

ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY DIVISION

NEWSLETTER

26 OCT. 2015

If you need older URLs contact George at ghh@att.net.

Please Note: "This newsletter contains articles that offer differing points of view regarding climate change, energy and other environmental issues. Any opinions expressed in this publication are the responses of the editor alone and do not represent the positions of the Environmental and Energy Engineering Division or the ASME."

George Holliday

A. 1. 2 SHELL DRILL VESSELS DEPART ARCTIC WATERS

Two Royal Dutch Shell drill vessels have left the Arctic for the Pacific Northwest, bringing an end to oil exploration efforts in the waters located off of Alaska's northwest coast. Although oil and natural gas were found in the area, Shell didn't find enough to continue operations in the area. There are no new destinations specified for the two vessels, according to Shell spokesman Curtis Smith. [The Associated Press \(10/13\)](#)

2. NEW REPORT ON THE BENEFITS OF INCREASED CARBON DIOXIDE IN ATMOSPHERE IN [A PAPER FOR THE GLOBAL](#)

Warming Policy Foundation, Dr Indur Goklany, who has previously represented the United States on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), says that the rising level of carbon dioxide in the Earth's atmosphere "is currently net beneficial for both humanity and the biosphere generally". The benefits are real, whereas the costs of warming are uncertain," he adds.

"Carbon dioxide fertilises plants, and emissions from fossil fuels have already had a hugely beneficial effect on crops, increasing yields by at least 10-15 per cent," Dr Goklany argues.

"This has not only been good for humankind but for the natural world too, because an acre of land that is not used for crops is an acre of land that is left for nature."

Increasing crops yields has helped reduce hunger and improved human well being, as well as generating around \$140 billion a year.

As well as crops, the "wild places of the Earth" have seen an improvement, becoming greener in recent decades. Dr Goklany attributes this to carbon dioxide, saying it can also increase their water-use efficiency, thus making them more resistant to drought.

"Unlike the claims of future global warming disasters," Dr Goklany says, "These benefits are firmly established and are being felt now.

"Yet despite this the media overlook the good news and the public remain in the dark. My report should begin to restore a little balance."

Professor Myles Allen of the University of Oxford admitted there were some benefits from increased levels of carbon dioxide, but nonetheless said Dr Goklany's assertions had "Stalinist overtones".

He [told](#) the *Sunday Times*: "... I worry about the Stalinist overtones of adding up the losses and benefits and deciding humanity as a whole will benefit from global warming. Drowning Bangladeshis might not be reassured by higher crop yields in Ukraine."

However, in a foreword to the report, Professor Freeman Dyson, a world-renowned physicist, said Dr Golkany's conclusions show how "a whole generation of scientific experts is blind to obvious facts", adding that "the thinking of politicians and scientists about controversial issues today is still tribal".
end paste

The Sunday Times is concerned about doing an economic analysis but eventually the world is going to have to do exactly that due to diminishing supplies of food, fresh water and fuel. The rising sea levels currently are due to pumping water from no or slow to recharge aquifers, not melting ice.

J Frank

*** WORLEYPARSONS GROUP NOTICE *** "This email is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose or use the information contained in it. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email and delete the email and any attachments. Any personal views or opinions expressed by the writer may not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of any company in the WorleyParsons Group of Companies."

Arnold, Ken (Houston)" <Ken.Arnold@WorleyParsons.com>

<http://www.thegwpc.org/patrick-moore-should-we-celebrate-carbon-dioxide/>

3. ARE WE CHASING IMAGINARY NUMBERS?

Guest Essay by Kip Hansen Spoiler Alert: This essay is not about the mathematical entity the imaginary number. I do think that an essay here about imaginary numbers of that sort would be interesting, but this isn't going to be it. This essay, while not about the usual fare seen here – AGW; CAGW;...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/09/are-we-chasing-imaginary-numbers/>

4. OIL CEOS DIFFER ON CARBON STRATEGY, HIGHLIGHTING INDUSTRY DIVIDE

U.S., European companies are split over approach to emissions ahead of climate-change summit

By Sarah Kent

The Wall Street Journal Amy Harder

Updated Oct. 7, 2015 7:50 p.m. ET

LONDON—The chief executives of [Royal Dutch Shell](#) LC and [ExxonMobil](#) Corp. laid out contrasting visions this week for reducing fossil-fuel emissions, illustrating a divide between American and European energy companies ahead of a United Nations climate-change summit.

[Rex Tillerson](#), CEO of U.S.-based Exxon, said Wednesday that innovation, free markets and competition were the best tools for curbing emissions. His remarks came a day after Ben van Beurden, chief of Anglo-Dutch giant Shell, said technology wouldn't be enough to bring about emissions cuts, and that governments needed to step in.

Both executives were speaking here at the Oil and Money conference, co-hosted by Energy Intelligence and the International New York Times.

The differing messages show that the oil industry hasn't come up with a unified response to climate change, even as its leaders become increasingly vocal about it in the run-up to the U.N. summit in Paris. Nearly 200 countries are expected to participate in the Nov. 30 to Dec. 11 meeting, which is designed to hammer out a way to reduce carbon emissions enough to slow climate change.

Messrs. Tillerson and van Beurden agreed on many issues, including that renewable-energy sources like solar can't meet the demands of a quickly industrializing world with a growing population. Both also

would back putting a price tag on carbon emissions, an idea expected to be discussed in Paris, but Mr. Tillerson's support was more qualified.

Advertisement

Mr. van Beurden, like many of European energy executives, was more explicit in calling on governments to intervene, and "take the opportunity to put a price on carbon." "By taking the costs of tackling climate change and air pollution into account, carbon-pricing systems will drive the right behavior of consumers and producers," Mr. van Beurden said.

Mr. Tillerson took a different stance, saying technological advances launched the American shale boom, producing an abundance of natural gas that has helped curb U.S. emissions. "We've proven that with the right policies in place the competition and cooperation inherent in free markets will spur us to invest and innovate," Mr. Tillerson said.

Those reductions, he said, were made without a U.S. policy on carbon pricing. Mr. Tillerson said he would accept a carbon tax if it was "revenue neutral," which, according to Exxon's website, means it would be "offset by tax reductions in other areas."

The divergence between American and European energy executives in their approach to climate change has played out elsewhere this year.

The chiefs of the biggest European oil companies signed an open letter in June calling for a carbon-pricing system to be instituted globally. Mr. van Beurden, who helped coordinate the letter, said American companies were invited to join, but declined.

"They probably came from a different point at that stage," Mr. van Beurden told The Wall Street Journal in a June interview. He played down any rift with American counterparts.

The American Petroleum Institute, which represents hundreds of U.S. oil and gas companies, including Exxon, [Chevron Corp.](#) and European companies like Shell, didn't sign the letter.

"We have members with differing views across the entire spectrum," Jack Gerard, the trade group's president and CEO, said in an interview Wednesday. "But our view is that the issue is a serious one that needs to be addressed."

Mr. Gerard said he was still talking with member companies about making statements ahead of the Paris summit or attending the talks.

American companies don't plan to participate in meetings next week in Paris among European energy companies including Shell, BP PLC and French oil giant [Total SA](#) and state-oil companies from Saudi Arabia and Mexico to discuss climate-change initiatives.

The oil industry for years has grappled with how to address environmental issues. The Bank of England's governor, Mark Carney, warned in a speech last month that investors could face huge losses if tough climate-change policies are enacted that could make vast reserves of oil, gas and coal "literally unburnable."

It's a threat the large oil companies deny, saying that rising energy use in coming years will keep oil and natural gas a vital part of the energy mix.

In fact, for the European energy companies, supporting new costs on carbon would make sense if the system hurt the coal industry to the benefit of cleaner-burning natural gas. Some companies like Shell produce more gas than oil.

U.S. energy companies have generally been more averse to climate taxes than their counterparts in Europe, where carbon is already taxed. The U.S. doesn't currently tax carbon emissions.

In a speech last year at the Economic Club of Minnesota, Chevron CEO [John Watson](#) said free markets support environmental objectives by creating a strong economy better able to fund environmental priorities. Policy makers should "override free-markets only in extreme circumstances. I can think of few cases where American consumers have been well-served by usurping markets."

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/oil-ceos-differ-on-carbon-strategy-highlighting-industry-divide-1444252378>

5. STUDY: HIGH CO2 LEVELS EQUATED TO “WARM AVERAGE TEMPERATURES AND FLOURISHING LIFE” LOW CO2, “PRECEDING AN ICE AGE AND EVENTUAL MASS EXTINCTION”

From the UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA: Paleoclimate researchers find connection between carbon cycles, climate trends Carbon cycling research can help scientists predict global warming and cooling trends COLUMBIA, Mo. – Making predictions about climate variability often means looking to the past to find trends. Now paleoclimate researchers from the University of Missouri have found clues in...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/11/study-high-co2-levels-equated-to-warm-average-temperatures-and-flourishing-life-low-co2-preceding-an-ice-age-and-eventual-mass-extinction/>

6. CLIMATE CRAZINESS OF THE WEEK: FICTIONAL MOVIE INSPIRES FICTIONAL CLIMATE MODELING

From the UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON and the “lets study science fiction by using climate model fiction” department.

Could ‘The Day After Tomorrow’ happen? A researcher from the University of Southampton has produced a scientific study of the climate scenario featured in the disaster movie ‘The Day After Tomorrow’. In the 2004 film, climate warming caused...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/09/climate-craziness-of-the-week-fictional-movie-inspires-fictional-climate-modeling/>

7. CLIMATE DOOMSAYERS IGNORE BENEFITS OF CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS – NOW COMPILED IN A NEW REPORT

From the GWPF: London 12 October:

In an important new report published today by the Global Warming Policy Foundation, former IPCC delegate Dr Indur Goklany calls for a reassessment of carbon dioxide, which he says has many benefits for the natural world and for humankind. Dr Goklany said: “Carbon dioxide fertilizes plants and emissions from...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/12/climate-doomsayers-ignore-benefits-of-carbon-dioxide-emissions-now-compiled-in-a-new-report/>

8. FREEMAN DYSON: DEMOCRAT SUPPORTER, CLIMATE SKEPTIC

Guest essay by Eric Worrall

Freeman Dyson, one of the world’s most prominent physicists, has given an interview to **The Register**, in which he discusses climate change, and his disappointment that President Obama, whom he strongly admires, chose the wrong side of the Climate issue. Freeman Dyson on Politics; an Obama supporter who describes himself...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/12/freeman-dyson-democrat-supporter-climate-skeptic/>

9. SCIENTIFIC URBAN LEGENDS

Guest Post by Willis Eschenbach I have a category that I call “scientific urban legends”. These include things like the idea that rising seas will drown atolls, when Darwin showed 150 years ago that rising seas create atolls. Another scientific urban legend is the claim that we’re in the middle of the “Sixth Wave of...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/11/scientific-urban-legends/>

10. NOMINATIONS NOW BEING ACCEPTED FOR THE 2016 NEW FACES OF ENGINEERING PROGRAMS



DiscoverE is currently accepting nominations for its two recognition programs, New Faces of Engineering Professional and New Faces College Edition. Early career members of ASME and student members who would like to nominate themselves or a colleague to represent the Society in either of the 2016 New Faces programs have until Nov. 20 to fill out and submit an online nomination form.

The New Faces of Engineering Professional program honors early career engineering leaders by highlighting their contributions to the profession and the resulting impact on society. To be considered to represent ASME in the 2016 New Faces Professional class, nominees must be members of ASME, aged 30 years or younger as of Dec. 31, 2015, with a degree in engineering from an ABET-accredited U.S. college or university or from an equivalent international institution.

The second New Faces program, New Faces College Edition, recognizes the accomplishments of undergraduate engineering students. Candidates must be third- fourth- or fifth-year students with a grade point average of 3.0 grade point average or higher. Nominees must also be enrolled in a Bachelor of Science engineering program from an ABET-accredited U.S. college or university or its equivalent.

The top New Faces Professional and College Edition applicants from each participating engineering organization will be selected by DiscoverE and announced on April 4, 2016. New Faces Professional winners will be featured in national and local U.S. media outlets, while College Edition winners will receive scholarships ranging from \$500 to \$1,000.

To nominate an ASME member or student member for either of the New Faces programs, or for more information, visit www.asme.org/events/competitions/new-faces-of-mechanical-engineering. To learn more about DiscoverE and its various programs, visit www.discovere.org.
Arnie Feldman

COMMENTS

A. THE WEEK THAT WAS: 2015-10-17(OCT. 17, 2015)

BY KEN HAAPALA, PRESIDENT, SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROJECT (SEPP)

Benefits of Carbon Dioxide: Indur Goklany has produced a brief report on the tremendous benefits of additional carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, largely attributable to the human use of fossil fuels. The report was published by the Global Warming Policy Foundation with a foreword by Freeman Dyson, the noted theoretical physicist from Princeton. In a recent interview Mr. Dyson said that he was a supporter of President Obama, but Mr. Obama has come out on the wrong side of the global warming/climate change issue and the effects of atmospheric carbon dioxide. In a recent interview Dyson expressed concern over the recent scientific concentration on global warming/climate change and said it is “not a scientific mystery but a human mystery. How does it happen that a whole generation of scientific experts is blind to the obvious facts [?]”

Goklany is a former US representative to the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and author of the well-researched book *The Improving State of the World: Why We’re Living Longer, Healthier, More Comfortable Lives on a Cleaner Planet* (2007). Goklany’s new report provides independent confirmation of the findings by the Non-government International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), namely in the more comprehensive *Climate Change Reconsidered II: Biological Impacts* [2014].

Among his main conclusions Goklany finds:

1. “Empirical data confirms that the biosphere’s productivity has increased by about 14% since 1982, in large part as a result of rising carbon dioxide levels.
2. Thousands of scientific experiments indicate that increasing carbon dioxide concentrations in the air have contributed to increases in crop yields.
3. Satellite evidence confirms that increasing carbon dioxide concentrations have also resulted in greater productivity of wild terrestrial ecosystems in all vegetation types.
4. Increasing carbon dioxide concentrations have also increased the productivity of many marine ecosystems.
5. In recent decades, trends in climate-sensitive indicators of human and environmental wellbeing have improved and continue to do so despite claims that they would deteriorate because of global warming.
6. Compared with the benefits from carbon dioxide on crop and biosphere productivity, the adverse impacts of carbon dioxide – on the frequency and intensity of extreme weather, on sea level, vector-borne disease prevalence and human health have been too small to measure or have been swamped by other factors.
7. Models used to influence policy on climate change have overestimated the rate of warming, underestimated direct benefits of carbon dioxide, overestimated the harms from climate change and underestimated human capacity to adapt so as to capture the benefits while reducing the harms.
8. It is very likely that the impact of rising carbon dioxide concentrations is currently net beneficial for both humanity and the biosphere generally. These benefits are real, whereas the costs of warming are

uncertain. Halting the increase in carbon dioxide concentrations abruptly would deprive people and the planet of the benefits of carbon dioxide much sooner than they would reduce any costs of warming” As these and other reports show the benefits of carbon dioxide, scientists and economists in government entities, such as the US Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), and other government-funded groups continue to labor over what they call the “Social Cost of Carbon.”

It appears they have their marching orders: exaggerate costs; ignore benefits. It is as if the US government entities are operating under a modified single-entry accounting system – only the costs, but not benefits. If any private organization reported only their expenses but not their revenues in tax filings, the organization would quickly be under government investigation, deservedly so. But apparently now, some government entities now think they are free to report only the costs of carbon dioxide without the benefits to the public.

See links under Challenging the Orthodoxy – NIPCC; Challenging the Orthodoxy; and Social Benefits of Carbon.

Neutrinos: Physicist Thomas Sheahen has a clear essay published in American Thinker, explaining the difficulty involved in uncovering the secrets of neutrinos. The leaders of two research groups were awarded the 2015 Nobel Prize in physics, even though the key papers appeared in 1998, 2001, and 2002 – it takes a long time to work out the details! The work contradicted the long held belief, since the 1930s, that neutrinos had no mass. The 80-year effort to work out the details illustrates why the claims that global warming/climate change is human caused are premature, at best, and possibly wrong. These claims, and those that the science is settled, should be considered political slogans, not scientifically based.

See links under Other Scientific News. [Note that Mr. Sheahen is a director of SEPP.]

On to Paris: It is becoming evident that the push by some government entities to reach a binding agreement at the 21st Conference of Parties (COP-21) of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change scheduled between November 30 and December 11 in Paris is having a few difficulties, in spite of slick promotion and fancy footwork. Among other issues, China is circumspect and India is demanding “climate justice” – payments from the west for supposed damage to the climate caused by past emissions of carbon dioxide. No doubt, Indian economists can develop the imaginative “social costs of carbon” as well as the western economists and track them to industrial civilization in the west.

To make issues more uncertain, President Obama may try to claim that a binding agreement will not require the consent of the Senate, which is not impressed by his efforts. Many of Mr. Obama’s former claims are being rejected by the federal courts, and it is doubtful if he can evade the clear Constitutional language that Senate consent is required for an international agreement to be binding on the United States. Add to this, the new head of the IPCC, Hoesung Lee, is a South Korean economist who said: **“If you ask me to choose the most important work in climate change issues, then I’ll choose carbon price. That’s because it is the driver to put us into the right track.”** Having governments determine a tax on carbon dioxide emissions creates a market distortion favored by economists, who falsely called it a “market-based solution.” No doubt, some may consider night-time satellite photographs of the Korean Peninsula, with South Korea and parts of China lighted and North Korea dark, an example of the social cost of carbon. Others may consider North Korea energy-bankrupt. See links under On To Paris, Problems in the Orthodoxy, and <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2014/02/140226-north-korea-satellite-photos-darknessenergy/>

Shifting Inter Tropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ)? One of the fascinating topics brought up by climate change pioneer H.H. Lamb is the effects of climate change on past civilizations and cultures. For example, in Climate, History and the Modern World (1982 & 1997) Lamb brought up the drying of the

Sahara and the Indus valley area during the cooling period from the Holocene Climate Optimum, about 8000 years ago, to about 4000 years ago. It was during this time that civilizations developed. Lamb's research showed this period was followed by episodes of warming and cooling. Subsequent research supports Lamb's views that the Sahara had cultures that were water dependent, and raised cattle, and that the Harappa civilization flourished, based on agriculture, in now arid regions of the Indus valley. [Note: Contrary to some claims, Lamb did not advocate atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO2) was a major cause of climate change.]

Lamb's explanation of the drying of the Sahara and the Indus valley region was that during the cooling period the annual rains did not come as far north. This change could be described as a shift in the Inter Tropical Convergence Zone, which roughly follows the zenith of the sun in moving back and forth across the equator. The information Lamb had on Asia, particularly China, was very limited.

A paper from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), adds to understanding historic climate change in China. Using changes in vegetation, namely the ratio of C3/C4 plants, the research tracks the movement of the East Asian monsoon rain belt across the Chinese Loess Plateau, a large area of highly erodible soils in the middle and upper part of the Yellow River. According to the papers abstract:

"We find that the spatial distribution of C4 plant biomass is a robust analog for the monsoon rain belt, which migrated at least 300 km to the northwest from the cold Last Glacial Maximum (~ 19 ka) to the warm Holocene (~ 4 ka). These results strongly support the idea that the Earth's thermal equator will move northward in a warmer world, and that the observed southward migration of the monsoon rain belt over the last few decades is transient and northern China will eventually become wet as global warming advances."

These findings are consistent with what Lamb observed with his limited data. Assuming the pattern holds, if the world warms, for whatever reason, the summer monsoon belt (Inter Tropical Convergence Zone) will move north. It is refreshing to see such research being done to understand the effects of climate change. See links under Changing Climate

Lowering Standards: One example of poorly conducted survey research is becoming a political slogan – 97% of scientists. The first paper proclaiming this result appeared in EOS, and was based on a survey of over 10,300 geo-scientists of whom over 3,000 responded. The 97% came from the researchers weeding through the responses and using 79, of which 77, according to the researchers, believe that global warming/climate change is human cause. It is more than a stretch to assert that less than 1% of those surveyed constitute 97% of scientists. The latest such survey was conducted by psychologist Stefan Lewandowsky. According to Andrew Montford, Mr. Lewandowsky is the editor of an entire issue of Philosophical Transactions A, published by the Royal Society. See links under Lowering Standards. *

Courts: Writing in Climate Etc., climate scientist Judith Curry expresses her views that the attempt by global warming promoters to use courts to silence skeptics is wrongheaded. She writes: "This whole notion of a climate 'consensus', 97% and all that, has been very cleverly, and arguably dishonestly, marketed. These people are still thinking that 'speaking scientific consensus to power' is actually going to work in terms of radically reducing global carbon emissions. At this point the science is almost irrelevant; the big issues in play are that India, Africa, etc. want electricity for its population and for economic development, and coal is the most economical way to accomplish that. "Trying to destroy science in the process of denying that radical near term emissions reductions aren't going to work is just plain stupid, not to mention dangerous and a few other adjectives that one can think of."

See links under Seeking a Common Ground.

RICO: Senator Sheldon Whitehouse from Rhode Island brought up the idea of investigating climate skeptics under the federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), designed to fight organized crime. The Senator now claims to be misunderstood. He did not call for criminal sentences to jail those skeptical of the claims humans are causing global warming. Instead, Mr. Whitehouse now claims is merely calling for civil charges under RICO. Whatever civil charges may be. Of course, RICO entails possible jail time. Scientific evidence is the issue. Skeptical scientists are demanding evidence, which Mr. Whitehead fails to provide. What tobacco company executives did is not evidence against global warming skeptics. Will it be jail first, evidence later? See link under Suppressing Scientific Inquiry – The Witch Hunt.

Number of the Week: 60%. In a June 2010 report, analysts of the McKinsey Global Institute estimated that 60% of the world's uncultivated arable land is in Africa.

Although many of the articles on the web site of Project Syndicate have a strong ideological slant of government centralized control of economic activity, usually the articles are factually correct. For that reason an error in an article on potential growth in Africa stood out. The article left out the critical modifier of "uncultivated" and said 60% of the arable land is in Africa.

However, significant natural resources exist in Africa to feed its population. What is needed is Western technology – a need that many western governments ignore. See links under Agriculture Issues & Fear of Famine and http://www.mckinsey.com/insights/africa/lions_on_the_move

<http://www.sepp.org/twtwfiles/2015/TWTW%2010-17-15.pdf>

B STUDY: HIGH CO2 LEVELS EQUATED TO “WARM AVERAGE TEMPERATURES AND FLOURISHING LIFE” LOW CO2, “PRECEDING AN ICE AGE AND EVENTUAL MASS EXTINCTION”

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/11/study-high-co2-levels-equated-to-warm-average-temperatures-and-flourishing-life-low-co2-preceding-an-ice-age-and-eventual-mass-extinction/>

C. FACT CHECKING MARK CARNEY'S CATASTROPHIC CLIMATE CLAIMS

Guest essay by Steve Kopits

Mark Carney, Governor of the Bank of England, touched off a firestorm of criticism by claiming that catastrophic climate events are in store. In a speech given to the insurers group, Lloyds, Mr. Carney stated that “the catastrophic impacts of climate change will be felt beyond the traditional horizons of...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/12/fact-checking-mark-carneys-catastrophic-climate-claims/>

D. GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE: A CALL FOR REASON

From James M. Policelli, P.E.: Dr. Moghissi makes the important point that,

“It is inherent in regulatory science, including regulatory engineering, that decisions often must be based on insufficient technical knowledge. Given such a situation society should make decisions that do not adversely impact the economic development.”

On the issue of forced reduction of fossil fuel use to combat global warming, the consequences of a wrong move make this statement exceptionally important.

An avalanche of conflicting and biased studies does more to cloud the issue than clarify it. However, using the scientific method as simply and straightforwardly as possible can give a lot of clarity that has eluded the discussion. The theory of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming (CAGW) can be effectively tested in this manner. Very simply, the theory is stated thusly:

“Emissions of CO2 from the burning of fossil fuels are causing a dangerous rise in Earth’s temperatures.”

There are only two relative parameters: Historical rates of fossil fuel use, and historical temperatures during that time. Data trends for both of these are readily available back to 1850 when fossil fuel use became significant.

From 1850 to the present, temperature has increased by 0.8 Deg. C. Half of that rise came by 1940 when there was a temperature plateau. On modern scales, emissions in 1850 can be considered to be zero. At the 1940 temperature plateau, CO2 emissions were about **1.0 billion tons** annually of carbon as CO2. (By the CAGW theory, 1.0 billion tons per year gave us 0.4 Deg. of temperature rise).

Today, emissions are about **10 billion tons** annually and Earth has only seen another 0.4 Deg. of temperature rise. This presents a stunningly poor correlation between CO2 emissions and temperature rise and of itself should command a halt to anti-fossil fuel initiatives. At the very least it would indicate that the next increment of CO2 has much less effect than the first (a known physical phenomenon).

The above evaluation spans 165 years. The shorter term is even more damaging to the CAGW theory. For nearly the past two decades temperature change has been trivial while annual emissions increased by about 50%. Again, a very poor correlation.

Predictions of catastrophic temperature rise are based on computer model runs. The graph following Dr. Moghissi’s paper prepared by John Christie of the University of Alabama Huntsville presents a stark picture (**Not Included in email**). It shows that the average of 102 models contributing to the IPCC initiative has already diverged by 0.6 Deg. from actual satellite and balloon measurements and the divergence grows with time.

Dr. Moghissi’s advice points strongly toward cessation of the anti-fossil fuel initiative.

Editor’s Note: Mr. Policelli, BSME, is a Registered Professional Engineer in Pennsylvania. Since 1965 he has been an energy and environmental specialist involved with the efficient use, conservation, waste heat recovery and acquisition of energy from coal, oil, natural gas and renewables spanning heavy industry and community initiatives including work in legislative and regulatory matters. Much of that time included environmental compliance, permit applications, emission calculations and remedial design. He has been connected to the global warming issue for over 25 years on both sides of the argument. He is neither employed by nor does he receive any payments from the energy industry.

Alan Moghissi, PhD

E. CRITICAL CLIMATE MODEL ERROR DISCOVERED

Two papers by David Evans, Ph.D., a former climate modeler for the Australian government’s Greenhouse Office, are currently under review for publication and could undermine the most dramatic temperature predictions made by climate alarmists ahead of the United Nations’ climate change conference in Paris. Analyzing the architecture of the basic climate model underpinning U.N. climate predictions, Evans found the underlying physics of the model have been applied incorrectly, resulting in the U.N. over-estimating future global warming by as much as 10 times.

After fixing the two errors he found in the fundamental climate model, Evans concludes the climate’s sensitivity to carbon dioxide is much lower than previously thought. Concerning his discovery, Evans states, “Yes, CO2 has an effect, but it’s about a fifth or tenth of what the [Intergovernmental Panel on

Climate Change] says it is. CO2 is not driving the climate; it caused less than 20 per cent of the global warming in the last few decades.”

Evans’ discovery would explain why none of the climate models used by IPCC reflect actual recorded temperatures and why the models have failed to predict the 18-year pause in global warming. According to Evans, “Carbon dioxide causes only minor warming. The climate is largely driven by factors outside our control.” In particular, Evans points to the waxing and waning of reflected radiation from the Sun as the most significant driver of global temperature.

SOURCE: [Northern Territory News](#)

F. GIMME THREE STEPS TOWARD THE RENEWABLE ENERGY DOOR

October 13th, 2015

A TV meteorologist named Greg Fishel (WRAL, Raleigh, NC) posted an article yesterday on their *WRAL Weathercenter Blog* entitled [Choose science, stewardship in understanding climate change](#). In the blog post Mr. Fishel claims — I hope I am not putting words in his mouth — to have finally accepted human-caused climate change, and therefore encourages other conservative Christians like himself to put aside partisanship for the good of humanity and the Earth.

I actually agree with most of the science he presents, but I want to address why he is misguided in his conclusions.

Mr. Fishel got (at most) 1 in 3 correct

In order to actually do something about human-caused climate change, primarily caused by our carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel use, you must answer “yes” to the three following questions:

- 1. Do humans significantly contribute to climate change?**
- 2. Does that human contribution have a demonstrably negative impact?**
- 3. Can we do anything to significantly avert it with new energy technologies without causing human suffering?**

Unfortunately, while Mr. Fishel spent most of his time on #1, he sort of skipped #2 and #3...or at least hasn’t spent much time researching them.

So, let’s take these three steps, one at a time.

1. Do humans significantly contribute to climate change?

I actually mostly agree with him on #1. I believe humans have caused maybe 50% of the recent warming of the oceans and the atmosphere, say since the 1950s since we have a published paper analyzing that time period. But Mr. Fishel seems to believe it was all caused by humans, since he says that “it can’t be the Sun”. Well, there are actually quite a few other possibilities, since even without humans the climate system changes all by itself. For example, a small change in ocean circulation can cause a small change in cloudiness. The recent multi-decadal period of stronger El Ninos by itself can explain about half of recent warming. Yes, the stratosphere has cooled, partly due to increasing CO2. But “weather” makes attribution of a human effect on tropospheric temperatures — where people live — much more difficult.

2. Does that human contribution have a demonstrably negative impact?

Here’s where Mr. Fishel has little to say. It has not been demonstrated that any kind of severe weather has increased because of our addition of 1 CO2 molecule to each 10,000 molecules of atmosphere over the last century. He ignores the benefits of mild warming (which likely isn’t even all our fault, and which has been demonstrably below computer model projections), as well as the benefits of more CO2 on the biosphere and agriculture (based upon satellite measurements of global greening and literally hundreds of agricultural experiments).

3. Can we do anything to significantly avert it with new energy technologies without causing human suffering?

This is where Greg Fishel appears to be the most misguided. Here's a quote from his article:

“And on top of all of this, we hear the argument that it is economic suicide for the U.S. to act alone, and that we need the cooperation of China and India. Did you know both of those countries are leaving us in the dust when it comes to pursuing new technologies relating to energy production? Those countries see the economic opportunity and are going after it while we sit around and have politically partisan arguments.”

This simply could not be further from the truth.

In the lead-up to the Paris climate conference in December, China and India are basically thumbing their nose at the world on carbon dioxide emissions. They will continue to burn fossil fuels at an increasing rate.

There is no “magic bullet” green energy technology which can replace fossil fuels, period. Plus, wind and solar power are so expensive (and did I mention intermittent?) that to rely on them in any but isolated, special cases will hurt economies and make poverty worse, not better.

This is why green energy programs, where they have been tried, are now being abandoned as too expensive and provide too little return in energy production.

As I've said before, I really don't care where our energy comes from...as long as it is inexpensive and abundant, because that's what humanity requires. And I don't care if the CEOs of every coal and petroleum company ends up disagreeing with me, and decide to join the ranks of the alarmists.

Since Greg Fishel invoked “Christ's teachings”, let me do the same.

How can we provide for widows and orphans if we can't even provide for ourselves?

Until new energy technologies are eventually developed — (the U.S. *does not* sit on our hands in alternative energy research) — the most moral thing we can do for humanity is to use fossil fuels.

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2015/10/gimme-three-steps-toward-the-renewable-energy-door/>

Roy Spencer

G. MANUFACTURED PANIC: PROJECTED ANTARCTIC ICE SHELF MELTING “MAY SURPASS INTENSITIES ASSOCIATED WITH ICE SHELF COLLAPSE”

From the WOODS HOLE OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTION and the “worse than we thought” department, comes this breathless press release that doesn't even mention the name of the study somehow manages to spin model results into a future frenzy worse than if the ice shelves just collapsed. New study projects that melting of Antarctic ice shelves will...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/13/manufactured-panic-projected-antarctic-ice-shelf-melting-may-surpass-intensities-associated-with-ice-shelf-collapse/>

H. ALASKA GOVERNOR: WE NEED MORE OIL DRILLING TO PAY FOR CLIMATE CHANGE

Guest essay by Eric Worrall

Governor Bill Walker of Alaska has demanded oil company be granted access to protected Alaskan wildernesses, to raise the money needed to pay for helping people affected by climate change.

According to the BBC; “We are in a significant fiscal challenge. We have villages that are washing away because of...”

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/13/alaska-governor-we-need-more-oil-drilling-to-pay-for-climate-change/>

I. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN CLIMATE SCIENCE. PART II

Posted on [October 12, 2015](#) | [82 Comments](#)

by Judith Curry

But when I queried them on various sources of funding – private, industry, government – they deemed all of the sources as suspect. – Dave Verardo

In the past several months, we have had several posts on scientists' conflicts of interest, and possible biases from funding sources:

<http://judithcurry.com/2015/10/12/conflicts-of-interest-in-climate-science-part-ii/#more-20242>

J. ADJUDICATING THE FUTURE: SILENCING CLIMATE DISSENT VIA THE COURTS

Posted on [October 11, 2015](#) | [126 comments](#)

by Judith Curry

A British academic wants an international court to declare climate skeptics wrong, once and for all.

<http://judithcurry.com/2015/10/11/adjudicating-the-future-silencing-climate-dissent-via-the-courts/#more-20199>

K. A PERSPECTIVE ON UNCERTAINTY AND CLIMATE SCIENCE

Posted on [October 11, 2015](#) | [143 comments](#)

by Marcia Wyatt

This past summer I was asked to give a presentation on science and ethics. The person who asked me was motivated by the Pope's encyclical, the comments regarding climate change.

<http://judithcurry.com/2015/10/11/a-perspective-on-uncertainty-and-climate-science/#more-20218>

L. THE EPA'S CLEAN POWER PLAN OVERSTEPS FEDERAL AUTHORITY

<http://newsdemocratleader.com/opinion/1655/the-epas-clean-power-plan-oversteps-federal-authority>

M. THE LACK OF FUNCTIONING WEATHER SERVICE CREATES MAJOR HOLE IN PLANNING, ESP FOR POOR, CLIMATE-VULNERABLE COUNTRIES

http://www.newsecuritybeat.org/2015/10/climate-data-critical-fragile-conflict-affected-states-heres/?utm_content=bufferdecce&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=buffer

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/speaking-of-science/wp/2015/10/03/ask-a-macarthur-genius-can-feces-fuel-cars/>

N. ARCHIVE FOR THE 'BLOG ARTICLE' CATEGORY

[Gimme Three Steps Toward the Renewable Energy Door](#)

Tuesday, October 13th, 2015

A TV meteorologist named Greg Fishel (WRAL, Raleigh, NC) posted an article yesterday on their *WRAL Weathercenter Blog* entitled [Choose science, stewardship in understanding climate change](#). In the blog post Mr. Fishel claims — I hope I am not putting words in his mouth — to have finally accepted human-

caused climate change, and therefore encourages other conservative Christians like himself to put aside partisanship for the good of humanity and the Earth.

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/category/blogarticle/>

Roy Spencer

O. MANUFACTURED PANIC, ANTARCTIC ICE SHELF MELTING

When you read below remember how poor the computer models have predicted global warming and decide if anyone can project Antarctic ice melting to 2050 and beyond with their computer models. Also remember that sea level rise has not accelerated and the rate has been constant for decades. Finally it references a warming climate which has not happened for 18+ years

Don Shaw

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/13/manufactured-panic-projected-antarctic-ice-shelf-melting-may-surpass-intensities-associated-with-ice-shelf-collapse/>

P. GWPF ANNUAL LECTURE BY PATRICK MOORE “SHOULD WE CELEBRATE CO₂?”

GWPF Annual Lecture by Patrick Moore, co-founder of Greenpeace. You can read the lecture [here](#).

Q. FRANCE’S TOP TV WEATHERMAN SUSPENDED FOR CRITICISING CLIMATE DOGMA

Guest essay by Eric Worrall

h/t fobdangerclose and ralfellis –

Philippe Verdier, weather chief at France Télévisions, the country’s state broadcaster, has been suspended for publicly criticizing Climate Alarmism. According to The Telegraph; Every night, France’s chief weatherman has told the nation how much wind, sun or rain they can expect the following day. Now...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/15/frances-top-tv-weatherman-suspended-for-criticising-climate-dogma/>

R. VOX WHINING ABOUT IGNORING CLIMATE CHANGE – AT THE DEMOCRAT DEBATE!

Guest essay by Eric Worrall

VOX has published a gem of an article, complaining that even CNN, the sympathetic TV station which covered the recent Democrat Presidential Candidate Debate, thinks Climate Alarmism is a special interest movement for fringe hippies. According to VOX; in 2012, CNN’s Candy Crowley moderated the second presidential debate between Barack...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/14/vox-whining-about-ignoring-climate-change-at-the-democrat-debate/>

S. POWER PLAY AT THE SUPREME COURT

Another illegal rule against fossil fuels may be overturned.

Oct. 14, 2015 6:46 p.m. ET

The Obama Administration's crusade against carbon returned to the Supreme Court on Wednesday, as the Justices heard an important federalism challenge to an energy scheme that usurps state powers to promote the green agenda. The oral arguments suggested they may be queuing up another judicial rebuke.

The culprit this time is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, which regulates most of the electric grid. In 2011 FERC ordered transmission operators to pay retail energy users to reduce their power consumption during peak periods, a program known as "demand response." The idea is to send a price signal to encourage large consumers to use power when the most capacity is available—instead of, say, on a hot summer afternoon when everybody's air conditioners are running.

In *FERC v. Electric Power Supply Association*, the problem is that Congress explicitly limited the commission's mandate to the interstate power markets—i.e., to the wholesale power supply. Under a 2005 law, the "exclusive jurisdiction" of retail pricing and patterns of energy consumption belongs to the states.

FERC attempted to erase this bright line by claiming that the regional wholesale markets and the state retail markets are essentially no different, because changes in the one would inevitably beget changes in the other. By this logic, FERC could regulate anything—fuel production, or what type of power plants are built—that has some distant connection to wholesale, with no limiting principle.

"Wholesale affects retail, retail affects wholesale, they're interlinked, which means you win the case, except the statute makes a distinction," Justice [Anthony Kennedy](#) told Solicitor General Donald Verrilli.

"We have to make a distinction. Can you tell us what the distinction is that marks the end of federal power and the beginning of local power?" The SG had no answer, despite several follow-ups. Chief Justice [John Roberts](#) said the FERC rule reduced state control to a "pure formality."

Demand response can help run the grid more reliably and safely, and this well-intentioned tool is more widely used in electric markets where FERC has no role at all. State-specific integration based on local needs is better than top-down instruction from Washington. But FERC rigged demand response to discriminate against fossil-fuel power. For this reason, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals struck down the rule as an illegal abuse.

FERC decreed that a megawatt added to the grid should be priced the same as a "negawatt" that is never consumed. Thus businesses that joined the demand-response program—like a factory—could be overcompensated for agreeing not to use energy at certain times, while an electricity supplier that must incur the costs of actually generating and delivering power to consumers is underpaid.

In practice, demand response paid out twice, once from the FERC rebate plus the savings of not purchasing energy. Overpaying for inaction to boost conservation over economic activity distorts incentives, while underpaying for tangible economic benefits leads to capital malinvestment and imposes gratuitous burdens on productive power generators. "We don't want to pay twice as much as the market really should pay for demand response," as attorney Paul Clement put it.

The High Court has been skeptical of Administration claims to command the economy on environmental pretexts. The FERC rule is another ripe candidate to overturn.

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/power-play-at-the-supreme-court-1444862800>

T. HOW A LIBERAL VEGAN ENVIRONMENTALIST MADE THE SWITCH FROM CLIMATE PROPONENT TO CLIMATE SKEPTIC

Hint: He did his homework, then took himself to the other side of the debate. Guest essay by David Siegel My name is David Siegel. I'm not a climate expert; I'm a writer. Early in 2015, I became interested in climate science and decided to spend the better part of this year trying to learn...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/16/how-a-liberal-vegan-environmentalist-made-the-switch-from-climate-proponent-to-climate-skeptic/>

U. PETITION FOR CLIMATE SKEPTIC PHILIPPE VERDIER TO BE REINSTATED IN HIS JOB AT FRANCE TÉLÉVISIONS

Yesterday (Q above) we informed you about how France's lead television weatherman was forced to take a "holiday" in response to him publishing a book that is critical towards climate change alarmism. So far, all the TV network has done is unleash the Striesand Effect, heaping negative attention upon their decision, which is being seen as prohibiting free...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/16/petition-for-climate-skeptic-philippe-verdier-to-be-reinstated-in-his-job-at-france-televisions/>

V. 2015 ANTARCTIC MAXIMUM SEA ICE EXTENT BREAKS STREAK OF RECORD HIGHS

From NASA Goddard: The sea ice cover of the Southern Ocean reached its yearly maximum extent on Oct. 6. At 7.27 million square miles (18.83 million square kilometers), the new maximum extent falls roughly in the middle of the record of Antarctic maximum extents compiled during the 37 years of satellite measurements – this year's...

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/16/2015-antarctic-maximum-sea-ice-extent-breaks-streak-of-record-highs/>

W. CRUZ TACKLES OVERREGULATION, CLIMATE CHANGE

At a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts hearing titled "Opportunity Denied: How Overregulation Harms Minorities," Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX), who chaired the hearing, said overregulation robs minority Americans of opportunity. He blamed stagnant household income and slow job growth since the 2008 crash, in part, on overregulation and an "invasive and bloated government." After noting the number of federal regulations increased dramatically in the past half-century, from 20,000 pages in the *Federal Register* to 175,000, Cruz remarked, "They seemingly regulate everything under the sun."

Aaron Mair, president of the Sierra Club, testified the science linking human actions to dangerous global warming "is settled, ... it's not up for scientific debate." In an exchange for which Mair clearly seemed unprepared, Cruz asked why, if humans are warming the planet, satellite data showed no planetary warming in the past 18 years. Mair seemed unfamiliar with that fact. When pressed by Cruz to say whether he would retract his statement about the science being settled if data proving the warming pause were provided to him, Mair remained silent. Cruz said, "You know, Mr. Mair, I find it striking that for a policy organization that purports to focus exclusively on environmental issues, that you are not willing to tell this committee that you would issue a retraction if your testimony is objectively false under scientific data."

"That undermines the credibility of any organization," said Cruz. *The Houston Chronicle* put it best: Ted Cruz 1, Sierra Club 0.

SOURCES: [Houston Chronicle](#) and [Youtube.com](#)

X. THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING THE MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING TOPIC AND ENERGY FROM FOSSIL FUELS & NUCLEAR POWER

**American Society of Mechanical Engineers - Energy Committee
Signers of the letter to the Science Advisor to the White House, February 1, 2010
Go Nuclear, Inc. and Environmentalists for Nuclear Energy - USA Boards and Staff
Contributors to all sides of the Man-Made Global Warming Topic
Science Advisor to The White House**

Dear all,

We need to support nuclear energy with sound scientific arguments, not with unsound & unscientific arguments. To do this, we have to understand how important fossil fuels have been and the two extreme sides of the Man-Made Global Warming topic: The Alarmists claim that we must stop using fossil fuels as quickly as possible to save the Earth's climate and the Skeptics claim that use of fossil fuels has tremendous benefits and CO2 from fossil fuels has little detrimental influence on Earth's climate. Actual pollutants and geo-political instabilities are other topics.

On the Environmentalists for Nuclear Energy - USA website, we present many sides of the Man-Made Global Warming topic for you to decide for yourself. You have a lot of information on both sides.

[- Man-Made Global Warming - Sounding the alarm](#)

[- Man-Made Global Warming - Considering some warming](#)

[- Man-Made Global Warming - Discussing all positions](#)

[- Man-Made Global Warming - Skeptical of serious anthropogenic global warming](#)

The difference in opinion is so vast that one side must not have the right answer and should not be used as scientific justification to support nuclear power. There are many papers and videos for you to review. All are interesting.

We draw your attention especially to a presentation given at the Institute of Mechanical Engineers in London, October 2015. [Click here.](#)

Please note: To view a document, click on the image of the first page of the document below the picture. This will open the full document. To close the document, press the ESC key.

John A. Shanahan

Regards,
George