no it isn't – and it never will be. But if sunspots do disappear for a prolonged period just as they did 350 years ago and our climate gets colder – or warmer – we might end up knowing just a little bit more.

3. That Footnote in Yesterday's Global Warming Ruling

By Sam Kazman, Global Warming.org, June 21, 2011

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2011/06/21/that-footnote-in-yesterday%E2%80%99s-global-warming-ruling/>

Yesterday's [Supreme Court ruling](#) on carbon dioxide provided some welcome relief to those concerned that the Court might say something, deliberately or otherwise, that would buttress the claims of global warming alarmists. The Court said no such thing. In fact, it seemed to step back from the suggestions in its 2007 [Massachusetts v. EPA](#) ruling that the scientific debate over anthropogenic warming had largely been settled. Yesterday's ruling does mention hurricanes and heat-related deaths and melting ice-caps, but only in characterizing EPA's view of global warming, not the Court's. And the Court quickly distances itself from EPA's views with an interesting footnote:

"For views opposing EPA's, see, e.g., Dawidoff, *The Civil Heretic*, N. Y. Times Magazine 32 (March 29, 2009). The Court, we caution, endorses no particular view of the complicated issues related to carbon dioxide emissions and climate change."

The second line of that footnote would have sufficed all by itself to make clear that this ruling was not about global warming science. But the Court went beyond that to cite a 2009 N.Y. Times Magazine cover story about award-winning physicist Freeman Dyson and his skepticism about anthropogenic warming. Alarmists had been up in arms when that story was published, arguing that it would give the skeptics unwarranted respectability.

Now bear in mind that the [N.Y. Times article](#) appeared before the [Alan Carlin-EPA whistleblower scandal](#), before ClimateGate, and before the subsequent series of [embarrassments regarding the IPCC report](#) (which itself was repeatedly cited by the 5-4 majority in *Massachusetts v. EPA*). One can speculate on why, of all the articles available to it, the Court chose to single out this one. But regardless—I'm glad that all those angered by the Times story two years ago now have reason to get angry all over again.

4...And the Climate Tort Cashiered

Justice Ginsburg's finest hour

Editorial, WSJ, Jun 21, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303936704576397673915105838.html?mod=ITP_opini_on_2

Yesterday's other important Supreme Court decision (see above) came in a case that joined the green lobby and the trial bar, if that isn't redundant. The Court unanimously struck down one of the legal left's most destructive theories, and not a moment too soon.

In *American Electric Power v. Connecticut*, eight states and various other environmental activists sued a group of utilities, claiming that their carbon emissions were a "nuisance" under federal common law and that therefore the courts should set U.S. global warming policy. Yet this is a fundamentally political question, one the Constitution reserves to Congress and the executive, as Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg wrote for the 8-0 majority.

The Court "remains mindful that it does not have creative power akin to that vested in Congress," Justice Ginsburg observed, in an all-too-rare vindication of legal restraint. "It is altogether fitting that Congress designated an expert agency, here, EPA, as best suited to serve as primary regulator of greenhouse gas emissions. The expert agency is surely better equipped to do the job than individual district judges issuing ad hoc, case-by-case injunctions. Federal judges lack the scientific, economic, and technological resources an agency can utilize in coping with issues of this order."

We'd go further and point out that Congress never granted the Environmental Protection Agency the power to regulate CO2. The EPA has merely asserted that power with an assist from the pure policy invention of the Court itself in 2006's 5-4 *Mass. v. EPA* ruling. Still, the fact that every Justice rejected the

new climate tort theory, and that the opinion was delivered by the most liberal Justice, shows how abusive it really was.

The Court dismissed the case under the "political question doctrine," but we wish it had resolved the technical issue of Article III standing, which determines when a plaintiff has a right to sue. The Justices were split four to four, and thus did not rule; Justice Sonia Sotomayor recused herself because she heard the case on the Second Circuit. Yet standing is one of the few restraints on the power of the federal courts, and the litigants didn't have it by a mile here.

Under the traditional legal reading of standing, plaintiffs have to show that the defendants caused their injuries and that the courts can meaningfully redress those injuries. But climate change is a world-wide phenomenon for which the group of utilities barely contributed even under the most aggressive global warmist theories. And even if the courts shut down those plants tomorrow, it would have no effect whatsoever on atmospheric CO2 concentrations.

The climate tort is nonetheless finished, and the Court's decision should make it impossible to advance the same claims in state courts. Anyone who cares about the economy and the Constitutional balance of power can breathe a little easier.

#####