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- An independent examination of published IPCC evidence by an international group of some 30 climate experts from 16 nations
- Organized in 2003 by Prof. S. Fred Singer as “Team B,” with workshop in Vienna, April 2007
- Summary for Policy Makers and Technical Summary published by Heartland Institute in March 2008
The only important Question:

Is Climate Change due to Nature or Man?

IPCC says: Human    NIPCC says: Nature

If natural, then all CO2 control is pointless – ineffective and very costly

How to decide?

- IPCC has no evidence to support its claim of anthropogenic global warming (AGW)
- NIPCC has contrary evidence
No Evidence for AGW

No scientific consensus: No “science is settled”

20th century not the warmest in 1000 years

Ice/glacier melting inconclusive

No unusual weather (hurricanes, droughts, floods)

No correlation of temperature and CO2

Sea level rise not unusual

Models cannot reproduce 20th century temperatures
World Temperatures Falling Whilst CO₂ Keeps Rising

Temperature variation in °C.

Carbon Dioxide level in part per million by volume
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NIPCC: Counter Evidence

• Comparison of ‘Fingerprints’ of Models and Observations
  
  (*i. e.*, Temperature Trends vs Latitude and Altitude)

**CO2 is not a pollutant**
Fingerprint test is negative: Modeled and observed temperature patterns disagree

- IPCC and NIPCC agree that a comparison of modeled and observed temperature patterns can produce a unique identification of the influence of greenhouse gases (GHG), like CO2
CCSP 1.1 – Chapter 1, Figure 1.3F  PCM Simulations of Zonal-Mean Atmospheric Temperature Change
CCSP 1.1 – Chapter 5, Figure 7E

HadAT2 radiosonde data

Linear trend (°C/decade)
A more detailed view of the disparity:
Douglass, Christy, Pearson, Singer - 2007
NIPCC Conclusions:

- No detectable human fingerprint
- Models overestimate the effect of GHG
- CO2 is not a pollutant
- Sea level rise will continue at its normal rate of 18cm (7 inches) per century
- Natural climate change is mostly the result of variable solar activity
[Neff et al. 2001]
...And now the bad news:
Policymakers are not yet listening

- Energy policy is distorted by bad science
- Since CO2 is not a pollutant, mitigation is pointless, very expensive, counterproductive
- Cap & Trade policies amount to regressive energy taxes and rationing, imposed indirectly
CO$_2$ mitigation is pointless, costly, and counterproductive

- Biofuels [ethanol from corn etc.]; Hydrogen
- “Renewable energy” [wind and solar]
- Uneconomic efficiency mandates [CAFE, etc]
- Carbon capture and sequestration [CCS]
- Cap & Trade schemes [with/without soft cap]
Global warming fears are distorting energy policy

- Increasing energy costs and oil imports
- Decreasing living standards and national security
- Critique of NCEP Report (April 2007)
- Critique of US Climate and Energy Policy (CEQ April 2008)
What can be done to save the economy?

• Energy should be low-cost and secure
• There’s no problem about electricity production if we use coal and nuclear
• There’s a wide choice of transportation fuels: gasoline, diesel, compressed natural gas, methanol, DME, Synfuel from coal, oil shale
Coal for electricity generation

- Can be pollution-free (‘clean’)
- Relatively low cost
- Secure sources of supply
Nuclear electricity generation

- Lower the costs of construction
- Variety of reactor designs – standardize:
  - *PWR, CANDU, HTGR, Pebble Fuel, PIUS*
- Research needed for future extensions of fission fuels:
  - *reprocessing, Breeders, Hybrids, Thorium*
Natural Gas: not a boiler fuel

- More domestic production; pipelines
- ‘Stranded’ gas into DME/methanol
- DME/methanol for transportation
- Reduced need for LNG imports
- Research into clathrates
Petroleum for transportation

- New discoveries and production: ANWR, offshore, etc
- Variable import fee; change leasing policies
- Unconventional oil: tar sands, oil shale, coal-to-liquid
- Refinery construction
- SPR management: BLASH (buy low and sell high)
Transportation Technology and Policy

• Hybrid electric and plug-in cars
• Improved batteries
• Fleet vehicles to use DME/Methanol/CNG
• Policies for conservation and anti-congestion
Climate Fears Drive Bad Policies

- Polar bears threatened?
- EPA waiver for Calif vehicle emissions
- Ninth Circuit Court rejects NHTSA decision
- Kansas stops new (clean) coal plant
- Georgia, Texas coal plants in doubt

-----------------------------

- Calif closes nuclear plant, sells ‘green’ electric power, wind power, PV roof tops -- but imports coal-fired electric power from Four Corners
More Bad News

• Calif AB-32 to cut CO2 by 30% by 2020
• CARB (Mary Nichols) to issue regs: Command-control; Fees (tax); or Cap&Trade – all costly.
• Industry prefers C&T; so do politicians
• ------------------------------------
• How to fight: (Cal has a $17Billion deficit)
• CO2 is not causing GW; is not a pollutant
• Anyway, a warmer climate is better than colder
• Negligible impact on Global growth of CO2
Even Worse News

• Supreme Court: April 2007: EPA must regulate CO2 under Clean Air Act - or explain why not
• Mass. vs EPA, based on flawed affidavit and bad science, plus gross incompetence by WH-CEQ, EPA, and DoJ-SG
• EPA issues Notice of Proposed Regs- 90 days
• Consequences: Will stop US economic growth
Dilemma for Politicians

„When the facts change, I change my opinion. What do you do, Sir?“

John M. Keynes