



Newsletter Number 7, 2013

Table of Contents

President Obama’s Climate Concerns:	2
From Trevor Louden’s blog:	2
Tony Elliott’s view:	3
Newsbusters:	3
David Kear- Global Warming alias Climate Change- the non-existent, terribly expensive threat to us all.	3
Windmills	4
Organised Crime	4
Subsidies	4
Bird Chopping	5
Climate Change and Economics:.....	6
It’s not Carbon Dioxide after all	6
Pastural Farming Climate Research	7
Religion and Global warming:	7
Life without Fossil Fuels	7
Spanish downturn a disaster for green energy	8

President Obama's Climate Concerns:

President Obama recently made a [speech](#) addressing global warming and climate change issues.

Brett

Here are a variety of responses:

We are always hearing about ways that you can "save the planet" from the perils of global warming—from riding your bicycle to work, to supporting the latest national greenhouse gas restriction limitations, and everything in between. In virtually each and every case, advocates of these measures provide you with the amount of greenhouse gas emissions (primarily carbon dioxide) that will be saved by the particular action.

And if you want to figure this out for yourself, the web is full of CO2 calculators

However, in absolutely zero of these cases are you told, or can you calculate, how much impact you are going to have on the actual climate itself. After all, CO2 emissions are not climate—they are gases. Climate is temperature and precipitation and storms and winds, etc. If the goal of the actions is to prevent global warming, then you shouldn't really care a hoot about the amount of CO2 emissions that you are reducing, but instead, you want to know how much of the planet you are saving.

How much anthropogenic climate change is being prevented by unplugging your cell phone charger, from biking to the park, or from slashing national carbon dioxide emissions? [Find out here.](#)

Keith

From Trevor Louden's blog:

The [IRS scandal](#) refuses to disappear. [Benghazi](#) still raises questions. The press is still irate at the Administration because of its [treatment of journalists](#) who publish leaked information. This is the perfect time, apparently, for President Barack Obama to ignore the political firestorms. Instead, he moves to grab more power over the environment, and economy, by pushing for more Environmental Protection Agency regulations.

On Tuesday the President [outlined](#) a climate change agenda which will circumvent the halls of Congress and place additional authority into the hands of unelected bureaucrats. Far from criticizing such a move, the mainstream media have celebrated the Administration's speech, and the suggested war on carbon emissions from new and existing power plants. [National Public Radio](#) calls it a "sweeping plan" and says the President is

"striving to reach" an "emissions-reduction goal" he committed to in 2009 in Copenhagen. [Full story](#).

Don

[Tony Elliott's view:](#)

Tony

Newsbusters:

President Barack Obama's new climate change initiative will purportedly share "a national plan to reduce carbon pollution, [prepare our country for the impacts of climate change](#) and lead global efforts to fight it." Although he intends to demand action, [most Americans](#) do not see climate change as a "major threat," according to Pew Research.

The Washington Post reported Obama will include "a plan to limit carbon-dioxide emissions from existing power plants." That's an agenda item the media will love. It was just a month ago when CBS "This Morning" interviewed Time magazine senior writer Jeffrey Kluger on May 11 who said "we have to curb the use of fossil fuels."

No doubt the broadcast networks will cheer the president's efforts, since they've spent years warning of the threat of climate change, even in the face of science that challenges their view. This year they've worried about many things including "raging infernos, surging seas, howling winds," reported alarmist claims that weren't accurate and connected weather to climate when scientists disagree. The networks have also completely ignored the "lull" in warming in recent years, in all 92 stories about climate change they reported in 2013. [Full article here](#).

George

More on [Obama climate lies](#) from Alan Caruba:

Sonya

David Kear- Global Warming alias Climate Change- the non-existent, terribly expensive threat to us all.

In today's mail came a [printed publication from Dr David Kear](#), regarded by me and by others far better qualified than me to judge, as one of New Zealand's all-time great physical scientists. David has dipped into his own pocket to print and publish this brochure in the hope of alerting fellow-Kiwis to the absolute stupidity of current policies in the field known these days as "climate change".

Terry

Windmills

Today OFGEM the UK's energy regulator [has issued its latest report](#) on the UK's generation capacity and it makes interesting reading (by candlelight).

Firstly they predict that by the winter of 2015 (election year) there are likely to be several hours of power cuts (figure 24). This has been brought about because of the closure of coal plants and a growing reliance on wind (figure 1). The report names the EU's Large Combustion Plant Directive and the fact that only 17% of wind generation can be relied upon compared to 80-90% for other generation methods. OFGEM concludes "reasonably small changes in conventional generation availability have a material impact on the risk of supply shortfalls". Worryingly wind seems to be there least when we need it most. [Read more.](#)

Sonya

Organised Crime

I saw this and had to share, I loved the related link, especially the "[organised crime meets organised crime](#)" quote that there is a real classic.

Adrian

Subsidies

Consider the [latest grim news about ongoing wind farm subsidies.](#)

The Government said onshore wind farms should get at least £100 per megawatt-hour, when the market rate for electricity is currently less than £50 per mega-watt hour. Offshore wind farms will get triple the market rate at £155 per megawatt-hour in a deal described by City analysts as "astonishingly expensive". The difference will be met by a subsidy from the taxpayer, which is potentially more generous than the current regime that hands developers more than £1 billion a year.

Ed Davey, the Energy Secretary, said new costs were "broadly comparable" with 2013 prices but his department said it had not worked out whether consumers will be paying more or less for wind power under the new system.

The [UKIP letter](#) outlining his folly is superb.

Ken

Bird Chopping

Around 40 people were watching the White-throated Needletail, the world's fastest flying bird, on the Isles of Harris when the tragedy happened.

Sightings of the bird have only been recorded eight times in the UK in nearly 170 years, most recently in 1991, prompting around 80 ornithologists to visit the island in the hope of catching a glimpse.

John Marchant, a project coordinator for the British Trust for Ornithology, visited the island on a specially-arranged trip with a group of other birdwatchers and witnessed the death.

The 62-year-old bird enthusiast said he travelled from Norfolk when he heard about the arrival of the bird, which had brown, blue and black bird plumage.

"We were absolutely over the moon and thrilled to see the bird. We watched it for nearly two hours. While we were watching it suddenly it was a bit close to the turbine [and then the blades hit it](#)," he said.

Sonya

Climate Change and Economics:

Hitch climate tax to the [ACTUAL CLIMATE](#), says top economist

Analysis: *A Canadian economist has an idea to tackle global warming so simple, it's stunning no one has thought of it before.*

Ross McKittrick, Professor of Economics at the University of Guelph in Ontario, an IPCC expert reviewer and one of its leading critics, proposes a carbon tax with the rate tied to climate response. He explained the idea at the House of Lords yesterday before an audience that included the architect of the UK's Climate Change Act.

The idea of an evidence-based tax alarmed some in the audience. And it was fascinating to see who was most alarmed by it.

This is well-worth reading and passing on as it's a great idea.

I was lucky enough to get invited by the GWPF to the talk by Dr McKittrick at the House of Lords on Wednesday after which there were many questions and comments. One comment was (correctly, I fear) that it would be almost impossible for the government or parliament to accept it because it might work! Another was that if they did accept it, however, it would give the government a good way out when it finally became apparent that global warming didn't exist.

Lord Lawson was at the top table for the talk and the Energy Minister, Peter Lilley, also attended. As did another UKIP-er.

Sonya P

It's not Carbon Dioxide after all

Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are to blame for global warming since the 1970s and not carbon dioxide, according to [new research](#) from the University of Waterloo published in the International Journal of Modern Physics B this week.

CFCs are already known to deplete ozone, but in-depth statistical analysis now shows that CFCs are also the key driver in global climate change, rather than carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions.

Jonathan

Pastoral Farming Climate Research

Robin Grieve of the PFCR team has an ongoing need for support with his research:

The politics of global warming are such that there is no place for truth. I am not talking about the lack of temperature rise and the stubbornly static sea level, I am referring to the increasing realisation that enteric methane is not a problem.

This was a [radical concept](#) when we started but it has become more widely accepted now. While that is something to be proud of, things should have changed because of this but they haven't. Even though Tim Groser knows the methane methodology is dodgy, he is a politician first and foremost and science is of no interest to him unless it suits his political needs.

That is why although we are attempting to use science to push our case we will have to use politics to get our science to work for us. We seek no more than recognition of the truth but only the naïve would think that the truth by itself will make a difference.

Religion and Global warming:

[American Thinker- Print Article](#)

Even apart from its sentiments this is an excellent piece of writing and well worth reading.

Sonya

Life without Fossil Fuels

[Atlas Shrugged](#) is the title of Ayn Rand's 1957 novel in which the world grinds to a halt after the productive segment of society goes on strike. Tired of being demonized and exploited, the world's innovators and entrepreneurs simply walk away.

What would happen to the US today if the fossil fuel industry went on a strike of indefinite duration? What would happen if we gave the environmentalists

what they want? Instead of nibbling around the edges, what if we just went all the way? What would be the consequences if Atlas shrugged?

Within 24 hours there would be long lines at service stations as people sought to purchase remaining stocks of gasoline. The same people who denounce oil companies would be desperately scrounging the last drops of available fuel for their SUVs. By the third day, all the gasoline would be gone.

With no diesel fuel, the trucking industry would grind to a halt. Almost all retail goods in the US are delivered by trucks. Grocery shelves would begin to empty. Food production at the most basic levels would also stop. Without gasoline, no farm machinery would function, nor could pesticides or fertilizers be produced on an industrial scale. The US cannot feed 315 million people with an agricultural technology based on manure and horse-drawn plows. After two weeks mass starvation would begin. [Read more.](#)

JH

Spanish downturn a disaster for green energy

Oh dear!

When man's arrogance and stupidity in trying to combat the weather goes horribly wrong. Or to paraphrase a well-loved saying, "All's well until an ideology runs out of other peoples' money"

Spain's wind turbine manufacturers are laying off workers and farmers who installed solar panels are facing ruin as austerity policies afflict the long-coddled green energy sector. Further cuts are expected this summer.

State subsidies to clean energy producers have already fallen by between 12 and 40 percent on average in recent years, [industry analysts](#) say.

They could fall by another 10-20 percent in a new energy sector reform expected mid-July, according to the Spanish media.

"The punishment meted out to renewable energies in the past five years amounts to more than six billion euros (\$8 billion)," said Sergio Otto, secretary general of the business group Renewables Foundation.

"In the wind turbine industry alone we have lost 20,000 jobs and in the solar energy sector it's probably more," he said.

At the heart of the problem is a deficit of more than 26 billion euros in Spain's [energy market](#), built up by subsidies to cover the gap between the cost of producing electricity and the price charged to consumers. [Full story.](#)

Adrian