

## *SPPI News Watch 12-23-08*

### **Scientists Call AP Report on Global Warming 'Hysteria'**

[http://www.foxnews.com/printer\\_friendly\\_story/0,3566,468084,00.html](http://www.foxnews.com/printer_friendly_story/0,3566,468084,00.html)



**Tuesday , December 16, 2008**

#### **FOX NEWS**

Scientists skeptical of the assertion that climate change is the result of man's activities are criticizing a recent Associated Press report on global warming, calling it "irrational hysteria," "horribly bad" and "incredibly biased."

They say the report, which was published on Monday, contained sweeping scientific errors and was a one-sided portrayal of a complicated issue.

"If the issues weren't so serious and the ramifications so profound, I would have to laugh at it," said David Deming, a geology professor at the University of Oklahoma who has been critical of media reporting on the climate change issue.

In the article, [Obama Left with Little Time to Curb Global Warming](#), AP Science Writer Seth Borenstein wrote that global warming is "a ticking time bomb that President-elect Barack Obama can't avoid," and that "global warming is accelerating."

Deming, in an interview, took issue with Borenstein's characterization of a problem he says doesn't exist.

"He says global warming is accelerating. Not only is it continuing, it's accelerating, and whether it's continuing that was completely beyond the evidence," Deming told FOXNews.com.

"The mean global temperature, at least as measured by satellite, is now the same as it was in the year 1980. In the last couple of years sea level has stopped rising. Hurricane and cyclone activity in the northern hemisphere is at a 24-year low and sea ice globally is also the same as it was in 1980."

Deming said the article is further evidence of the media's decision to talk about global warming as fact, despite what he says is a lack of evidence.

"Reporters, as I understand reporters, are supposed to report facts," Deming said. "What he's doing here is he's writing a polemic and reporting it as fact, and that's not right. It's not reporting. It's propaganda."

"This reads like a press release for an environmental advocacy group like Greenpeace. It's not fair and balanced."

A spokesman for the Associated Press said that the news agency stands by its story. "It's a news story, based on fact and the clearly expressed views of President-elect Barack Obama and others," spokesman Paul Colford told FOXNews.com in an e-mail.

Michael R. Fox, a retired nuclear scientist and chemistry professor from the University of Idaho, is another academic who found serious flaws with the AP story's approach to the issue.

"There's very little that's right about it," Fox said. "And it's really harmful to the United States because people like this Borenstein working for AP have an enormous impact on everyone, because AP sells their news service to a thousand news outlets.

"One guy like him can be very destructive and alarming. Yeah it's freedom of speech, but it's dishonest."

Like Deming, Fox said global warming is not accelerating. "These kinds of temperatures cycle up and down and have been doing so for millions of years," he said.

He said there is little evidence to believe that man-made carbon dioxide is causing temperature fluctuation. "It's silly to lay it all on man-made carbon dioxide," Fox said. "It was El Nino in 1998 that caused the big spike in global warming and little to do with carbon dioxide."

Other factors, including sun spots, solar winds, variations in the solar magnetic field and solar irradiation, could all be affecting temperature changes, he said.

James O'Brien, an emeritus professor at Florida State University who studies climate variability and the oceans, said that global climate change is very important for the country and that Americans need to make sure they have the right answers for policy decisions. But he said he worries that scientists and policymakers are rushing to make changes based on bad science.

"Global climate change is occurring in many places in the world," O'Brien said. "But everything that's attributed to global warming, almost none of it is global warming."

He took issue with the AP article's assertion that melting Arctic ice will cause global sea levels to rise.

"When the Arctic Ocean ice melts, it never raises sea level because floating ice is floating ice, because it's displacing water," O'Brien said. "When the ice melts, sea level actually goes down.

"I call it a fourth grade science experiment. Take a glass, put some ice in it. Put water in it. Mark level where water is. Let it melt. After the ice melts, the sea level didn't go up in your glass of water. It's called the Archimedes Principle."

He called sea level changes a "major scare tactic used by the global warming people."

O'Brien said he doesn't discount the potential effects man is having on the environment, but he cautioned that government should not make hasty decisions.

"There is no question that the Obama administration is green and I'm green, and there's no question that they're going to really take a careful look at what we need to do and attack problems, and I applaud that," O'Brien said.

"But I'm really concerned that they're going to spend all the money on implementation of mitigation, rather than supporting the science."

=====

## **Greenies go ga-ga over emissions**

<http://www.smh.com.au/news/opinion/miranda-devine/greenies-go-gaga-over-emissions/2008/12/17/1229189705771.html>

Miranda Devine  
December 18, 2008

APOPLECTIC apocalyptic greenies threw shoes at an effigy of Kevin Rudd, broke into a woodchip mill in Tasmania and threatened to move to Europe as part of an orchestrated dummy spit against the Prime Minister's emissions scheme announced this week.

The tantrums from Australia's screeching environmental banshees have barely abated since the Government revealed its plan to cut Australia's greenhouse gas emissions from between 5 and 15 per cent by 2020, an amount deemed too small by green groups.

"It's a decision to see the Great Barrier Reef die before our very eyes," said Greens Senator Christine Milne.

Rudd must be rubbing his hands with glee as the more crazed greenies give him the appearance of being a safe pair of hands on climate change - doing just enough to placate green-aware citizens but not enough to wreck the economy.

But his scheme is a more radical proposal than any other country has adopted.

Professor Bob Carter, a James Cook University geologist, described it yesterday as "the worst single piece of legislation to be tabled in the Parliament since Federation".

"It is a non-solution to a non-problem," he said. "If ever there were a bill that justifies a conscience vote, then this must be it, for it wittingly intends to reduce the living standards of all Australians."

The Czech President, Vaclav Klaus, who is about to take up the EU presidency, described the European climate deal as "a silly luxury" this week, so what does that make Australia's deal?

The fact sheets attached to the Government's emissions white paper reveal that, per capita, Australia's emissions reduction will be 34-41 per cent below 1990 levels. That is far greater than the comparable EU cuts of 24-34 per cent, or the United States, 25 per cent.

Des Moore, director of the Institute for Private Enterprise and a former deputy Treasury secretary, said yesterday it is "ridiculous" for Australia to take the lead by starting its own scheme before all major emitters agree on a "global" one.

He said a cap and trade style system proposed by Rudd is a "bad idea even if you believe in the need to reduce emissions. It requires an enormous bureaucratic interference in the economy and provides potential for structural adjustments that will harm the economy unnecessarily."

Professor Aynsley Kellow, the head of the school of government at the University of Tasmania, and an expert on climate change treaties, acknowledged yesterday that Rudd's scheme was clever politics. But he said there are "substantial dangers" for Australia.

"Ironically, at the very point in history when the EU has abandoned unilateral gestures, Rudd has made one - one that will not make a discernible difference to global greenhouse gas levels, and that has annoyed the Green movement and business simultaneously."

The fact is temperatures have not risen in a decade, and have actually been falling in recent years, despite increasing carbon emissions.

The tide has turned for the fundamentalist zealots of the climate change movement as more scientists declare their doubts that the science on climate change is "settled", and opinion polls show the public growing ever more reluctant to make personal sacrifices to reduce carbon emissions.

As the economy sinks, more people who blithely believed in the "precautionary principle" are realising the potential costs to their hip pockets and have started to apply a little clear-eyed vision themselves.

"What was it you were saying?" they ask the vilified sceptics.

As it turns out, plenty. Try the latest US Senate minority report from its environment and public works committee that quotes 650 dissenting scientists questioning the doomsday scenario. The minority report, which comes from the office of Republican Senator James Inhofe, gathers quotes from sceptical scientists this year.

They include Japanese scientist Dr Kiminori Itoh, who was an expert reviewer for last year's United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report, who declared global warming the "worst scientific scandal in [history]". Former NASA atmospheric scientist Dr Joanne Simpson is quoted: "Since I am no longer affiliated with any organisation nor receiving any funding, I can speak quite frankly ... As a scientist I remain sceptical."

Opinion polling reflects the mood. Last month, on the eve of the Poznan climate conference, a poll of 12,000 people in 11 countries, including Australia, showed the growing public reluctance to make sacrifices to reduce emissions. Conducted by HSBC and green groups, it found just one in five respondents willing to spend money to reduce climate change.

Almost 20 per cent fewer people than last year were willing to make changes to their lifestyle - 47 per cent, compared to 58 per cent last year. A Lowy Institute poll in July found climate change went from being the most important issue of public concern last year to equal fifth this year.

According to the Garnaut Report, Australia was responsible for 1.5 per cent of global emissions in 2005, dropping to 1.1 per cent by 2030. So a 5 per cent reduction of 1.1 per cent is hardly going to set the world on fire - it's a 0.055 per cent reduction in global emissions. Whoopee.

Meanwhile the world's largest emitter, China, will almost double its emissions by 2030, from 18.3 per cent of global emissions in 2005 to 33 per cent in 2030 - a whopping one-third.

Even if we reduced our emissions by 100 per cent, as the crazies want us to, our sacrifice would be meaningless.

[devinemiranda@hotmail.com](mailto:devinemiranda@hotmail.com)

This story was found at:

<http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2008/12/17/1229189705771.html>

=====

This is from the **New York Times** 12-19-08

E.P.A. Ruling Could Speed Up Approval of Coal Plants

By MATTHEW L. WALD and FELICITY BARRINGER WASHINGTON –

Officials weighing federal applications by utilities to build new coal-fired power plants cannot consider their greenhouse gas output, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency ruled late Thursday. Some environmentalists fear the decision will clear the way for the approval of several such plants in the last days of the Bush administration.

The ruling, by Stephen L. Johnson, the administrator, responds to a decision made last month by the Environmental Appeals Board, a panel within the E.P.A. that had blocked the construction of a small new plant on the site of an existing power plant, Bonanza, on Ute tribal land in eastern Utah.

The Supreme Court ruled last year that the agency could regulate carbon dioxide, the most prevalent global warming gas, under existing law. The agency already requires some power plants to track how much carbon dioxide they emit.

But a memorandum issued by Mr. Johnson late Thursday puts the agency on record saying that carbon dioxide is not a pollutant to be regulated when approving power plants. He cited "sound policy considerations."

His said in the memorandum that each year, about 275 new sources of pollution, from power plants to apartment buildings, must obtain permits saying that they will not significantly decrease air quality. Mr. Johnson wrote that the decision he overruled had confused the federal and state agencies that issue these permits.

"Given the confusion," the memorandum said, "the best path forward is to establish a clear interpretation" of what can be considered a pollutant to be regulated.

"The current concerns over global climate change should not drive E.P.A. into adopting an unworkable policy of requiring emission controls" in these cases, he said.

Mr. Johnson rejected a new line of attack by environmental groups. In the wake of the Bush administration's failure to decide if carbon dioxide could be regulated under existing laws, environmental groups pursued a new strategy in fighting proposed coal plants like the one in Utah.

They asserted that because carbon dioxide must already be monitored under federal laws, that monitoring is tantamount to regulation. Therefore, they argued, its impact must be considered before new plants are approved.

Last month the appeals board said the argument could be used, but was not required. On Thursday the administrator overruled the board. He said that simple monitoring cannot be considered regulation.

John Walke, a lawyer at the Natural Resources Defense Council, said in a statement, "It's a marvel to behold an E.P.A. action that so utterly disdains global warming responsibility and disdains the law at the same time."

Jeff Holmstead, a former E.P.A. official who now works with the Electrical Liability Coordinating Council, said the Johnson memo ensured that the incoming Obama administration had increased freedom to make its decisions on the status of carbon dioxide.

"I think if you're Lisa Jackson," whom Obama has chosen as Mr. Johnson's successor, "you have to be pretty grateful," he said. "She has the opportunity to go through a rule-making and see how to deal" with the issue.

Vickie Patton, deputy general counsel of the Environmental Defense Fund, estimated that as much as 8,000 megawatts of new coal-fired power plants could win swifter approval as a result of the ruling.

Opponents of coal plants list several in the late stages of the approval process that could be affected by the decision Thursday.

"There are a bunch that they are going to argue now don't have to consider carbon dioxide, and which will be beyond the reach of the incoming Obama administration," said Bruce Nilles, director of the antioal campaign at the Sierra Club, an environmental group.

He listed a proposed \$1.25 billion plant, called Pee Dee, that Santee Cooper, a South Carolina utility, is seeking to build and that won state approval on Tuesday; a project in Rogers City, Mich., that the Wolverine Power Cooperative Electric is seeking to build; and another project in Utah, a small plant sought by Consolidated Energy in Davis County. That one would run on petroleum coke, which is also carbon-rich.

=====  
**Sunspot data vital clue to climate change**  
[http://insciences.org/article.php?article\\_id=981](http://insciences.org/article.php?article_id=981)

Published on 22 December 2008, 04:17 Last Update: 29 minute(s) ago by [Insciences](#)

New discoveries linking periodic changes in the Sun's magnetic field with global weather patterns could enable scientists to gain a clearer understanding of how additional factors – such as greenhouse gases – contribute to those weather patterns.

A newly-published paper by the University of New England's Dr Robert Baker establishes the connection between solar cycles and the weather by correlating sunspot activity and rainfall figures for south-eastern Australia over the past 130 years. Cycles of sunspot activity are a visible indication of the periodic changes in magnetic forces within the Sun. The most well-known sunspot cycle is the 11-year "Schwab" cycle, which comprises alternating five-and-a-half-year periods of relatively high and low sunspot activity.

Dr Baker's paper, "Exploratory analysis of similarities in solar cycle magnetic phases with Southern Oscillation Index fluctuations in Eastern Australia" (*Geographical Research*, December 2008), shows that periods of increased sunspot activity are consistently associated with those periods of high rainfall in south-eastern Australia predicted by the Southern Oscillation Index (SOI). Periods of drought, such as that which has afflicted Australia for the past six years, are associated with minimal sunspot activity.

Dr Baker (pictured here) is an Associate Professor in UNE's School of Behavioral, Cognitive and Social Sciences. His paper compares sunspot / weather patterns in all 23 of the documented "Schwab" cycles, noting particularly the similarity between Cycle 15 (1914-1924) and the current Cycle 23. "Such comparisons between the current cycle and past cycles have important implications for both weather prediction and the monitoring of climate change," Dr Baker said. "They could not only allow us to forecast farther into the future, but – through analyzing differences in weather patterns between the current cycle and a past cycle with similar sunspot activity – they could help us to isolate the effect of recent additions to the system such as greenhouse gases."

"We have to benchmark the natural system (i.e., the Sun) before looking at additions to it (e.g. carbon dioxide)," he explained. "Comparing current data with those of a century ago can give us an idea of the added effect of greenhouse gases. But sticking your head in the sand and saying the Sun has no effect on climate change is a virtual denial of historical reality."

"I'm not a 'climate-change skeptic'," he added. "But although carbon dioxide could be a major contributor to global warming, it's just one part of a complex system." That system is so complex, he said, that the short-term temperature trend in the Southern Hemisphere (since 2002) is actually down rather than up.

Dr Baker is keeping a keen eye on daily reports of solar activity. "The Sun isn't powering up," he said. "The period of minimum sunspots signaling the completion of Cycle 23, although due to end in October 2007, is continuing. We could, in fact, be entering a prolonged period of minimal sunspot activity such as the one that brought the 'Federation droughts' around the turn of the twentieth century and a dip in global temperatures for a decade."

=====

### **Reply to RealClimate's Attacks on the NIPCC Climate Report**

Written By: Joseph L. Bast and James M. Taylor  
Published In: News Releases > December 2008

On November 28, the global warming alarmist Web site “RealClimate” posted a ridiculously lame attack by Michael Mann and Gavin Schmidt against “**Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate**,” the summary for policymakers of the 2008 report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC).

The NIPCC report was written by S. Fred Singer, Ph.D. and an additional 23 contributors, including some of the most accomplished atmospheric scientists in the world. The paper references approximately 200 published papers and scientific reports in support of its conclusions. It provides strong evidence that human activity is not causing a global warming crisis.

Mann and Schmidt call the NIPCC report “dishonest” and “nonsense,” a document “served up” by “S. Fred Singer and his merry band of contrarian luminaries (financed by the notorious ‘Heartland Institute’).” But instead of critiquing the scientific arguments presented in the NIPCC report, Mann and Schmidt simply dismiss and belittle them and refer readers mostly to their own past blog comments. Time spent following those links reveals a hodgepodge of opinions and superficial comments, a boatload of rhetoric, and very little science--an entirely unsatisfactory way to support such serious charges.

The reference to financing seems intended to imply that the authors of the NIPCC report were paid by The Heartland Institute, which is not true. RealClimate has been informed of this, but hasn’t corrected its false claim. To go on implying it anyway tells you all you need to know about the integrity of the RealClimate authors.

And what about “the notorious ‘**Heartland Institute**’”? It’s a 24-year-old national nonprofit organization that gets 95 percent of its funding from non-energy-related donors and 84 percent of its funding from non-corporate sources (in 2007). It has a long history of publishing reliable scientific and economic analysis of global warming. Heartland’s credibility is certainly less questionable than that of **RealClimate**, a front group created specifically to attack global warming skeptics by Fenton Communications, a truly “notorious” PR agency.

Mann and Schmidt’s assault on Fred Singer reminds us of Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon’s observation, in his book *The Deniers*, that the qualifications of most alarmists in the global warming debate fall short of those of the skeptics. Consider only the first few paragraphs of **Singer’s resume**:

Dr. S. Fred Singer, an atmospheric and space physicist, is one of the world’s most respected and widely published experts on climate. Dr. Singer served as professor of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA (1971-94); distinguished research professor at the Institute for Space Science and Technology, Gainesville, FL (1989-94); chief scientist, U.S. Department of Transportation (1987-89); vice chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Oceans and Atmosphere (NACOA) (1981-86); deputy assistant administrator for policy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (1970-71); deputy assistant secretary for water quality and research, U.S. Department of the Interior (1967-70); founding dean of the School of Environmental and Planetary Sciences, University of Miami (1964-67); first director of the National Weather Satellite Service (1962-64); and director of the Center for Atmospheric and Space Physics, University of Maryland (1953-62).

Dr. Singer did his undergraduate work in electrical engineering at Ohio State University and holds a Ph.D. in physics from Princeton University.



Dr. Singer has published more than 200 technical papers in peer-reviewed scientific journals, including *EOS: Transactions of the AGU*, *Journal of Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*, *Science*, *Nature*, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *Geophysical Research Letters*, and *International Journal of Climatology*. His editorial essays and articles have appeared in *Cosmos*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *New York Times*, *New Republic*, *Newsweek*, *Journal of Commerce*, *Washington Times*, *Washington Post*, and many other publications. His accomplishments have been featured in front-cover stories appearing in *Time*, *Life*, and *U.S. News & World Report*.

Now consider Mann's and Schmidt's qualifications. Mann is the author of the "hockey stick" temperature graph that did so much to fuel global warming hysteria when it was featured in an IPCC report, but which a **Congressionally appointed panel of experts** found was not supported by scientific data. Gavin Schmidt is a climate modeler at the Goddard Institute for Space Studies and in recent weeks has been frantically trying to explain why his organization falsely reported that October 2008 was the warmest October in recorded history. Many climate researchers believe Mann and Schmidt are **deliberately falsifying temperature data** to keep their global warming scare going a few more years.

With no apparent sense of irony or shame, these two discredited authors call one of the world's leading scientists "dishonest."

Mann and Schmidt pretend to be engaged in a scientific debate over global warming, but they are not. They have banned global warming "skeptics" from posting on their blog, resort to ad hominem attacks against anyone who dissents, and have repeatedly declined invitations to appear in public forums to debate their critics. They are what the history of their organization says they are: A PR shop for discredited global warming alarmism.

Persons interested in understanding the real science of global warming can find it at Heartland's **Global Warming Facts** Web site or at any of the many other sites linked on that site, or by attending the **2009 International Conference on Climate Change**, taking place in New York on March 8-10, 2009.

---

*Joseph Bast (jbast@heartland.org) is president and James M. Taylor (jtaylor@heartland.org) is a senior fellow of environment policy at The Heartland Institute.*

=====

## **ropical Cyclones (Atlantic Ocean - Global Warming Effects: Frequency, The Past Few Centuries) -- Summary**

<http://co2science.org/subject/h/summaries/hurratlancent.php>

---

Has the warming of the past century, which rescued the world from the extreme cold of the Little Ice Age, led to the yearly formation of more numerous Atlantic Basin tropical storms and hurricanes? We investigate this question via a brief review of several studies that have broached this question with sufficiently-long databases to provide reliable answers.

[Elsner et al. \(2000\)](#) provided a statistical and physical basis for understanding regional variations in major hurricane activity along the U.S. coastline on long timescales; and in doing so, they presented data on major hurricane occurrences in 50-year intervals for Bermuda, Jamaica and Puerto Rico. These data

revealed that hurricanes occurred at *far* lower frequencies in the last half of the 20th century than they did in the preceding *five* 50-year periods, and at *all three* of the locations studied. From 1701 to 1850, for example, when the earth was locked in the icy grip of the Little Ice Age, major hurricane frequency was 2.77 times greater at Bermuda, Jamaica and Puerto Rico than it was from 1951 to 1998; and from 1851 to 1950, when the planet was in transition from Little Ice Age to current conditions, the three locations experienced a mean hurricane frequency that was 2.15 times greater than what they experienced from 1951 to 1998.

[Boose \*et al.\* \(2001\)](#) used historical records to reconstruct hurricane damage regimes for an area composed of the six New England states plus adjoining New York City and Long Island for the period 1620-1997. In describing their findings, they wrote that "there was no clear century-scale trend in the number of major hurricanes." At lower damage levels, however, fewer hurricanes were recorded in the 17th and 18th centuries than in the 19th and 20th centuries; but the three researchers concluded that "this difference is probably the result of improvements in meteorological observations and records since the early 19th century." Hence, confining ourselves to the better records of the last 200 years, we note that the cooler 19th century had five of the highest-damage storms, while the warmer 20th century had only one such storm.

[Nyberg \*et al.\* \(2007\)](#) developed a history of major (category 3-5) Atlantic hurricanes over the past 270 years based on proxy records of *vertical wind shear* and *sea surface temperature* that they derived from corals and a marine sediment core. These parameters are the primary controlling forces that set the stage for the formation of major hurricanes in the main development region westward of Africa across the tropical Atlantic and Caribbean Sea between latitudes 10 and 20°N, where 85% of all major hurricanes and 60% of all non-major hurricanes and tropical storms of the Atlantic are formed. This effort resulted in their discovering that the average frequency of major Atlantic hurricanes "decreased gradually from the 1760s until the early 1990s, reaching anomalously low values during the 1970s and 1980s." More specifically, they note that "a gradual downward trend is evident from an average of ~4.1 (1775-1785) to ~1.5 major hurricanes [per year] during the late 1960s to early 1990s," and that "the current active phase (1995-2005) is unexceptional compared to the other high-activity periods of ~1756-1774, 1780-1785, 1801-1812, 1840-1850, 1873-1890 and 1928-1933." Hence, they concluded that the recent ratcheting up of Atlantic major hurricane activity appears to be simply "a recovery to normal hurricane activity." And in a commentary on Nyberg *et al.*'s paper, Elsner (2007) states that "the assumption that hurricanes are simply passive responders to climate change should be challenged," which is what Nyberg *et al.* do in a very convincing manner.

Also noting that "global warming is postulated by some researchers to increase hurricane intensity in the north basin of the Atlantic Ocean," with the implication that "a warming ocean may increase the frequency, intensity, or timing of storms of tropical origin that reach New York State," [Vermette \(2007\)](#) employed the Historical Hurricane Tracks tool of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Coastal Service Center to document all Atlantic Basin tropical cyclones that reached New York State between 1851 and 2005, in order to assess the degree of likelihood that 20th-century global warming might be influencing these storms -- as climate alarmists are suggesting it should -- particularly for hurricanes but also for tropical storms, tropical depressions and extratropical storms.

This work revealed, in Vermette's words, that "a total of 76 storms of tropical origin passed over New York State between 1851 and 2005," and that of these storms, 14 were hurricanes, 27 were tropical storms, 7 were tropical depressions and 28 were extratropical storms." For Long Island, he further reports that "the average frequency of hurricanes and storms of tropical origin (all types) is one in every 11 years and one in every 2 years, respectively." Also of note is his finding that storm activity was greatest in *both* the late 19th century and the late 20th century, and the fact that "the frequency and intensity of storms in the late 20th century are similar to those of the late 19th century." As a result, Vermette concludes that "rather than a linear change, that may be associated with a global warming, the changes in recent time are following a multidecadal cycle and returning to conditions of the latter half of the 19th century." Hence, he also concludes that "yet unanswered is whether a warmer global climate of the future will take hurricane activity beyond what has been experienced in the observed record."

In a similar study, [Mock \(2008\)](#) developed a "unique documentary reconstruction of tropical cyclones for Louisiana, U.S.A. that extends continuously back to 1799 for tropical cyclones, and to 1779 for hurricanes." This record -- which was derived from daily newspaper accounts, private diaries, plantation diaries, journals, letters and ship records, and which was augmented "with the North Atlantic hurricane database as it pertains to all Louisiana tropical cyclones up through 2007" -- is, in Mock's words, "the longest continuous tropical cyclone reconstruction conducted to date for the United States Gulf Coast." And this record reveals that "the 1820s/early 1830s and the early 1860s are the most active periods for the entire record."

In discussing his findings, the University of South Carolina researcher says that "the modern records which cover just a little over a hundred years is too short to provide a full spectrum of tropical cyclone variability, both in terms of frequency and magnitude." In addition, he states that "if a higher frequency of major hurricanes occurred in the near future in a similar manner as the early 1800s or in single years such as in 1812, 1831, and 1860, [they] would have devastating consequences for New Orleans, perhaps equaling or exceeding the impacts such as in hurricane Katrina in 2005." And, of course, the new record clearly indicates that the planet's current high levels of both air temperature and CO<sub>2</sub> concentration cannot be blamed for the 2005 Katrina catastrophe, as both parameters were much *lower* than they are currently when tropical cyclone and hurricane activity in that region were much *higher* than they are now back in the early to mid 1800s.

Around the same time, [Wang and Lee \(2008\)](#) used the "improved extended reconstructed" *sea surface temperature* (SST) data described by Smith and Reynolds (2004) for the period 1854-2006 to examine historical temperature changes over the global ocean, after which they regressed vertical wind shear -- "calculated as the magnitude of the vector difference between winds at 200 mb and 850 mb during the Atlantic hurricane season (June to November), using NCEP-NCAR reanalysis data" -- onto a temporal variation of global warming defined by the SST data. This work led to their discovery that warming of the surface of the global ocean is typically associated with a secular increase of tropospheric vertical wind shear in the *main development region* (MDR) for Atlantic hurricanes, and that the long-term increased wind shear of that region has coincided with a weak but robust downward trend in U.S. landfalling hurricanes. However, this relationship has a *pattern* to it, whereby local ocean warming in the Atlantic MDR actually *reduces* the vertical wind shear there, while "warmings in the tropical Pacific and Indian Oceans produce an opposite effect, i.e., they increase the vertical wind shear in the MDR for Atlantic hurricanes."

In light of these findings, the two researchers conclude that "the tropical oceans compete with one another for their impacts on the vertical wind shear over the MDR for Atlantic hurricanes," and they say that to this point in time, "warmings in the tropical Pacific and Indian Oceans win the competition and produce increased wind shear which reduces U.S. landfalling hurricanes." As for the years and decades ahead, they write that "whether future global warming increases the vertical wind shear in the MDR for Atlantic hurricanes will depend on the relative role induced by secular warmings over the tropical oceans." Hence, it is by no means clear whether further global warming, due to *any* cause, will lead to an increase or decrease in U.S. landfalling hurricanes. All we can say is that up to *this* point in time, global warming appears to have had a weak negative impact on their numbers.

Publishing concurrently, [Vecchi and Knutson \(2008\)](#) write in the introduction to their study of the subject that "there is currently disagreement within the hurricane/climate community on whether anthropogenic forcing (greenhouse gases, aerosols, ozone depletion, etc.) has caused an increase in Atlantic tropical storm or hurricane frequency." In further exploring this question, they derived an estimate of the expected number of North Atlantic tropical cyclones (TCs) that were missed by the observing system in the pre-satellite era (1878-1965), after which they analyzed trends of both reconstructed TC *numbers* and *duration* over various time periods and looked at how they may or may not have been related to trends in sea surface temperature over the main development region of North Atlantic TCs. This work revealed, in their words, that "the estimated trend for 1900-2006 is highly significant (+~4.2 storms century<sup>-1</sup>)," but they say that the trend "is strongly influenced by a minimum in 1910-30, perhaps artificially enhancing significance," When using their base case adjustment for missed TCs and considering the entire 1878-2006 record, for example, they find that the trend in the *number* of TCs is only "weakly positive" and "not statistically significant," while

they note that the trend in average TC *duration* over the 1878-2006 period "is negative and highly significant."

In conclusion, the bulk of the evidence that has been accumulated to date over multi-century timescales indicates that late 20th-century yearly hurricane numbers were considerably lower than those observed in colder prior centuries, verifying what [Elsner \(2008\)](#) wrote in his summary of the *International Summit on Hurricanes and Climate Change* that was held in May of 2007 on the Greek island of Crete, wherein he states that *paleotempestology* -- which he defines as the study of prehistoric storms based on geological and biological evidence -- indicates the presence of more hurricanes in the northeastern Caribbean Sea "during the second half of the Little Ice Age when sea temperatures near Puerto Rico were a few degrees (Celsius) cooler than today," which he goes on to say provides evidence that "today's warmth is not needed for increased storminess."

Indeed, it is not. And there is no compelling reason to believe that any additional warmth that may come our way would be any different.

## References

- Boose, E.R., Chamberlin, K.E. and Foster, D.R. 2001. Landscape and regional impacts of hurricanes in New England. *Ecological Monographs* **71**: 27-48.
- Elsner, J.B. 2007. Tempests in time. *Nature* **447**: 647-649.
- Elsner, J.B. 2008. Hurricanes and climate change. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **89**: 677-679.
- Elsner, J.B., Liu, K.-B. and Kocher, B. 2000. Spatial variations in major U.S. hurricane activity: Statistics and a physical mechanism. *Journal of Climate* **13**: 2293-2305.
- Mock, C.J. 2008. Tropical cyclone variations in Louisiana, U.S.A., since the late eighteenth century. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems* **9**: 10.1029/2007GC001846.
- Nyberg, J., Malmgren, B.A., Winter, A., Jury, M.R., Kilbourne, K.H. and Quinn, T.M. 2007. Low Atlantic hurricane activity in the 1970s and 1980s compared to the past 270 years. *Nature* **447**: 698-701.
- Smith, T.M. and Reynolds, R.W. 2004. Improved extended reconstruction of SST (1854-1997). *Journal of Climate* **17**: 2466-2477.
- Vecchi, G.A. and Knutson, T.R. 2008. On estimates of historical North Atlantic tropical cyclone activity. *Journal of Climate* **21**: 3580-3600.
- Vermette, S. 2007. Storms of tropical origin: a climatology for New York State, USA (1851-2005). *Natural Hazards* **42**: 91-103.
- Wang, C. and Lee, S.-K. 2008. Global warming and United States landfalling hurricanes. *Geophysical Research Letters* **35**: 10.1029/2007GL032396.

Last updated 10 December 2008

---

## South African Urban Heat Islands

<http://co2science.org/articles/V11/N50/C1.php>

---

### Reference

Hughes, W.S. and Balling Jr., R.C. 1996. Urban influences on South African temperature trends. *International Journal of Climatology* **16**: 935-940.

### What was done

The authors analyzed near-surface air temperature data from what they describe as "five very large metropolitan areas and 19 stations from non-urban locations" of South Africa for the period 1960-1990, comparing their results with those of Jones (1994) for the same time interval.

### What was learned

Hughes and Balling report that the mean annual air temperature trend of the five large cities averaged 0.24°C per decade, while the mean warming rate of the 19 non-urban centers was a statistically insignificant 0.09°C per decade over the 1960-1990 period, which values are to be compared to the overall warming rate of 0.31°C per decade that was derived by Jones for the entire country. In addition, they note that the mean rate-of-warming difference between their urban and non-urban sites was driven primarily by increases in daily minimum temperatures, which rose at a mean rate of 0.07°C per decade at the non-urban stations, but at an average rate of 0.34°C per decade at the five large cities.

### What it means

According to the two researchers, the "disparate trends in temperature" that they found to exist between the urban and non-urban stations they studied "suggest that urbanization has influenced the Jones (1994) records for South Africa over the 1960-1990 period of apparent rapid warming," and that their analyses suggest that "half or more of this recent warming may be related to urban growth, and not to any widespread regional temperature increase."

### Reference

Jones, P.D. 1994. Hemispheric surface air temperature variations: a reanalysis and an update to 1993. *Journal of Climate* **7**: 1794-1802.

Reviewed 10 December 2008

---

## Dengue Fever in a Warming World

<http://co2science.org/articles/V11/N50/B1.php>

---

### Reference

Kyle, J.L. and Harris, E. 2008. Global spread and persistence of dengue. *Annual Review of Microbiology* **62**: 71-92.

### Background

The authors state that "dengue is a spectrum of disease caused by four serotypes of the most prevalent arthropod-borne virus affecting humans today," and that "its incidence has increased dramatically in the past 50 years," to where "tens of millions of cases of dengue fever are estimated to occur annually, including up to 500,000 cases of the life-threatening dengue hemorrhagic fever/dengue shock syndrome."

### What was done

Kyle and Harris conducted a review of the pertinent scientific literature, exploring "the human, mosquito, and viral factors that contribute to the global spread and persistence of dengue, as well as the interaction between the three spheres, in the context of ecological and climate change."

### **What was learned**

With respect to the status of dengue fever within the context of climate change, the two researchers say "there has been a great deal of debate on the implications of global warming for human health," but that "at the moment, there is no consensus." However, "in the case of dengue," as they continue, "it is important to note that even if global warming does not cause the mosquito vectors to expand their geographic range, there could still be a significant impact on transmission in endemic regions," as they say that "a 2°C increase in temperature would simultaneously lengthen the lifespan of the mosquito and shorten the extrinsic incubation period of the dengue virus, resulting in more infected mosquitoes for a longer period of time." Nevertheless, they note there are "infrastructure and socioeconomic differences that exist today and already prevent the transmission of vector-borne diseases, including dengue, even in the continued presence of their vectors," citing Reiter (2001).

### **What it means**

It would appear that whatever advantages rising temperatures may confer upon the dengue virus vector, they can be more than overcome by proper implementation of modern vector control techniques.

### **Reference**

Reiter, P. 2001. Climate change and mosquito-borne disease. *Environmental Health Perspectives* **109** (Supplement1): 141-161.

Reviewed 10 December 2008

---

## **Hydrological Extremes of France**

<http://co2science.org/articles/V11/N50/C2.php>

---

### **Reference**

Renard, B., Lang, M., Bois, P., Dupeyrat, A., Mestre, O., Niel, H., Sauquet, E., Prudhomme, C., Parey, S., Paquet, E., Neppel, L. and Gailhard, J. 2008. Regional methods for trend detection: Assessing field significance and regional consistency. *Water Resources Research* **44**: 10.1029/2007WR006268.

### **Background**

The authors write that "the impact of climate change on the hydrological regime of rivers is still a subject of active research, especially regarding extreme hydrological events such as floods or droughts," which climate alarmists contend should become more frequent and extreme as the earth warms.

### **What was done**

Renard *et al.* employed four different procedures for assessing field significance and regional consistency with respect to trend detection in both high-flow and low-flow hydrological regimes of French rivers, using daily discharge data obtained from 195 gauging stations having a minimum record length of 40 years.

### **What was learned**

The twelve researchers report that "at the scale of the entire country, the search for a generalized change in extreme hydrological events through field significance assessment remained largely inconclusive." In addition, they say that at the smaller scale of hydro-climatic regions, there were also no significant results for most regions, although they add that "consistent changes were detected in three geographical areas."

### **What it means**

Although small geographical areas often display trends in hydrological regimes of one extreme or the other (high- or low-flow), when scaling up to larger regions such as countries, there is typically less consistent change in extreme behavior. Consequently, as a result of their own findings and those of others they cite, Renard *et al.* conclude that "when considered at the global scale," the impact of climate change on

hydrological regimes "is still an open question, as illustrated by the lack of a clear signal emerging from large-scale studies (Knudzewicz *et al.*, 2005; Svensson *et al.*, 2005)."

Clearly, this state of affairs must be rather embarrassing for the world's climate alarmists, who vociferously contend that the latter part of the 20th century experienced a warming that was *unprecedented over the past one to two millennia*, and who claim that such extreme warming should significantly enhance the frequency and severity of extreme hydrological events the world over.

#### **References**

Knudzewicz, Z.W., Graczyk, D., Maurer, T., Pinskiwar, I., Radziejewski, M., Svensson, C. and Szwed, M. 2005. Trend detection in river flow series: 1. Annual maximum flow. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* **50**: 797-810.

Svensson, C., Kundzewicz, Z.W. and Maurer, T. 2005. Trend detection in river flow series: 2. Flood and low-flow index series. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* **50**: 811-824.

Reviewed 10 December 2008