



[Review: James Lovelock, *The Vanishing Face of Gaia: A Final Warning*](http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/milo_yiannopoulos/blog/2009/02/21/review_james_lovelock_the_vanishing_face_of_gaia_a_final_warning)

http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/milo_yiannopoulos/blog/2009/02/21/review_james_lovelock_the_vanishing_face_of_gaia_a_final_warning

Until recently, we were told that the scientific community was in broad agreement about climate change. But, in the last few weeks, open warfare has broken out between experts presenting serious, evidence-based research and hysterical alarmists like James Hansen, who seem hell-bent on destroying the global economy through eye-wateringly expensive and totally unnecessary "emergency measures".

Bless. I almost couldn't bring myself to write this review. Almost.

Vicky Pope, head of climate change advice at the Met Office, recently called on scientists and journalists to stop misleading the public with "claim and counter-claim". Pope says there is little evidence to support claims that Arctic ice has reached a tipping point and could disappear within a decade or so, as some reports have suggested: "The record-breaking losses in the past couple of years could easily be due to natural fluctuations in the weather, with summer ice increasing again over the next few years."

In a recent wide-eyed rant in the Guardian last week, **James Hansen branded coal-fired power plants "factories of death"**. But Hansen, the global warming lobby's most celebrated cheerleader, **has now been called "an embarrassment to NASA"**. **His work has been branded "unscientific"**. Dr. Roger Pielke, Jr., former director of the University of Colorado's Center for Science and Technology Policy Research, recently **accused him of "megalomania" and of "scientific authoritarianism"**. Others say he has "lost the plot".

In fact, as long ago as June 2008, Dr. Nicholas Drapela from Oregon State University Chemistry Department wrote: **"My dear colleague Professor Hansen, I believe, has finally gone off the deep end. When you have dedicated the bulk of your career to a cause, and it turns out the cause has been proven false, most people cannot bring themselves to admit the truth. [His claims] contain neither reason nor truth."**

But there is a greater, more sacred cow that even the most strident climate sceptics seem reluctant to attack: James Lovelock. Lovelock is responsible for the now-famous Gaia hypothesis, which is predicated on the idea that each of the planet's systems exist in intricate symbiosis with one another. Or, in his words,

Gaia is "a complex entity involving the Earth's biosphere, atmosphere, oceans, and soil; the totality constituting a feedback or cybernetic system which seeks an optimal physical and chemical environment for life on this planet".

Sounds nice, doesn't it? But this isn't really a "hypothesis" at all: it's just a highfalutin' way of saying we shouldn't cut down so many trees and we shouldn't burn so much coal. The problem with Lovelock's theory is that he presents it as a scientific position, when really it's not even cargo cult stuff: Gaia is a perfectly pleasant metaphor for the dangers of abusing the natural world, but to posit his "cybernetic system" as a serious theory is to invite ridicule.

Perhaps realising - as James Hansen surely now does, if only privately - that the planet might just make it through the twenty-first century intact after all, Lovelock has switched focus in his new book. Now it's only humanity that's at risk. The planet will look after itself. All that saving the planet stuff was just a sales pitch: what we really need to be doing is saving the human race.

Controversially, Lovelock says nuclear power is the only viable way of generating enough energy to meet future demand. But in doing so, he overlooks - or ignores - the fact that even sustainable power is unsustainable. According to *New Scientist*, "The most advanced 'renewable' technologies are too often based upon non-renewable resources." In other words, the green lobby could be about to rob the planet of irreplaceable natural assets.

After close reading of this slender volume, I can offer no sensible summary of it, save to say that the climate lobby is clearly struggling to come up with new and inventive ways to keep the "industry" going.

But I can offer some advice. Do not purchase *The Vanishing Face of Gaia*. Do not read it. Do not tell your friends about it. Do not, in short, do anything to attract further attention to this silly - though I'm sure lucrative - drivel. "Future generations" will thank you.

The publishers tell me this is Lovelock's "final word" on the environmental problems humanity will face in the twenty-first century. We can be grateful, at least, for that.

=====

AP Interview: Reid pushing for climate change bill

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20090220/ap_on_go_co/reid_climate

By H. JOSEF HEBERT, Associated Press Writer H. Josef Hebert, Associated Press Writer – Fri Feb 20, 5:29 am ET

Featured Topics:

AP – The New Mexico National Guard's wind turbine is pictured at the Guard's headquarters compound in Santa ...

WASHINGTON – Saying it's time to "take a whack" at climate change, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid says he plans to push for Senate action on global warming by the end of summer.

The Nevada Democrat in an interview with The Associated Press said the Senate will take up energy legislation in a couple of weeks "and then later this year, hopefully late this summer do the global warming part of it."



Climate legislation will be among the most complex and contentious issues facing a Congress.

While there is widespread agreement among both Democrats and Republicans — as well as across the business community — that global warming must be addressed, there remains a sharp divide over the details of a climate package and how best to limit the cost.

Nevertheless, Reid said he is convinced many senators want to move on the issue this year, ahead of international climate negotiations in Copenhagen, Denmark, in December.

"We have to take a whack at it," Reid said in a telephone interview late Thursday. He said failure to act "would be neglectful."

Along with climate, Reid, who is up for re-election next year, has assumed a high profile on the need to promote "clean energy" such as wind, solar and biomass that do not produce carbon dioxide, the predominant greenhouse gas. These are also energy projects popular in Reid's home state, where several major solar projects are under way or planned.

Next week, Reid will participate in a "clean energy" forum being convened by the Center for American Progress. Others participating will include former President Bill Clinton, possibly former Vice President Al Gore, and senior Obama administration officials.

Reid said the energy legislation expected to be taken up in the coming weeks will be limited largely to promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency — priorities of the Obama White House.

It is expected to say nothing about offshore oil development, or address the growing debate over whether the federal government should wield greater power

in locating high-voltage transmission lines — an area of conflict between Washington and the states.

Sen. Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M., chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, is crafting a national requirement for utilities to use renewable energy to generate electricity — at least 4 percent within two years, rising to a minimum of 20 percent over the following decade.

Reid said he favors a 20 percent renewable standard for utilities, but added, "We'll get by with what we can."

Many states already have requirements for utilities to use renewable energy, but attempts in Congress to establish a national mandate have fallen short repeatedly because of regional divisions. Lawmakers from the Southeast particularly have argued that utilities in their area would be hard pressed to meet a federal standard because they lack wind or solar energy resources.

Reid said he also favors some additional tax incentives aimed at spurring energy efficiency, especially for construction of more energy efficient buildings.

"We've got to give people incentives to build better buildings and also do something about the buildings that are there right now," said Reid.

But Reid said he doesn't expect the Senate to tackle the issue of offshore oil drilling again.

While Congress last fall ended a drilling moratorium that covered 85 percent of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf, Reid said he's convinced that Obama's Interior Department will protect those areas where drilling shouldn't be allowed.

"I don't think we need to do anything legislatively," he said.

Interior Secretary Ken Salazar recently scrapped a Bush administration blueprint for offshore energy development through 2015 and said he was developing a new plan, keeping in mind that some areas are not suitable for drilling and putting greater emphasis on developing wind and wave energy projects offshore.

=====

The Prince of hypocrites: Charles embarks on 16,000 mile 'green' crusade... aboard a private jet

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1145127/The-Prince-hypocrites-Charles-embarks-16-000-mile-green-crusade--aboard-private-jet.html#>

By [Rebecca English](#)
14th February 2009

Prince Charles was accused of hypocrisy last night for using a private jet on an 'environmental' tour of South America.

The prince will travel to the region next month in a visit costing an estimated £300,000 as part of his crusade against global warming.

He will use a luxury airliner to transport himself, the Duchess of Cornwall and a 14-strong entourage to Chile, Brazil and Ecuador on a 16,400-mile round trip.

Another holiday: Prince Charles and Camilla will go to Chile, Brazil and Ecuador

Aides insist it is impossible for the prince to complete the ten-day official visit using scheduled flights as he will undertake almost 40 engagements.

They also stress that he will offset his carbon emissions.



But last night critics seized on his choice of transport. Labour MP Ian Davidson, a member of the Commons Public Accounts Committee, said: 'It would be hard to make this up.'

'To hear that the Prince of Wales is flying to South America to save the environment and taking 14 staff on his jet at hideous cost just for this trip is the height of the absurd.'

'At a time when the greed of bankers is causing much adverse comment I would have thought that Prince Charles would have had more sense than to be so financially and ecologically wasteful.'



Luxury: Charles's Airbus A319, like above, is equipped with his own VIP suite

The prince's determination to bring environmental issues to the forefront of public policymaking has been regularly praised but has also left him open to accusations of hypocrisy.

He was roundly criticised for flying first class to the U.S. with a 20-strong entourage to collect an environmental award in 2007.

He has also been pilloried for continuing to use gas-guzzling transport, although he has converted his classic Aston Martin to run on biofuel made from wine.

Charles and Camilla will arrive for their spring tour in Chile on March 8 and end their trip with a visit to the Galapagos Islands to mark the 200th anniversary of the birth of Charles Darwin.

The couple will be flying with an exclusive Portuguese-based charter company, which cannot be named for security reasons, in an Airbus A319.

As a commercial aircraft it would have carried up to 134 passengers but now seats just 29.

The company boasts its private jets have an exclusive 'VIP lounge' at the front of the cabin which can be split into a master suite with its own toilet and shower. The aircraft also boasts a satellite phone, printer, fax and laptop sockets and 'luxury VIP leather seats' with personal DVD players.

The cost of the trip will not be revealed until the prince releases his annual accounts later this year but it is expected to exceed £300,000.

Charles intends to use the trip to focus on issues of environmental sustainability and

A 322-TON CARBON FOOTPRINT

CHARLES'S tour of South America will leave a carbon footprint of 322 tons, according to experts.

The Carbon Managers company, which carries out carbon audits, worked out the figure using an air industry average of 100 grams of carbon dioxide per kilometre per passenger.

The prince and his entourage are travelling an estimated 26,367 kilometres (16,400 miles) on their round trip from London taking in Chile, Brazil and

Ecuador. That means the plane will emit 327,000 kilograms of CO₂, equal to around 322 tons.

A spokesman for the Carbon Managers said: 'This is a subjective figure as you need to take account of the weight of the plane, wind speeds on the day and other factors but it is a relatively accurate estimate.'

'Although the plane isn't going to be full, the amount of luggage they have will fairly much cancel out the lack of passengers.'

climate change as well as the wider ties between Britain and South America.

In Brazil, where he will visit Rio de Janeiro and the Amazon, he will concentrate on the problem of tropical deforestation, while in Chile he will try to enlist the help of the business community in building partnerships with the public sector to fight global warming.

Clive Alderton, the prince's deputy private secretary, stressed yesterday that the prince had undertaken the trip at the specific request of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

'The issues of climate change and creating a high growth, low carbon economy are of great importance to both the Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister,' he said.

'As the Government put it to me: we are fortunate to have, in the Prince of Wales, someone with 40 years of work and experience on environmental issues who can help lead the charge for Britain in the battle for countries which sit on the frontline of climate change.' As for the question of how much the tour would cost the public purse, Clarence House stressed that it had taken advice from the Government given the current economic climate.

Mr Alderton said: 'In this time of economic uncertainty we are extremely mindful of the cost and sought advice from the Government, who confirmed they wanted the trip to proceed given the importance of the strategic priorities that the visit would address and the bilateral diplomatic relations it would strengthen.'

He added: 'We looked at all available options of travel but the impracticability of moving around the region on scheduled flights meant that we had to take the charter option.'

'Financially, we have secured the best deal that we possibly can.'

Last year Charles launched The Prince's Rainforests Project.

It works with governments, business, non-governmental bodies and individuals to increase global recognition of the contribution of tropical deforestation to climate change and to find ways to make the rainforests worth more alive than dead.

Additional reporting: Tom Kelly

=====

Nuke Global Warming

February 12, 9:26 AM

by PAUL TAYLOR, LA Ecopolitics Examiner

<http://www.examiner.com/x-3089-LA-Ecopolitics-Examiner~y2009m2d12-Nuke-Global-Warming>

In this time of global recession, it's high time that the green axis of antagonism stop its obsessive obstructions of future growth and prosperity. Big green nonprofit groups routinely invest massive idle assets in offshore hedge funds and private equity. Green groups grew from 2,000 to over 4,000 during the 1990s. According to The Chronicle of Philanthropy in 2007, eco-nonprofits in the US received about \$1.5 billion in untaxed revenues to spew global warming propaganda. Environmentalists' fascination with unproven and inadequate alternative energies must give way to massive expansion in nuclear power plants. Today's solar and wind power operate at 25% efficiency on an annual basis, while nuclear power operates at 85% efficiency. (<http://philanthropy.com/>)

The US and other industrialized countries are still using 19th Century electric power generation technologies in the 21st Century. The Wall Street Journal has reported that the US, only 4% of the nation's electricity is generated by oil, compared with 52% by coal, 15% by natural gas, 19% by nuclear reactors and less than 10% by renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, hydroelectric, etc. Today, 103 nuclear power plants account for 19% of the US electric power supply. One half of the US uranium that powers those plants comes from recycled Russian nuclear weapons Cold War disarmaments. There are 430 nuclear power plants operating in 31 countries worldwide. The energy from one pound of uranium is equivalent to 1.3 million pounds of coal energy. Nuclear power produces none of the greenhouse gases associated with global warming.

Geopolitics, technology, economics and even some environmentalists are moving toward nuclear power. Western governments are concerned that most of the world's oil and gas is in the hands of hostile or unreliable governments. Much of the nuclear industry's raw material, uranium, is conveniently located in friendly

places such as Australia and Canada. Simpler reactor designs cut maintenance and repair costs. Shut-downs are now far less frequent, so that a typical US nuclear power plant operates 90% of the time, up from less than 50% in the 1970s. New “passive safety” features can shut a reactor down in an emergency without the need for human intervention. Today’s nuclear engineering uses the new approach where most of the radioactive portion of the reactor waste from conventional nuclear power plants is isolated and burned in “fast” reactors. Technology has vastly improved nuclear power’s economics and safety since the accidents of Three Mile Island in the US and Chernobyl in the Ukraine of twenty and thirty years ago.

The Bush administration enacted the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to provide government incentives for alternative energy research, development and facility siting – including expanded and new nuclear power facilities. California lawmakers imposed a moratorium on the building of new nuclear power plants in 1976. And unfortunately, Californians approved the California Global Warming Solutions Act in 2006 (Assembly Bill 32) that mandates reductions of greenhouse gases associated with global warming. This legislation would eventually place a “carbon tax” on California coal-fired and natural gas power plants that provide our electricity. The tax would theoretically force the conversion to alternative energies – wind, solar, geothermal, etc. But, today wind and solar power costs are about fifty cents per kilowatt hour, while conventional coal and natural gas cost about ten cents per kilowatt hour. These cost differentials under a carbon tax will punish any prosperity, and impose severe economic hardships upon those unfortunates among us who can least afford them. Proposed carbon taxes or carbon trading (presently estimated at \$20 to \$40 per ton of carbon dioxide released) would significantly inflate the production costs of conventional coal and oil-based power plants, and make nuclear more viable. Any pricing of carbon emissions will cause a global re-structuring of public power facilities and a commensurate re-pricing in global energy markets.

(<http://www.ne.doe.gov/energyPolicyAct2005/neEPACT2a.html>)
(<http://www.calnews.com>)

The hyper interest in climate change and global warming has also made nuclear power attractive. Nuclear power offers the possibility of large quantities of base load electricity that is cleaner than coal, more secure than gas, and more reliable than wind or solar energy alternatives. And if cars switch from oil-based fuels to plug-in electricity, the demand for power generated from carbon-free nuclear sources will increase still further. A recent UK poll showed 30% of the population against nuclear power, compared with 60% three years ago. A US poll in 2007 showed 50% in favor of expanding nuclear power, up from 44% in 2001.

(<http://www.hudson.org/>)

=====

<http://www.oregister.com/articles/global-warming-earth-2295334-gore-called>

Sunday, February 1, 2009

Deroy Murdock: Even the Left's now laughing at global warming

<http://www.oregister.com/articles/global-warming-earth-2295334-gore-called>

By DEROY MURDOCK

Syndicated columnist

SAN FRANCISCO -- So-called "global warming" has shrunk from problem to punch line. And now, Leftists are laughing, too. It's hard not to chuckle at the idea of Earth boiling in a carbon caldron when the news won't cooperate:

- Nearly four inches of snow blanketed the United Arab Emirates' Jebel Jais region for just the second time in recorded history Jan. 24. Citizens were speechless. The local dialect has no word for snowfall.
- Dutchmen on ice skates sped past windmills as canals in Holland froze in mid-January for the first time since 1997. Defense Minister Eimert van Middelkoop, who inhabits a renovated 17th Century windmill, stumbled on the ice and fractured his wrist.
- January saw northern Minnesota's temperatures plunge to 38 below zero, forcing ski-resort closures. A Frazee, Minn., dog-sled race was canceled, due to excessive snow. Snow whitened beaches in Surf City, N.C. Days ago, ice glazed Florida's citrus groves.

As Earth faces global cooling, both troglodyte Right-wingers and lachrymose Left-wingers find Albert Gore's simmering-planet hypothesis increasingly hilarious:

- "In terms of (global warming's) capacity to cause the human species harm, I don't think it makes it into the top 10," Dr. Robert Giegengack, former chairman of University of Pennsylvania's Earth and Environmental Sciences Department, told the Pennsylvania Gazette. Giegengack voted for Gore in 2000, and says he likely would again.
- Commentator Harold Ambler declared Jan. 3 on HuffingtonPost.com that he voted for Barack Obama "for a thousand times a thousand reasons." He added that Gore "owes the world an apology for his actions regarding global warming." He called Gore's assertion that "the science is in" on this issue "the biggest whopper ever sold to the public in the history of mankind."

•"Not only is it false that human activity has any significant effect on global warming or the weather in general, but for the record, global warming is over," retired Navy meteorologist Dr. Martin Hertzberg wrote on carbon-sense.com. The physical chemist and self-described "scientist and lifelong liberal Democrat" added: "The average temperature of Earth's atmosphere has declined over the last 10 years. From the El Niño Year of 1998 until January 2007, it dropped a quarter of a degree Celsius (0.45 degrees Fahrenheit). From January 2007 to the spring of 2008, it dropped a whopping three-quarters of a degree Celsius (1.35 degrees Fahrenheit). Those data further prove that the fear-mongering hysteria about human-caused global warming is completely unjustified and is totally counterproductive to our nation's essential needs and security."

•"It is a tribute to the scientific ignorance of politicians and journalists that they keep regurgitating the nonsense about human-caused global warming," veteran left-wing commentator and Nation magazine columnist Alexander Cockburn wrote. "The greenhouse fear mongers rely on unverified, crudely oversimplified models to finger mankind's sinful contribution – and carbon trafficking, just like the old indulgences, is powered by guilt, credulity, cynicism, and greed."

Some leftists believe the collective hallucination of warmism distracts from what they consider urgent progressive priorities:

•"The most destructive force on the planet is power-driven financiers and profit-driven corporations and their cartels backed by military might," University of Ottawa physics professor Dr. Denis Rancourt has written. "The global warming myth is a red herring that contributes to hiding this truth."

•Social historian Dr. David Noble of Canada's York University concurs. He has lamented that warmism is "diverting attention from the radical challenges of the global justice movements."

•Geophysicist Dr. Claude Allegre, previously education minister in France's late 1990s Socialist government, denounced the "prophets of doom of global warming." He sounded amused in a September 2006 L'Express article. "The ecology of helpless protesting has become a very lucrative business for some people."

"The so-called 'consensus' on man-made global warming is not holding up," Oklahoma Republican Sen. James Inhofe told his colleagues Jan. 8. "It is becoming increasingly clear that skepticism about man-made global warming fear is not a partisan left-vs.-right issue."

So-called "global warming" has accomplished the impossible: It has united liberals and conservatives in laughter.

=====

Don't Count on 'Countless' Green Jobs

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123509599682529113.html>

FEBRUARY 20, 2009

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

WSJ.com

The evidence shows alternative energy is expensive.

By **MAX SCHULZ**

In signing the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act this week in Denver, President Barack Obama claimed that the law -- which among other things will ramp up funding for renewable energy development -- is "laying the groundwork for new green energy economies that can create countless well-paying jobs."

This statement follows promises he made during his campaign for the presidency. Mr. Obama said, for example, that he'd create as many as five million such jobs by investing over \$150 billion over 10 years on wind, solar, biofuels and other renewable energy sources.

He's also proposed a federal "renewable portfolio standard" that would require 25% of our electricity to come from clean sources -- a mandate that would boost demand for windmills, solar farms, and other clean but expensive technologies (nuclear power, however, would be excluded). This transformed energy economy, Mr. Obama said at a campaign debate in Nashville, Tenn., last October, would be an "engine of economic growth" to rival the computer.

If the green-jobs claim sounds too good to be true, that's because it is.

There's an unavoidable problem with renewable-energy technologies: From an economic standpoint, they're big losers. Renewables simply cannot produce the large volumes of useful, reliable energy that our economy needs at attractive prices, which is exactly why government subsidizes them.

The subsidies involved are considerable. The U.S. Energy Information Administration reported in early 2008 that the government subsidizes solar energy at \$24.34 per megawatt-hour (MWh) and wind power at \$23.37 per MWh. Yet even with decades of these massive handouts, as well as numerous state-level mandates for utilities to use green power, wind and solar energy contribute less than 1% of our nation's electricity.

Compare the subsidies to renewables with those extended to natural gas (25 cents per MWh in subsidies), coal (44 cents), hydroelectricity (67 cents), and nuclear

power (\$1.59). These are the energy sources (along with oil, which undergirds transportation) that do the heavy lifting in our energy economy.

The alternative technologies at the heart of Mr. Obama's plan, relying on mandates and far greater handouts, will inevitably raise energy prices -- and high power prices are job killers. Industries that make physical products, whether cars or chemicals or paper cups, are energy-intensive and gravitate to low-cost-energy locales.

With some of the highest electricity prices in the country, California and New York have hemorrhaged manufacturing jobs. California-based Google houses its massive server farms in states like North Carolina and Oregon, which have lower electricity costs. Policies that drive up energy costs nationwide, as Mr. Obama intends, will inevitably drive more manufacturing jobs overseas.

What about jobs in the traditional industries currently supplying Americans with reliable, affordable energy? The American Petroleum Institute reports that the oil and gas industry employs 1.6 million Americans. Coal mining directly and indirectly supports hundreds of thousands of jobs, according to the National Mining Association and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. A radical plan to transform our energy economy will put an untold number of these men and women out of work.

Digging deeper each month to pay for expensive renewable energy, consumers will have less to save or spend in other areas of the economy. Killing jobs in efficient industries to create jobs in inefficient ones is hardly a recipe for economic success. There may be legitimate arguments for taking dramatic steps to fight climate change. Boosting the economy isn't one of them.

Mr. Schulz is a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute's Center for Energy Policy and the Environment. This op-ed is adapted from the forthcoming Winter issue of City Journal.

=====