

Climate Alarmism and Copenhagen

Nonoy Oplas
January 4, 2010

Introduction

Below are my short articles on climate alarmism, before, during and shortly after the Copenhagen meeting. These are posted in my blog, <http://funwithgovernment.blogspot.com>, and some of these were my articles in the online magazine, www.thelobbyist.biz.

All dates refer to 2009. An outline of the list of articles is given below.

1. 3 months before Copenhagen, panic continues, September 5
2. Solar minimum and Copenhagen, September 12
3. Global cooling and flooding, Part 2, September 28
4. Major actors in ecological central planning, September 30
5. Global cooling and cosmic rays, October 3
6. No to green protectionism, November 17
7. Warmers' intellectual dishonesty uncovered, November 22
8. From GW to CC, November 25
9. Climategate spreading, December 1
10. Carbon rent-seeking, CDMs, December 2
11. Carbon rent-seeking, part 2
12. Early snow and Copenhagen, December 7
13. How stupid Al Gore is? December 10
14. Hottest decade? December 10
15. Challenging the warmers to a debate, December 10
16. Mayon volcano and climate, December 19
17. Winterstorm and warming extortion, December 20
18. Warmers shooting the messenger, not the message, December 26

September 5

3 months before Copenhagen, panic continues

A friend referred me to this climate alarmism news report,
<http://www.reuters.com/article/latestCrisis/idUSN02547411>

It says how the Arctic ice is slowly melting because of global warming.

With the Copenhagen meeting just 3 months away, all the panic is setting in. Bureaucrats need hundreds of billions of \$ of carbon tax, like Obama's cap and trade energy bill worth around \$7.5 trillion from 2012-2030, or around \$317B/year on federal carbon taxes alone, on top of existing environmental taxes, on top of carbon taxes by various states like California; hundreds of billions of \$ in carbon cap and trade (was \$128 B in 2008, from private corporations alone in EU and Japan), of several billion \$ of subsidies to wind farms, solar farms, etc.

Lie if they must, demonize a useful gas CO₂ (the gas that we humans exhale, the gas that plants and crops need) if they must, scare the world as much as possible, so they will get the carbon regulation that they need. Goldman Sachs and many other big banks are too happy to join the bandwagon because they are among the biggest bank-traders of carbon trading.

Several years ago, the world had tech bubble burst. Recently, we had housing bubble burst. And soon, a carbon bubble burst. Another financial disaster in waiting. A non-commodity like the gas that we exhale is now a commodity that is traded in billions of \$, that will be taxed by governments by the trillions of \$.

Here's one simple but clear paper written by a chemist,'
http://tech-know.eu/uploads/Open_letter_to_Gordon_Brown.pdf

His paper has a short discussion about the Sun-climate link, and why CO₂ hardly affects global climate. And if it does, it's for a useful purpose -- helping more plant growth, more agricultural productivity, more trees, more flowers.

September 12

Solar minimum and Copenhagen

Honest people change their position when the data that stare them in the face are contrary to what they previously thought. Dishonest people don't. They only make totally different interpretations of existing data.

There's a chart comparing global temperature and carbon dioxide (CO₂) levels in the atmosphere over the past 30 years, latest figure is August 2009. Temperature is from satellite data, UAH and RSS, measured at the troposphere, 8 kms. from the surface of the Earth. Data is from Mauna Loa, Hawaii.

The chart shows one glaring fact: Global cooling continues despite increases in CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere. From January 2002 to August 2009, the best-fit line shows cooling of 0.24 C, whereas CO₂ concentration is now close to 390 parts per million (ppm), from only 285 ppm at the start of the Industrial Revolution two centuries ago, and around 385 ppm just about two years ago. But even at 390 or even 400 ppm, this ratio is still very small, only 0.04 percent of total gases in the atmosphere.

This year, it has been mostly cloudy and often raining. Like the first 12 days of this month. There were two typhoons (local names “Labuyo” and “Maring”) that entered the Philippine area of responsibility this month. Although they did not make any landfall, both typhoons dumped lots of rain in Luzon, Metro Manila and almost the entire country, causing heavy flooding and landslides in many areas, and causing several casualties.

Meanwhile, the Sun continues its deep solar minimum. In 2007, 44 percent of all (365) days have zero sunspots. Last year, it rose to 73 percent and this year, from January 01 to September 10, 80 percent of all days have zero sunspots. Some solar physicists and other scientists are even asking if sunspots will disappear in the next few years.

Sunspot activities are indicator of the strength, or weakness, of the Sun’s magnetic field. Weak solar magnetic field results in few or zero sunspots and weak solar wind, etc. Now there are plenty of galactic cosmic rays coming from exploding stars that travel in the universe, some of which reach our planet’s atmosphere. Such cosmic rays help catalyze the formation of low-lying clouds. When there are more of them in the atmosphere, more low-lying clouds are formed. And there are more of them when solar magnetic field and solar wind is weak to push the cosmic rays away. When there are plenty of low-lying clouds in the sky, (a) direct sunlight is blocked from reaching the Earth’s surface and is reflected back to the outer space, and (b) more rains are falling, resulting in global cooling.

At solar maximum, solar wind would be traveling at around 600,000+ kms per second. With the current prolonged solar minimum, solar wind speed is only around 300,000 to 400,000 kms per second. According to one Australian scientist, Dr. David Archibald (www.davidarchibald.info), there is a lag of 1 year from sunspot activities to the formation of low lying clouds. A deep solar minimum became more pronounced from August to December last year. Many scientists including those from NASA thought that solar cycle 23 (one cycle would average 11 years to finish then move to another cycle) was already over, so that by January this year, solar cycle 24 was suppose to have started. They expected an uptick of solar activity. The reverse happened, the deep solar minimum continues up to these days.

So the current frequent cloudy skies – despite the fact that an El Nino is occurring this year – could be explained by the weak solar magnetic field late last year. And since the deep solar minimum continues up to this year, then we can expect that cloudy skies, frequent rains and colder climate will extend up to next year, and the coming decades. It has been the behavior of the Sun that in a solar cycle with deep and prolonged minimum sunspot activities, the next two cycles (ie, solar cycle 24 and 25, corresponding to 2.5 decades) will also be weak. And so, global cooling is expected to last for the next 2 to 3 decades.

Meanwhile, many governments around the world and the UN are busy with almost bi-monthly expensive global meetings in preparation for the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UN FCCC) meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark, this coming December. The goal of such big meetings is for various governments to plan and sign a new global climate deal that will succeed the Kyoto Protocol which will expire in 2011 or 2012. They just held a meeting in Bonn, Germany last month. Their next meetings will be in Bangkok, Thailand, this coming September 28 to October 9, and another meeting in Barcelona, Spain, on November 2 to 6, before they move to Copenhagen in December for the penultimate meeting.

The main goal of those frequent and expensive global meetings, is for “climate negotiators” of those governments and the UN to curtail as much carbon dioxide emission into the atmosphere as this gas is believed to be the main cause of what they call as “man-made (or anthropogenic) global warming.” These government and UN negotiators believe that there is already a “consensus”, that “scientific debate is over”, as signified by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports, so that politics and politicians will now take over to curb as much carbon emission as possible to “save” the planet. For the UN IPCC and global politicians, our Sun is a static and non-changing star whose job is only to give sunlight during daytime.

It is the non-recognition of natural factors – the Sun’s magnetic field and sunspot activities, volcanic eruptions and geologic changes, the ocean – as the main drivers of the Earth’s climate that betrays the evil design of those governments, the UN and the various environmentalist groups. Their grand design is to create and tighten more environmental regulations, to enact new carbon taxes, and to impose ecological protectionism. In short, to arrogate more political power into their hands, to collect more money for them and their favored corporations and banks which are engaged in carbon offsets and carbon trading.

Since there is no scientific consensus yet as more scientific data and studies that discredit the man-made warming theory of the UN IPCC and various governments come up, then those expensive global meetings and the forthcoming Copenhagen meeting should be scrapped. They are unnecessary and only prolong the big scam that they themselves have invented.

The pre-defined political agenda of governments and the UN – to regulate and ration energy sources, to collect more climate-related taxes, to play God to “save” the planet – becomes more indefensible with each passing days and months. They cannot regulate the Sun’s magnetic field, they cannot regulate the cosmic rays that come from outside the solar system, so they have to trivialize and de-emphasize the role of those natural factors. There’s no money and additional political power for them if they accept that the Sun is main driver of the planet’s climate, whether warming or cooling.

Let’s have clean air, clean water, clean environment, fine. Regulate lead, mercury, soot, carbon monoxide, methane, CFC, etc., only for their own sake, and not say to “save the planet” because the planet is never in danger.

September 27

Global cooling and flooding

Yesterday's flooding in Metro Manila and surrounding provinces was among the worst in recent memory. Lots of pictures and narratives were posted in the web like facebook. Here are some pictures in our place in Makati. Luckily, the flood in our street was only above the knee, while in other areas and cities, the flood would submerge a bungalow or even 2-storey houses.

Then some friends started posting, "because of global warming/climate change", "mother nature getting back at us", "Sign the Copenhagen Deal", etc.

I countered with those friends' postings, I argued that this is global cooling. If they read the Sun-climate link theory, they will realize that the Earth is approaching a Dalton Minimum type of global cooling -- for at least 2 decades.

Since last year, even in previous years, there was little proof that there is "global warming" happening in the Philippines and other parts of the planet. Last year, strong, early typhoon "Cosme" (a local name) dumped huge amount of rainfall in northwestern Luzon and killed several people due to flash flood. That was in May. The next month, June 2008, typhoon "Frank" dumped heavy rains for around 10 days straight in Panay island (with 4 provinces), Sorsogon, etc. and it caused the sinking of a big ship, "MV Princess of the Stars" which killed around 1,000 passengers and crew.

This year, there was practically no summer in the "summer" months of March-April-May. My friend who is in the business of manufacturing and selling umbrellas told me that she made big money since April this year due to the early start of the rainy season. Another proof: the rice farmers that I talked to last week in northern Luzon complained that with too much rains, their rice was growing well but after harvest, they cannot dry it because the Sun would hardly show up. When newly harvested rice is not dried the next few days, the moisture content would cause the unhusked rice to blacken and this will adversely affect the quality and taste of their rice. The selling price therefore, will be low.

The heavy rains and flooding that happened yesterday was somehow, not too "surprising". These days, especially this month, we seldom see the Sun. There are always dark clouds almost everyday. Sometimes it's sunny in the morning, then would become dark by 2 or 3pm because of the thick clouds. Clouds, not smog. And even if our drainage are as big as jeepneys, there would still be flooding because of the huge amount of rainfall.

This climate alarmism is really a jerk. The UN and many governments, including the Philippine government, are warning the people and spending billions of pesos preparing for drought and hotter days, when we should prepare for the opposite -- too much rains and flood. And in temperate countries, long and severe winter. They create new carbon taxes, created big international bureaucracies like the UN FCCC and IPCC, they have plenty of international climate meetings in many countries and cities, instituted ecological central planning via the Kyoto Protocol and soon,

Copenhagen Protocol/Agreement. Lie if they must, but they should continue scaring the public of global warming, which they later euphemistically called “climate change”.

The anthropogenic global warming (AGW) proponents like the UN, many governments, Greenpeace, WWF, etc. if they are honest, should simply say, "We believe AGW is a valid explanation for current climate change. However, we recognize that there are many other scientists and groups who believe that the Sun, cosmic rays, volcanoes, water vapor, etc. are the main drivers of climate change. We continue the debate." But they don't and never said that. They say, "There is overwhelming evidence, there is already a consensus; debate is over. CO2 is evil." And they would quickly add, "So you taxpayers should shoulder all those new carbon taxes, carbon cap and trade, subsidies for renewable energy, etc."

About having clean air, clean water, clean environment, Yes we should pursue those, as end by themselves and not say, "to save the planet" because the planet is never in danger. Not now, not yesterday, not tomorrow. Unless a huge asteroid will lose its GPS track and go towards the earth :-)

If interested, I have written/presented 2 papers on climate alarmism.

1. Global cooling vs. global money and power, May 28, 2009, 23 pages incl annexes, http://www.minimalgovernment.net/media/mg_20090528.pdf

2. Global cooling reality vs. global warming politics, April 22, 2009, 24 pages incl. annexes, http://www.minimalgovernment.net/media/mg_20090422.pdf

Three central themes are discussed by those paper:

- a) This climate change is not global warming. This is global cooling.
- b) This is not anthropogenic (man-made). This is nature-caused, mainly the Sun, the galactic cosmic rays from the universe, volcanoes and geologic de-gassing, etc. And
- c) carbon dioxide (CO2) is not a pollutant. It is a useful gas.

Here also, is a comprehensive report, <http://www.climatechangereconsidered.org/>.

September 28

Global cooling and flooding, Part 2

As the Philippines is reeling from the disaster caused by typhoon “Ondoy” hundreds of climate bureaucrats led by the UN FCCC (Framework Convention on Climate Change) are meeting in Bangkok, Thailand, since yesterday (September 28) up to October 9. The climate bureaucrats and negotiators are planning more ecological central planning, to be signed hopefully in Copenhagen this coming December. The current Kyoto Protocol is not enough for them, they want a post-Kyoto Agreement or Protocol to fight global warming which they now euphemistically call “climate change”.

The goal of ecological central planning is very clear: more environmental regulations and prohibitions, more carbon taxes collection, more energy rationing, more and bigger climate bureaucracies at the national and international levels.

The environmental planners will determine what kind of power plants we can put up and cannot put up. What kind of light bulbs to be used and which ones should not be used. How much carbon taxes to be slapped against “non-renewable” energy and how much subsidies to be given out to “renewable” energy sources.

They keep scaring us the public that unless we listen to them, we are doomed to extinction. And for these environmental socialists, the Sun and its magnetic field, the cosmic rays from outside the universe, “biosols” and volcanic aerosols, do not exist or do not affect the Earth’s climate, that only CO₂ and other greenhouse gases (GHGs) are the main cause of global warming. Why? Because they cannot regulate solar magnetic field, they cannot regulate galactic cosmic rays, they cannot regulate volcanic aerosols. There’s no money and political power for governments and the UN there. Whereas demonizing and regulating CO₂ gives them lots of political and ecological power.

The environmental planners have made the global warming hypothesis a dogma. Even if both global temperature data (specially satellite data like UAH & RSS) and actual realities (like sustained rains in “summer” months, this heavy flooding) point to cooling, governments still collect huge tax money to sustain those national and international bureaucracies, their expensive frequent international meetings and agreements. There is a lot of coercion, lying and rent-seeking involved.

Meanwhile, more than 100 people have been confirmed to have died, 106 as of 8am update by the National Disaster Coordinating Council or NDCC). There are reports that if we account for the missing, the death toll could reach 700.

Some people, especially here in facebook, asked, “How come there were no (or not enough) standby rubber boats or amphibious boats in areas considered as “hot spots” for flooding? Billions of pesos poured into government agencies concerned with disaster recovery/relief and yet we don’t have enough rub...ber boats.”

I replied to that post, I said that the government and its politicians have already spent the money preparing for global warming. They created new climate bureaucracies like the Presidential Adviser on climate change. Such Adviser (former Sen. Heherson Alvarez (and staff?) I think is travelling every 2 months abroad to attend meetings by the UN FCCC, other events organized by other governments. Since there will be drought, they constructed a number of dams (big and small), bought airplanes and chemicals for cloud seeding. Since there will be more hot days, perhaps they bought more powerful air-conditioners in their offices, more SUVs. Since CO₂ is evil, they gave away big subsidies of taxpayers’ money to solar and wind farms, other “renewable” energy sources.

But if they can only be more honest, if they will only look up the sky more often, they will realize that the problem is not from rising ocean many years from now. Rather, the problem is the thick rain clouds that are always in the sky, almost everyday, with or without a typhoon. The Sun would hardly show up as those clouds block the sunlight. Consequently, there is general cooling, and lots of rainfall. And why?

Because the Sun is not dead yet. Its magnetic field has become weak lately, less sunspots appear on its surface, its irradiance (or brightness) is slightly reduced, there is weaker solar wind. Solar scientists call it the “deep solar minimum” of this century. What is the implication?

Weak solar wind to push away lots of galactic cosmic rays (from exploding stars) to reach the Earth’s atmosphere. Such cosmic rays help catalyze the formation of aerosols, which are the nuclei of seed formation. So more cosmic rays, more aerosols, more low-lying clouds, less sunlight to reach the Earth’s surface, more rain clouds to fall anytime, global cooling.

There are many other natural factors that also contribute to more cloud formation. Geologic de-gassing and release of volcanic aerosols, release of gases from plants and trees that form “biosols” (aerosols from biological sources). Although their contribution is lesser compared to solar factors.

None of these natural factors are ever considered by the UN and those government leaders who are planning ecological central planning. So even with global cooling happening, they still insist that the world should prepare for global warming, meltic ice and snow, and rising ocean.

It's important that the public will realize the unholy desire and plans of the environmental central planners. They should not waste of our tax money. They should NOT:

- a. create new climate bureaucracies, or retain existing ones
- b. enact new carbon taxes
- c. subsidize solar and wind farms from our tax money
- d. over-tax coal and oil power plants
- e. impose ecological protectionism
- f. others.

Instead, governments should:

- a. reduce if not abolish income taxes, let us keep our monthly or yearly income and allow us to build stronger houses against more heavy rains, against colder weather in the coming years and decades.
- b. strengthen river banks, dredge heavily silted rivers and creeks, make them deeper again, so they won't swell easily in anticipation of more heavy rains and more flash floods. There are dozens of consumption-based taxes and transaction taxes (VAT, excise tax, travel tax, doc stamp tax, franchise tax, etc.) where government can still collect big revenues.
- c. build higher roads, cover up cracked and potholed road with a new layer of new roads on top, instead of removing the old layer and build a new road on the same elevation.
- d. others.

September 30

Major actors in ecological central planning

The UN FCCC meeting still ongoing in Bangkok, up to Oct. 9.

One of my friends posted this in her facebook account about an hour ago.

http://www.bangkokpost.com/news/local/24648/activists-answer-call-of-climate-talks?awesm=fbshare.me_350

The figures in that report showed, among others: About 3,000 climate bureaucrats from 190+ countries and about 1,500 climate activists in Bangkok! And both want ecological central planning, it's just that the former want a "milder" carbon emission cut, while the latter want as deep cut as possible. Can't we all go back to riding horses and bicycles? That seems to be at the back of the mind of many of the climate activists.

I think far from the limelight, but applauding those central planning moves, are the climate bankers and traders. These are the likes of Goldman Sachs, etc. which made big money in carbon trading, which was about \$128 billion in 2008 alone, from private corporations in EU, Japan, other rich countries.

It is an ugly alliance of big government + big activist NGOs + big rent-seeking banks and traders. They all say one thing: Over-regulate and overtax carbon, the Sun is dead as a climate driver, more climate bureaucracies, and approximate the Stone age lifestyle.

Anyway, I made this comment on her wall:

"Current 'deep solar minimum' for the century showed weak solar magnetic field, few sunspots, weak solar wind, so more galactic cosmic rays enter the Earth's atmosphere, which help catalyze the formation of low-lying clouds. More clouds, less sunlight that reach the Earth's surface more rainfall, global cooling.

Cooling started in solar cycle 23 (up to early this year), the Sun has very similar behavior with solar cycle 4. Dalton Minimum occurred in solar cycles 5 and 6. So the projection is that solar cycles 24 (current cycle) and 25, corresponding to 2 1/2 decades, period of cooling.

How many climate bureaucrats and activists understand that?

October 3

Global cooling and cosmic rays

Global cooling – not warming – seems to be accelerating this year. Without going through scientific papers with their graphs, charts and greek equations, even without checking temperature data from surface stations (say PAGASA data for the Philippines) or from satellite data (say from UAH, RSS, Hadley). We just look around,

look up the sky, especially, and recollect the weather since January up to September this year. It was cold in January to February, of course. Yet it was still cold in March up to Holy Week in early April. There were two typhoons in April, another two typhoons in May. March to May are officially “summer” months but it was mostly cloudy and rainy. One of my friends whose business is manufacturing and selling umbrellas and raincoats, told me that she’s been making money as early as April.

We now go to more objective and more scientific way of observing climate. In my article on September 10, Solar minimum and Copenhagen, I showed there a graph that compares global temperature from satellite data (UAH and RSS) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentration from 1979 to August 2009 (30 years period). The graph showed cooling of around 0.24 Celsius from 2002 to August 2009, whereas CO₂ concentration keeps on rising, up to around 390 parts per million (ppm), from only around 285 ppm during the Industrial Revolution.

I argued that it was the weak Sun in the current deep solar minimum that allowed the entry of huge number of cosmic rays (coming from exploding stars) into the Earth’s atmosphere, the rays catalyze the formation of aerosols that form the nuclei for cloud formation. So weak Sun, plenty of cosmic rays, lots of cloud, sunlight is blocked from reaching the Earth’s surface, lots of rainfall, global cooling.

We will notice also that even if there are no typhoons, the sky is often dark as there are lots of clouds in the lower atmosphere (the troposphere). So when typhoon “Ondoy” (international name “Ketsana”) hit Metro Manila and neighboring provinces, the typhoon dumped huge volume of rains that inundated a wide area of the Philippines. As of this writing, nearly 300 people have been confirmed and counted as dead. There are many more missing, so the headcount should rise in the coming days.

After the typhoon, facebook and other social networking was also flooded with “blame global warming and climate change” posting by a number of people. I challenged almost all of my friends who posted such and argued that this is one proof that we are in a period of global cooling, not warming. And the weak Sun, not lots of CO₂ in the air, is mainly responsible for this cooling or what the warmers would euphemistically call “global warming” as “climate change”.

Two days ago, a scientist at NASA, Dr. Tony Phillips, wrote a paper, "Cosmic rays hit space age high", where he noted that cosmic rays are +19 percent plentier or stronger this year than last year. The graph he showed just confirms the inverse relationship between solar activity and cosmic rays level. Cosmic rays have been steadily rising from 2001 up to 2009.

So now, one question that will crop up is, more cosmic rays this year, that's why there are lots of clouds in the sky? Partly Yes, but one Australian scientist that I have read, Dr. David Archibald (www.davidarchibald.info) says that there is a lag of one year from the Sun's level of activity or inactivity, to the effect on cloud formation and volume.

So if we think that it is always cloudy these days and months, wait for next year. While solar minimum was also observed last year, the Sun is even weaker this year

than last year. So the implication is, we will hardly see the Sun next year! Clouds will rule the sky, even during "summer" months of March-April-May, again!

On another note, a British astrophysicist, one of the scientists that I have heard during the 2nd International Conference on Climate Change (ICCC) in NYC last March, has practically predicted the wrath of typhoon "Ondoy", about 3 weeks before Ondoy pummeled Metro Manila and the surrounding provinces.

In its Weather Action (WA) news no. 66 dated September 27, 2009, owner of independent weather forecasting firm WA, Mr. Piers Corbyn, reported that as solar cycle 24 (a solar cycle would last for 11 years on average) is starting from an extended solar cycle 23 (it lasted for more than 13 years), a lot of Sun-triggered extreme events would happen, including the last typhoon Ondoy. See <http://www.weatheraction.com/displayarticle.asp?a=88&c=1>

Mr. Corbyn and his team do not rely on meteorological computer models. Instead, they watch the Sun: sunspots, solar flares, solar magnetic field, the level of cosmic rays, etc. and predict the kind of weather disturbances that are likely to occur, where and when!

One may wonder, then why wouldn't the UN, UK, US, Philippine and other governments get his services to prepare themselves for big catastrophes? The quick answer that I can think of is this: the UN and all those governments believe in CO2-climate theory (actually just a hypothesis), they all hate the Sun-climate theory which Dr. Corbyn and many other astrophysicists and geologists explain. Those governments want only one thing: ecological central planning dream. They cannot regulate the Sun and cosmic rays from the outer universe, so they cannot implement their deep desire for more environmental regulations and ecological central planning.

Mr. Corbyn's services are for a fee, of course. He receives zero tax funding or subsidy for his scientific work and climate prediction services.

Today, the 16th typhoon of the year, "Pepeng" (international name "Parma") is entering Cagayan province in the north. The typhoon was far from Metro Manila. Dark clouds did not seem to go away even after typhoon "Ondoy" left the country last September 27.

The thick volume of cosmic rays in the Earth's atmosphere is causing lots of rainclouds, which later become heavy rainfall, which causes heavy flooding, and results in heavy human misery.

But certain sectors of society keep blaming global warming in the face of obvious cooling. The desire for more environmental regulations and taxation is way deep in the hearts and mind of these people. Lie if they must, fool if they must, corrupt science if they must, so long as they can have the power for more ecological central planning.

November 17

No to green protectionism

Consumers need more choices and options, not more restrictions and prohibitions. Trade protectionism via carbon taxes and similar schemes limit choices and create more poverty, which push more poor people to use more environmentally-degrading technologies.

Please sign the petition against eco-protectionism,
<http://www.policynetwork.net/trade/news/petition-against-green-protectionism>

The opening paragraph of the petition says it clearly:

You have no doubt heard about the UN's climate conference in Copenhagen next month. Chief among the bad ideas being touted by environmental activists and politicians in the run-up to that meeting is a proposal to permit trade restrictions on the grounds that they will help to prevent climate change (for example by encouraging governments to sign up and comply with an international agreement to restrict emissions). Pascal Lamy, director of the World Trade Organization, has even sanctioned this approach, saying that the world's priorities should be "climate first and trade, second." And – surprise surprise – uncompetitive industries and other vested interests have jumped on the bandwagon.

November 22

Warmers' intellectual dishonesty uncovered

As incriminating emails and documents from the hacked website of, or stolen data from, the Climate Research Unit (CRU) in UK are spreading like wildfire in the web, the extent of intellectual dishonesty, if not intellectual prostitution, of a number of known warming scientists, are discovered. It's chilling to hear or read how those scientists deliberately alter or hide info that can show decline in global temperatures.

The most exposed scientists are Phil Jones, the head of CRU, and Michael Mann, main author of the "hockey stick" shape of global warming chart.

I wonder what alibi, if any, they can produce since the number of emails and documents that all seem to be original, are just too many? But if they admit that they indeed lied, that they indeed prostituted science for their political designs and desire for millions of dollars of research contracts, then that should be the end of their scientific career. They better go to the most isolated islands or the most uninhabitable place on Earth, with no internet or electricity, to escape global ridicule.

November 25

From GW to CC

Yesterday, I gave a talk at the Las Pinas Chamber of Commerce and Industry, a local branch of the Philippine Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The President of Las Pinas CCI, Mohammad Yasin Badr, is my friend, my "classmate" in Rotary Intl. Dist 3830. The title of my paper was "Warming time out amidst climate hysteria" (22 slides, 1.5MB). It should be posted in our website within the week, www.minimalgovernment.net.

Another friend and "classmate" in rotary, Rodolfo "Inky" Reyes, who is a top official of the Philippine National Red Cross (PNRC), is in Nairobi, Kenya, for an International Red Cross assembly and meeting. Inky said that if I were in their event, I would love the discussions on climate change (CC).

Well, if I were in Nairobi, I'm sure I would figure in endless debates with many participants there who believe in anthropogenic [man-made] global warming or AGW. The warmers have almost monopolized the discussion for at least 2 decades that it is considered a sacrilegious act to even question AGW, much more to present charts and data that contradict that claim. That is why they declared a few years ago, "There is no more debate, shut up." And it is that dictatorial mindset that somehow crippled public debate, until the global temp data -- tropospheric and surface station data, ocean heat and ocean level data, Arctic temp. and Arctic ice extent data, etc. -- showed that there was NO warming that is happening for the past 10 years. The data have a negative answer to the Rotary test, "Is it the truth?"

The shift from GW to CC was a face-saving act by the warmers. They saw the temperature data, the warming years that should happen now as predicted by their computer models did not happen. So CC is used more often while retaining the warming scare. That is, melting polar ice and Greenland ice (due to GW), that will result in rising ocean by up to 7 meters (about 2 storeys high) just 90 years from now, according to Al Gore, more hurricanes, more typhoons-more drought, etc.

The important point is: there is NO scientific consensus yet of AGW and CC. Big debates still happening.

So if there is no consensus, there should be NO global coercion in energy and environment policies. But here we are, debating how much carbon emission cut by whom and by when. Kill or over-tax cheap energy sources like coal, subsidize from tax money clean but expensive and low-power output wind farms and solar farms, create climate bureaucracies from the national to provincial levels (look at political has-been Heherson Alvarez, now a "climate czar" secretary). And a number of politicians made big money putting up ethanol and bio-diesel plants because all oil companies, big and small, are forced to buy from them because of the mandatory E10 gas and B5 diesel products.

Further money from CC alarmism -- carbon taxes (in the US, about \$300 billion/year in Obama cap and trade bill alone, on top of existing federal environmental taxes, on top of existing state and county env'l taxes), carbon trading (in 2008, \$128 billion

from corporations in the EU, Japan, etc., excl. the US as the US is not a signatory to Kyoto), carbon tariff and eco-protectionism.

So it's the distortions in energy, environment, fiscal and trade policies in almost all countries in the world that are being targeted by the warmers. Ecological central planning is a pernicious game plan. Some of those central planners wish that we stop riding our cars soon and ride bicycles "to save the planet" while they're jet-setting almost every month in endless global climate meetings, not to mention national and provincial climate meetings.

December 1

Climategate spreading

Here's one online search even for fun:

Google "global warming", you get 9.8 million entries (as of this writing)

Then google "climategate", you get 13.4 million entries!

The former is 3 decades old, the latter is only 2 weeks old.

The latter is about the hacked emails, thousands of emails and documents at the Climate Research Unit (CRU) of the Univ. of East Anglia in Britain, where a number of warming scientists were emailing each other how they cheated on climate data to "hide the decline" in global temperature, how to hide or destroy climate data to escape UK's Freedom of Information law, how to kill and not publish scientific papers that question man-made warming in some scientific journals, and so on.

These warming scientists and politicians that give them millions of dollars of climate research funds have one major goal: to scare the world of "impending environmental catastrophies" so that the world will accept their planned ecological central planning agenda.

The big problem of the UN, Al Gore and other warmers now, is that millions of people around the world have already known and read the climate data manipulation and bastardization of climate science. And these people are angry.

December 2, 2009

Carbon rent-seeking via CDMs

A good friend asked me what's wrong with the Kyoto Protocol (KP) and the forthcoming Copenhagen meeting (to start next week) projected to produce a sort of KP part II in binding environmental commitments. He does not see such international environmental regulations restrict economic freedom and individual liberty.

For me, the main problem with KP and soon, the planned Copenhagen agreement, is the extent of new environmental regulations, energy rationing, carbon taxation,

carbon cap and trade, carbon tariff and eco-protectionism. In short, an expanded ecological central planning.

The science behind anthropogenic global warming (AGW) is highly questionable, if not discredited. The current "climategate" scandal is one proof that the AGW claim is not even a theory because of the presence of so many contrary data and facts that do not conform with the predictive capacity of the "theory". Thus, imposing those carbon emission restrictions and regulations based on suspicious, heavily debated, if not wrong science, is wrong.

About clean development mechanisms (CDMs), certified emission reduction (CERs) and related schemes for carbon mitigation, these are among the offshoot of carbon rent-seeking. Consider the following examples.

Philippine Airlines (PAL), Cebu Pacific airline, Superferry shipping line, Victory bus line, San Miguel Corp., for instance, will be assigned a carbon cap by the DENR or a new climate bureaucracy by the Philippine government, say at X tons per year starting 2010. Then such climate or carbon control agency will declare,

"You PAL (or Cebu Pacific or Superferry, etc.), your carbon emission cap by 2015 will be reduced to (X - 10%); by 2020, it will further be reduced to (X-20%); by 2030, it will be further reduced to (X - 30%), and so on."

So as the number of airplanes of an airline company, or the number of boats of a shipping company, the number of buses of a bus company, etc. are increasing because the population and passengers are rising and people are driving less too, the emission from these corporations will be rising.

So you have a situation of rising emission from these companies but the cap given by government is reducing. What will these airline, shipping line, bus line and other companies do? One is invest in emission-reduction technologies to be put in the engines of their airplanes, boats, vehicles, and other machineries. If this is not technologically possible, or very expensive to do, another option is to buy carbon credits from some companies, whether in the Philippines or abroad, that sell extra carbon offsets (say from a solar power plant or wind power farm).

As carbon caps across the world are declining, the number of companies seeking to buy carbon credits expanding, the price of carbon credits naturally will rise. The price of carbon per ton will rise. So those airlines, shipping lines, hotel and restaurant chains, bus lines, vehicle manufacturers, etc. will be passing on the extra cost of higher carbon credits to their consumers, to their passengers, to the public.

CDM sounds "clean" in theory if the AGW science is absolutely correct. But in reality, such mechanisms contribute to higher prices, both of energy and consumer items. Lots of reports that such cap and trade system as CDM has resulted in job losses and company closure, in Europe. The value of carbon trading was \$128 billion in 2008 alone, and those do not include companies in the US as the US government is not a signatory to the KP.

At home, some political families were said to have made big money with the mandatory Ethanol 10% (E10) and biodiesel 5% (B5) provisions. They capitalized on

the carbon restrictions, that all petroleum companies in the country, big and small, will be forced to buy from them. Of course there is a related issue of agricultural lands previously planted to food crops have now been converted to fuel crops, contributing to the recent and continuing food price inflation.

A poor household will soon face higher electricity bill as "non-clean" but cheap energy sources like coal will be slapped with high carbon taxes. A poor and middle class family will soon face higher bus fares, higher airfares and boat fares, because of those carbon caps and trade and related CDMs.

So those supposedly "market-based" instruments to drastically cut carbon emission in the atmosphere like CDM and CER, are actually very distortionary of the market economy. Banks, carbon traders and other private and government bodies that live off implementing and monitoring those schemes become the new carbon rent-seekers. They produce not a single kilo of food, transport not a single passenger, or produce not a single kwh of electricity, but they make big money, hundreds of billions of dollars of carbon traded money every year.

Carbon rent-seeking, part 2

My friend suggested that Kyoto Protocol (KP) is an application of the polluter-pay principle. He also suggested that most developing countries, or Annex II countries, are not obliged by KP to make drastic carbon emission cuts.

I think he is right that for now, developing countries like the Philippines are not obliged to make deep emission cuts. But it's just a matter of time. When KP was sealed in 2005 I think, China, India, Brazil, Indonesia, S. Africa, Mexico, etc. were just innocent countries. Now in the Copenhagen meeting, there are direct cap being expected, if not imposed, on them, especially China. In addition, some rich countries are threatening that developing but very big economies like China and India, should make their own deep emission cut, otherwise they will impose high carbon tariffs ("eco-protectionism") on their exports. And this makes implementation of the emission cut less transparent. Any rich country can slap different carbon tariffs for different countries, like +10% on top of existing tariff duties for Mexican exports, +15% for Chinese exports, etc.

So for the Philippines having 92 million people, the 12th biggest population in the world, it should be a matter of time and we will be given carbon cap by some international climate bureaucrats.

But even if there will be no carbon emission cap to be imposed on the Philippines and other poorer countries say, in the next 30 years, such economies will also suffer from low and anemic growth that will happen in rich countries. Why? Because the rich countries are the main buyers of our exports, the main employers of our outbound workers (the OFWs), among the main sources of in-bound foreign tourists and foreign investors.

Losing jobs as a result of restricting environmental and energy regulations in rich countries. Last month I read about the biggest aluminum plant in the US closing, going bankrupt. Why -- energy prices in the US becoming more and more expensive.

Some states are more strict than the federal government in practically killing coal power plants (which supplies about 60 percent of all US energy needs).

I mentioned that coal is cheap energy source because I read that the per kwh cost of generating electricity from solar and wind power is 10x that from coal. At least in the US energy situation.

I also doubt that the Philippines will be able to sell substantial carbon credits to companies from rich countries because growing domestic demand for more power are often not enough. Whatever new power plants to be put up, from renewables like hydro and geothermal, will be snapped up by domestic industries and households, no credit to be left to foreign companies from abroad wanting to buy carbon credits.

Finally, we should visit and review some scientific literature on anthropogenic global warming (AGW) science, that it is highly debatable if not discredited, because all those carbon regulations are based from that "theory".

December 7, 2009

Early snow and Copenhagen

Last week, supposedly dry Houston received snow, people there were surprised. My Filipino friends there were happy of course that their kids got their pictures in the snow, for they just migrated from Singapore a few months ago.

This morning, another Filipino friend in NJ posted pictures of his wife and son playing in the snow, saying early winter is here. And tonight, another Filipino friend in Rocklin, north California, was surprised to find snow in their backyard!

Meanwhile in Copenhagen, some 15,000 climate bureaucrats, 5,000 media people and environmentalists, went to Copenhagen to fight global warming and climate change. More than 1,200 limousines were not enough, 140 extra private jets, not to mention commercial planes, sedans and SUVs, are crowding the city. Yes, those officials, showbiz celebrities, environmentalists, and so on want to save the world! Here's the link for the above figures,

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/copenhagen-climate-change-confe/6736517/Copenhagen-climate-summit-1200-limos-140-private-planes-and-caviar-wedges.html>

December 10, 2009

How stupid Al Gore is?

At one TV interview last month, he said that the temperature of the Earth at 2 kilometers below the surface was "millions of degrees" (correct answer: between 500 to 900 C)

The other day, when he was interviewed, he said that the climategate emails, "the most recent one is more than 10 years old". Boo-boo. The most recent emails there were several days old when they were hacked/passed on. See here, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/12/08/al-gore-cant-tell-time-thinks-most-recent-climategate-email-is-more-than-10-years-old/#more-13904>

It's really dangerous to put politicians as "spokesmen" of major natural science issues. They talk junk science and propose junk solutions and the world is implementing them!

Hottest decade?

Yesterday, well almost everyday before and during the Copenhagen meeting on climate, we hear and read news reports from the UN, from various governments, and from big environmentalist groups, saying we're doomed unless we follow their ecological central planning agenda.

One such report yesterday, is a news report from the UN saying that "this decade likely to be the hottest on record", <http://www.gmanews.tv/story/178855/un-2000-2009-likely-warmest-decade-on-record>

I was interviewed yesterday by Ms. Steph Ongkiko of RPN Channel 9 to ask me about my reaction to such report. I said "the UN IPCC is lying. This decade, the planet is cooling, not warming."

This argument and the chart to prove it is contained in my recent paper, "Warming time out amidst climate hysteria" that I presented at the Las Pinas Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LPCCI) last November 24, 2009, http://www.minimalgovernment.net/media/mg_20091124.pdf

I showed there the following:

1. Earth this decade is experiencing cooling, not warming.
2. Arctic ice is melting, and growing, and melting, and growing.
3. Sea level height is not rising, it is even declining by 0.51 mm/year.
4. Number of hurricanes around the world is not rising, it is declining. and so on.

Meanwhile, the hypocrisy of the "saviours of the planet" who want the world to cut on carbon emission, brought to Copenhagen 1,200+ carbon-guzzling limousines, 140 extra private jets, not to mention SUVs, sedans, lots of commercial planes. See here, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/12/07/december-7th-2009-a-day-that-will-live-in-hypocrisy/>

Challenging the warmers to a debate

Recently, I've been challenging to a public debate the leaders of Oxfam Philippines, IBON, WWF, Greenpeace, etc. re warming hysteria.

I know their usual arguments, the IPCC mantra being paraded, as follows:

- a) there is unequivocal warming,
- b) this warming is unprecedented in history, and
- c) CO₂ and other GHGs are the main cause of warming.

For me this is a big SCAM.

And I will argue the following:

1. NO warming in global temperature (northern hemisphere, southern hemisphere, tropics) that occurred since 1998.
2. There were periods in the past which are a lot WARMER than today's levels. In particular, the Medieval Warm Period (MWP).
3. CO₂ is NOT the main driver of the earth's climate cycle (or natural climate change) of warming-cooling. It's the SUN and other natural factors (PDO, cosmic rays, volcanoes).

A few days have passed, there reply is...

Nothing, nada, zero, wala.

Well, IBON said that they will invite me in some of their activities, I said ok, but I wish it will be a debate format -- charts vs charts, tables vs tables, graphs vs graphs. No additional comment from them yet.

I was also sending some of my presentations showing that we are experiencing a global cooling, not warming, to 2 PAGASA officials, including the affable Nathaniel "Tani" Cruz. So far, got no comment or countercomment from them.

One of my friends, Ozone Azanza, asked his friends at the DOST if they will comment on my papers that Ozone sent him, probably engage me in a debate, he said no comment from them either.

Well, I would assume that all leaders of the Filipino warmers are in Copenhagen now. So I should receive a reply from them later.

Meanwhile, I will have a debate with Dr. Joey Comiso, perhaps the only Filipino scientist, at NASA. This will be on late Feb or early March 2010. Organizers will be the Filipino Foresters assn. they plan the venue to be either at the DENR or UPLB. I will just wait for details later.

December 19, 2009

Mayon volcano and climate

Mayon volcano, the most active of the Philippines' 21 active volcanoes (and several dozens inactive ones), has been very active recently. In the last century, it was exploding every 10 years on average, I think. This decade and century, this will be it's 3rd explosion. First was February 2000, 2nd on August 2006, and now December 2009. That volcano is contributing lots of CO₂ and other gases into the atmosphere.

Contribute to global warming? No. Exploding volcanoes release lots of gases, CO₂ among them; also dust and smoke, into the lower and upper atmosphere. Such gases and particles tend to block sunlight from reaching the Earth's land and ocean surfaces, resulting in cooling.

When Mt. Pinatubo erupted in 1991, that event alone caused global cooling by at least 0.4 C for nearly 3 years. Thick volume of ashes, smoke and gases that navigated around the globe several times, blocking sunlight. When it erupted, certain hours of the day in Metro Manila, Pampanga and nearby provinces became dark.

One friend, Winthrop Yu, wondered how much cooling a Mayon eruption would contribute. Should be small, maybe by only 0.0__ C, but cooling, nonetheless.

And we go back to the IPCC 4th Assessment Report (AR4). On its "analysis" table, 8 out of 9 factors are anthropogenic (man-made), only 1 was natural, solar irradiance.

Whaaattt??? Galactic cosmic rays (GCRs) don't contribute to the earth's climate? Volcanoes, water vapor, clouds, biosols, pacific decadal oscillation (PDO), other natural factors, do NOT contribute to the Earth's climate?

PDO cycles of cooling and warming average about 25 years. The warming phase is over, we're now entering the cooling phase.

Last September, NASA reported that there were 19 percent more GCRs in the Earth's atmosphere than last year. GCRs come from exploding stars from across the universe, within and outside our galaxy. They help create aerosols that become the "seeds" for more clouds.

The IPCC relied 100 percent of their climate predictions for the next 100 years on their global computer models (GCMs).

Seriously, anyone believes those computer models' predictive capacity of what will happen in the Philippines' weather, US weather, Europe weather, the world's weather, 1 or 2 weeks from now? For instance, the temperature range of hi-low, by Dec. 31, 2009? Because the IPCC's GCMs say they CAN predict the Earth's temperature range 90 or 100 years from now! And they have the figures, "best case" prediction of 4 C rise, max range of up to 6.4 C, by 2100!

December 20, 2009

Winterstorm and warming extortion

I saw in my facebook account, pictures just a few hours ago, of my Filipino and American friends in deep snow in front of their houses in DC-VA and NYC. In this picture, my good friend Jo Kwong of the Atlas Economic Research Foundation in DC.

That's one day after the conclusion of the Copenhagen meeting to "fight unequivocal global warming."

US President Obama was forced to cut his trip in snowy Copenhagen to head back to DC because of the winter storm. But before flying, he and State Sec. Hillary Clinton promised "\$100 billion a year starting 2020", all to fight global warming. The agreement in Copenhagen was to "limit global warming to only 2 C". The IPCC AR4 warned of "best case" 4 C rise in global temperature, with worst case of 6.4 C rise by 2100.

I would say that the Copenhagen meeting was an event of irony and hypocrisy. Let me enumerate a few points why I say this.

1. The \$100 B/year promise by Mr. Obama will be made long after his term in the White House has ended, by 2020. It's the typical "promise everything" or "scare everyone with scenarios" long after you yourself is gone from your office or from the face of the Earth. The IPCC scientists for instance who predicted in 2007 of "up to 6.4 C rise by 2100" will all be dead by then.
2. Extortion by poor country governments. There was high political heat and bickering among poor country govts. vs rich country govts. vs. big environmental NGOs, in pressuring how much carbon emission cuts by whom and by when. In the end, they talk about money, money, money. European government initially said \$10 billion/year, poor country governments said "No, We want \$300 to \$400 billion/year!" Haggling and bickering, they end up with \$100 B/year promise by Obama, plus contributions by EU and other rich governments. So in a sense, it was a meeting for extortion by poor country govts. But the leaders of those poor countries are ALL rich.
3. Venezuelan socialist President Hugo Chavez spoke in Copenhagen, lambasted the evils of capitalism and how capitalist corporations destroyed the planet. And many government representatives and NGOs applauded and gave him a standing ovation! Last time I checked, it was capitalism which gave them all commercial airlines, private jets, expensive limos and sedans, that brought them to capitalist Copenhagen. And they stayed in capitalist hotels, ate in capitalist restaurants in the city. Capitalist power plants gave them uninterrupted power and electricity for their meeting, and capitalist media outlets broadcasted their meetings and riots all around the world. And those politicians and bureaucrats say "capitalism is evil."
4. Blizzard in Copenhagen and upcoming winter storm in DC and surrounding states while they are meeting to "fight global warming". This time, it's the Earth telling them, "Get real guys. I got no fever. I'm chilling, and so are you."

December 26, 2009

Warmers shooting the messenger, not the message

It is too common. When one cannot argue with data and facts, they attack the people or institutions that bring the idea. That is, they shoot the messenger, not the message.

This practice is very visible in the anthropogenic [man-made] global warming (AGW) claims. Many campaigners of such claim are too impatient to hear any opposing idea, so they douse any dissenting voice as "that's big oil lobby" and similar statements.

One article from mother jones has pathetically attacked the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, the International Policy Network (IPN), the Civil Society Coalition on Climate Change (CSCCC), and other think tanks and coalitions/network that do not agree with the AGW claim, see here.

<http://motherjones.com/environment/2009/12/climate-deniers-atlas-foundation>

The author is Mr. Josh Harkinson. The science and data behind AGW claim is highly suspect. I wrote a few papers on this, the latest of which is "Warming lies", http://www.minimalgovernment.net/media/mg_20091201.pdf.

Atlas is helping small think tanks around the world that advance individual liberty, not because they are questioning AGW. Most or all of those think tanks are fighting dictatorships, corruption, trade protectionism, high taxation, private property rights confiscation, among others. Questioning AGW is a small part of their work.

The CSCCC is a big international coalition of independent think tanks and institutes in more than 40 countries that don't believe in ecological central planning. Since there is no consensus yet about the science behind AGW, there should be no global coercion on environment and energy policies.

Talking about money, I think that while it is true that some oil money like Exxonmobil's was mobilized to help some "skeptics" groups, another big oil, Shell, is on the side of the warmers and most likely be giving them money too.

One estimate of lobby is goes like this: against AGW, about \$2m/year.
pro-AGW: \$4 billion/year from the US federal government alone.

This is for climate researches that support the man-made warming conclusion. See for instance,

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_money.pdf