

February 7, 2010

Saturday was the [99th anniversary of Reagan's birth](#). Paul Kengor, professor of political science at Grove City College, and one of Reagan's biographers shares a story.

... Reagan was just plain likable. Of all the subjects I've studied, few were as universally liked. Sure, Reagan, as president, was demonized by the Left, but that's what the Left does: indecent, ugly rage. Still, even most liberals muster nice words about Reagan personally.

Central to that likability was Reagan's humility. The word "I" didn't dominate his conversation, unless he was poking fun at himself. He was no narcissist. Ronald Reagan was not full of pride; he was thoroughly unpossessed of self-love.

And so, with that background, I'd like to take the opportunity presented by Reagan's time of year — not to mention the month of Presidents' Day — to share an anecdote that was told to me by Bill Clark, Reagan's close friend and most significant adviser. ...

[David Warren](#) discusses how every major claim of "climate science" was fabricated.

...To my survey, there is not a single aspect of the "anthropogenic global warming" hypothesis that has been left standing by recent revelations, and more shoes drop every day. ...

...the disgraced Dr. Phil Jones, the former boss of the East Anglia operation, now implicated in various cover-ups, attempts to intimidate and silence skeptics, and purposeful breaches of Britain's freedom of information act. I'm sure he "believed" in what he was doing.

Like communist apparatchiks in the good old days, a global warm-alarmist may "honestly" think he is serving a higher purpose, that he is on "the right side of history," that he must cut a few corners for the greater good, that the end will eventually justify the means. Read Dostoevsky on this. The book is Crime and Punishment, and the character is Raskolnikov. By subtle increments a failure of candour degenerates into major-league crime.

Not only all the numbers, but all the assumptions behind "AGW" -- not "most," but all -- have depended on the manipulation of facts by persons who had an interest in manipulating them. Often the specific incident is small, but the falsehood is cumulative. Investment in the illusion grows, the stakes become too large to forfeit. Yet the reality remains: that we still don't know any more about long-term human influence on climate than Punxsutawney Phil can know by observing his own shadow. ...

[Michael Barone](#) says climate scientists are on his list of the most distrusted professions. We take exception to his inclusion of trial lawyers being on the list, as we know some who are good, principled people. Perhaps he might include politicians and MSM reporters instead. Speaking of the MSM, where are they on this story?

Quick, name the most distrusted occupations. Trial lawyers? Pretty scuzzy, as witness the disgraced John Edwards, kept from the vice presidency in 2004 by the electoral votes of Ohio. Used car dealers? Always near the bottom of the list, as witness the universal understanding of the word "clunker."

But over the last three months a new profession has moved smartly up the list and threatens to overtake all. Climate scientist. ...

... "The global warming movement as we have known it is dead," writes Walter Russell Mead of the Council on Foreign Relations in The American Interest. "The movement died from two causes: bad science and bad politics."

Some decades hence, I suspect, people will look back and wonder why so many government, corporate and media elites were taken in by propaganda that was based on such shoddy and dishonest evidence. And taken in to the point that they advocated devoting trillions of dollars to a cause that was based on flagrant dishonesty and dissembling. ...

It's [Mark Steyn's](#) turn to roast the global-warming-sky-is-falling crowd.

Whenever I write about "climate change," a week or two later there's a flurry of letters whose general line is: la-la-la can't hear you. Dan Gajewski of Ottawa provided a typical example in our Dec. 28 issue. I'd written about the East Anglia Climatic Research Unit's efforts to "hide the decline," and mentioned that Phil Jones, their head honcho, had now conceded what I'd been saying for years—that there has been no "global warming" since 1997. Tim Flannery, Australia's numero uno warm-monger, subsequently confirmed this on Oz TV, although he never had before. ...

...But where did all these experts get the data from?...

...That's it? One article from 12 years ago in a pop-science mag? Oh, but don't worry, back in 1999 Fred did a quickie telephone interview with a chap called Syed Hasnain of Jawaharlal Nehru University in Delhi. And this Syed Hasnain cove presumably knows a thing or two about glaciers.

Well, yes. But he now says he was just idly "speculating"; he didn't do any research or anything like that.

But so what? His musings were wafted upwards through the New Scientist to the World Wildlife Fund to the IPCC to a global fait accompli: the glaciers are disappearing. Everyone knows that. You're not a denier, are you? India's environment minister, Jairam Ramesh, says there was not "an iota of scientific evidence" to support the 2035 claim. Yet that proved no obstacle to its progress through the alarmist establishment. Dr. Murari Lal, the "scientist" who included the 2035 glacier apocalypse in the IPCC report, told Britain's Mail on Sunday that he knew it wasn't based on "peer-reviewed science" but "we thought we should put it in"—for political reasons. ...

V. K. Raina, of the Geological Survey of India, produced a special report demonstrating that the run-for-your-life-the-glaciers-are-melting IPCC scenario was utterly false. For his pains, Dr. Rajendra Pachauri, the self-aggrandizing old bruiser and former railroad engineer who serves as head honcho of the IPCC jet set, dismissed Mr. Raina's research as "voodoo science." He's now been obliged to admit the voodoo was all on his side. But don't worry. By 2008, Syed Hasnain's decade-old casual chit-chat over the phone to a London journalist had become "settled science," so Dr. Pachauri's company TERI (The Energy & Resources Institute) approached the Carnegie Corporation for a grant to research "challenges to South Asia posed by melting Himalayan glaciers," and was rewarded with half a million bucks. Which they promptly used to hire Syed Hasnain. In other words, professor Hasnain has landed a cushy gig researching solutions to an entirely non-existent global crisis he accidentally invented over a 15-minute phone call 10 years earlier. As they say in the glacier business, ice work if you can get it. ...

In the [WSJ](#), [Eric Felten](#) says that the corruption, deception, and back-stabbing we are witnessing in various scientific communities is better drama than most soap-opera writers could produce.

This has not been the proudest of weeks for science. Twelve years after publishing an article purporting to prove a link between childhood vaccines and autism, the prominent British medical journal Lancet finally retracted the paper in its entirety. But only after Britain's General Medical Council found that the author of that article had been "irresponsible and dishonest" in his research, bringing medical science "into disrepute."

That wasn't the only controversy involving scholarly journals and the reputations of researchers to flare up this week. Also in Britain, two prominent stem-cell researchers went to the BBC with their complaint that the peer review system has become corrupt. Flawed and unoriginal work gets published and promoted, while publication of truly original findings is often delayed or rejected, according to Austin Smith of Cambridge University and Robin Lovell-Badge of the National Institute for Medical Research.

...Not all such news comes from Britain, of course. Scott S. Reuben, formerly of Baystate Medical Center in Springfield, Mass., and until recently a prominent researcher in pain medications, agreed last month to plead guilty to a federal charge of fabricating scientific data. The anesthesiologist had phoned-up results in as many as 21 articles published in scientific journals to secure funding from credulous pharmaceutical companies.

Or how about the case of Cello Energy of Alabama? Investors had poured millions into the company, which claimed it had devised a high-tech process for turning wood pulp and grasses into biodiesel. The Environmental Protection Agency had been counting on the firm to produce more than half of the "cellulosic biofuel" in the country this year. Belatedly, the moneymen decided to do some due diligence and took a sample of Cello's biodiesel to an independent lab—and found that it was just old-fashioned fossil fuel dressed up in a new green bottle. In June a federal jury in Alabama found that investors had been defrauded and ordered Cello to pay \$10.4 million in punitive damages. What are the odds that, with the government belching billions into green technology research, we will see repeats of the Cello fiasco?...

[David Harsanyi](#) has an interesting opinion on Rahm Emmanuel's comment.

...In truth, in nearly every way the lives of the mentally disabled have vastly improved, from the care they receive to the quality of their lives to the respect they are given.

Though I've heard the r-word thrown around plenty (often, I'm sure you'll be shocked to learn, directed at me) I can't recall anyone using it as a pejorative to describe a person who was actually disabled. Far from ridiculing the disabled, our culture has humanized them.

Emanuel certainly deserves to be reprimanded. But if his offense is worthy of losing a job, you have to wonder if we really are a nation of the perpetually offended.

In [American.com](#), [Max Schultz](#) takes a fascinating look at the new technology in drilling and transporting natural gas, and discusses the political and economic implications that will be felt worldwide. Here is an overview of the drilling advances:

...The first profound shift was made possible by a little-noticed technological breakthrough in the last three years that has changed the way we extract natural gas. Engineers now make use of two important innovations. One is horizontal, or directional, drilling, which permits wells to move laterally beneath the surface instead of going straight down. This technology minimizes the number of holes that have to be drilled, leaving a smaller surface footprint and accessing a larger area. The other technology is hydraulic fracturing, used to extract gas trapped in porous shale rock. In this process, also known as fracking, water and chemicals are pumped at tremendous pressure into shale rock formations to push gas into pockets for easier recovery.

By marrying and perfecting the two processes into a technology called horizontal fracking, engineering has virtually created, from nothing, new natural gas resources, previously regarded as inaccessibly locked in useless shale deposits. Suddenly, the mammoth shale formations in Texas, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York, North Dakota, and elsewhere have the potential to produce abundant amounts of gas for decades to come.

...

Proven reserves of natural gas in the United States have been revised upward by 50 percent in the last decade, and those numbers are sure to climb higher as more shale gas is discovered. Perhaps not surprisingly, other nations are sending geologists to the United States to study techniques for extracting gas from unconventional sources. China, India, and Australia all have enormous shale fields. In the coming decades, the shale gale won't be just an American phenomenon; it will blow all over the globe. ...

The Corner

[Ronnie and Joe](#) [Paul Kengor]

Today marks the 99th anniversary of Ronald Reagan's birth. In a telling development, Republicans around the country have begun holding Reagan Day dinners, as they've long traditionally done every February for Abraham Lincoln. This is yet another spontaneous display of affection for Reagan.

Having written so much on the man, I get lots of questions about Reagan this time of year, running the gamut from his domestic achievements to his historic foreign-policy triumph: peacefully ending the Cold War. Sometimes I get asked for unreported anecdotes reflecting on his personality and character. I have a bunch of those, which were eagerly shared with me by people who met Reagan (he talked to anyone) or were dug up from the thousands of letters Reagan wrote to everyday Americans over a long lifetime. (See [my NRO article on Reagan and Ruth Smith of Idaho](#).)

Reagan was just plain likable. Of all the subjects I've studied, few were as universally liked. Sure, Reagan, as president, was demonized by the Left, but that's what the Left does: indecent, ugly rage. Still, even most liberals muster nice words about Reagan personally.

Central to that likability was Reagan's humility. The word "I" didn't dominate his conversation, unless he was poking fun at himself. He was no narcissist. Ronald Reagan was not full of pride; he was thoroughly unpossessed of self-love.

And so, with that background, I'd like to take the opportunity presented by Reagan's time of year — not to mention the month of Presidents' Day — to share an anecdote that was told to me by Bill Clark, Reagan's close friend and most significant adviser.

At the time this happened, Clark was serving as Reagan's national-security adviser. He had previously been deputy secretary of state, and would later be appointed secretary of the interior. His driver all this time was a man named Joe Bullock, a Georgia native who had moved to Washington during the Great Depression. Joe was a victim of the cruel Jim Crow laws that afflicted the South. He went to Washington for a better life.

Joe first found employment as a mule driver. He eventually began chauffeuring various senior people in the federal government, some of whom, including a high-level figure in the Carter administration, didn't treat him well; in fact, that previous cabinet secretary didn't speak a word to Joe in three years.

Thus, Joe was taken aback when Bill Clark not only talked to him, asking questions about his life and family, but also asked whether he could sit up front. Clark rode shotgun with Joe, drawing more than a few stares and safety concerns as well, since Clark, given his influence in national security, was a target of America's enemies.

One morning, Clark's father visited Washington. He hit it off with Joe. Clark's father was a rancher, a man of

the West. He gave Joe a gift: a Western-style belt, with a kind of “John Wayne belt buckle,” as Clark described it. Joe loved it, proudly displaying it by always leaving his blue suit-jacket unbuttoned.

That belt soon assumed a life of its own. A state visit by England’s Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip was upcoming, and protocol demanded that the White House provide gifts. Clark, Reagan, and a few others brainstormed following a morning briefing. For Philip, Clark suggested a “Western belt.” He had one in mind, made by Si Jenkins, a Santa Barbara friend of both Clark and the president. (Reagan, too, was a California rancher.)

“Well, what does it look like?” asked Reagan. Clark noted he had a model in the car: Joe, who was wearing the belt. “Send him up,” ordered the president. They called for Joe, who entered via the door of Reagan’s secretary.

Joe had worked for the federal government for half a century, but had never been within 50 yards of the Oval Office. He walked in. He saw Clark, Vice President Bush, the senior aides, and the president of the United States. He was in awe, overcome. Suddenly, this tough six-foot-four man began weeping: He had come so far since Jim Crow and the Great Depression. He was choked up.

No one in the room was prepared for that reaction. They were dead silent, uncomfortable, unable to respond — except for Ronald Reagan. The president rose, walked over to the driver, extended his hand, breathed in, and said matter-of-factly, “Mr. Bullock, I understand you have a belt to show me?”

It was an “everyman” touch. And it put old Joe immediately at ease. Business-like, Joe showed the belt, and then he and Reagan began swapping stories, chatting away like old friends.

“The rest of us just faded away,” said Bill Clark, “as the two got along famously.” President and driver, remembering the old days.

Bullock left with a story to tell his fellow drivers, and his grandchildren. He died a few years later.

No, this anecdote is nothing dramatic. It’s not like challenging Gorbachev to tear down the wall. It’s simply another of many small stories I hear constantly about Ronald Reagan. This was a good president and a good man. The White House needs more of them. That’s a thought worth bearing in mind this February.

Paul Kengor is professor of political science at Grove City College. His books include [The Judge: William P. Clark, Ronald Reagan's Top Hand](#), [God and Ronald Reagan](#), and [The Crusader: Ronald Reagan and the Fall of Communism](#).

Ottawa Citizen **Resisting temptation**

by David Warren

Yesterday was Candlemas, and therefore also Groundhog Day. Punxsutawney Phil, the weather-prognosticating groundhog of Gobbler's Knob, predicted six more weeks of "global cooling." I use that term with the same abandon as might the IPCC, of course: technically, the animal only predicts six more weeks "of winter." I'm not sure how far away from his location in Pennsylvania the prediction is meant to apply.

In fact, I've never been able to get a clear answer to this, just as my reader will never get a clear answer from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change -- which, together with Al Gore, an immense groundhog-like creature who crawls frequently out of a hole in Tennessee, constitutes our chief media source of climatological "settled science." (A contradiction of terms.)

We've been given some clear answers that weren't serious, ranging from the famed "hockey stick" diagram, that entirely misrepresented planetary temperature trends; to smaller assertions such as, "all the glaciers in the Himalayas will have melted by the year 2035." This latter we now know was made up from whole cloth, like the polar bear die-off, and a great deal of nonsense about Arctic and Antarctic ice cover.

To my survey, there is not a single aspect of the "anthropogenic global warming" hypothesis that has been left standing by recent revelations, and more shoes drop every day.

It's better than that: Sir David King, the British government's former "chief scientist," has even had to abandon his arguably paranoid claim that "highly sophisticated" foreign intelligence services and/or wealthy rightwing Americans were behind the e-mail leak from the University of East Anglia, that touched off the bottomless "Climategate" scandal in November. For as he admitted to the Guardian on Monday (hardly a rightwing newspaper), he had simply failed to follow the story.

All the e-mails were hacked through a single server. They included e-mails saved from as far back as 1996, and various data sets that fatally undermined the credibility of the whole international "anthropogenic global warming" research effort -- by illustrating conscious selection of statistics, and direct manipulation of reporting in scientific publications, by major players.

From what I can see, I doubt Sir David was dishonest. He had simply averted his eyes from inconvenient truths. This is a very common human foible, and scientists are, I insist, human beings. Had he been following the story he would have grasped that everything came through one server, that the information had not been cherry-picked by some nefarious spy agency over 14 years.

I might almost say the same for the disgraced Dr. Phil Jones, the former boss of the East Anglia operation, now implicated in various cover-ups, attempts to intimidate and silence skeptics, and purposeful breaches of Britain's freedom of information act. I'm sure he "believed" in what he was doing.

Like communist apparatchiks in the good old days, a global warm-alarmist may "honestly" think he is serving a higher purpose, that he is on "the right side of history," that he must cut a few corners for the greater good, that the end will eventually justify the means. Read Dostoevsky on this. The book is Crime and Punishment, and the character is Raskolnikov. By subtle increments a failure of candour degenerates into major-league crime.

Not only all the numbers, but all the assumptions behind "AGW" -- not "most," but all -- have depended on the manipulation of facts by persons who had an interest in manipulating them. Often the specific incident is small, but the falsehood is cumulative. Investment in the illusion grows, the stakes become too large to forfeit. Yet the reality remains: that we still don't know any more about long-term human influence on climate than Punxsutawney Phil can know by observing his own shadow.

This should have been obvious to climatologists from the beginning. At the simplest level, they could observe that global temperature estimates depended on a slur of constantly changing thermometer locations and time sequences. NASA's recent admissions are the more pathetic for that reason: from the top down, these were men who should have known better than to think they could fly beyond the end of such a limb.

I have argued previously for chastity: not limited to the sexual sense, of keeping one's pants on. The virtue of chastity requires us to look at the world without immediately engaging our desires. Those desires are often not sexual at all; some of the most powerful involve justifying one's livelihood. A scientist with an interest in getting a result is under huge temptation, compounded by the huge public funding on which his research depends.

Our mysterious capacity for chastity can put us above the animal level: for if we try, we can actually remove the blinkers of, "What's in it for me?" -- and discover truths larger than ourselves. The highest arts and sciences require alike the highest conditions of chastity. It is what lifts us above the groundhogs.

[How climate-change fanatics corrupted science](#)

by Michael Barone



Quick, name the most distrusted occupations. Trial lawyers? Pretty scuzzy, as witness the disgraced John Edwards, kept from the vice presidency in 2004 by the electoral votes of Ohio. Used car dealers? Always near the bottom of the list, as witness the universal understanding of the word "clunker."

But over the last three months a new profession has moved smartly up the list and threatens to overtake all. Climate scientist.

First came the Climategate e-mails made public in November that showed how top-level climate scientists distorted research, plotted to destroy data and conspired to prevent publication of dissenting views. The British government concluded last week that the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit violated the nation's freedom of information act, although the violations occurred too long ago for prosecution.

The CRU has been a major source of data for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which for 20 years has issued alarms about supposed global warming. The e-mails conclusively establish the intellectual dishonesty of the climate scientists at the CRU and their co-conspirators.

Recently there have been even more shocking revelations. The IPCC has claimed that warming will cause the Himalayan glaciers to disappear by 2035. It turns out that that claim was based solely on a pamphlet published by the World Wildlife Federation, based on no science at all. The head of the IPCC was informed that a 1996 report said those glaciers could melt significantly by 2350, not 2035, but he let the claim stand.

As Christopher Booker writes in the Telegraph of London, "A Canadian analyst has identified more than 20 passages in the IPCC's report which cite similarly non-peer-reviewed WWF or Greenpeace reports as their authority." Similarly, the Times of London reports that a claim that warming could endanger "up to 40 percent" of the Amazon rain forest came from an anti-smoking activist and had no scientific basis whatever.

"The global warming movement as we have known it is dead," writes Walter Russell Mead of the Council on Foreign Relations in *The American Interest*. "The movement died from two causes: bad science and bad politics."

Some decades hence, I suspect, people will look back and wonder why so many government, corporate and media elites were taken in by propaganda that was based on such shoddy and dishonest evidence. And taken in to the point that they advocated devoting trillions of dollars to a cause that was based on flagrant dishonesty and dissembling.

There was some basis for concern. If carbon dioxide emissions were the only factor affecting global climate, it is clear that increased emissions would tend to produce warmer temperatures over time. Those temperatures could create problems that rational societies would want to address.

But carbon dioxide emissions are not the only factor affecting global climate. Solar activity and water evaporation and countless other things do too. Climate scientists do not fully understand those things, and how they interact. It is rational for society to want to learn more.

Unfortunately, the cadre of climate scientists who have dominated public discussion and have controlled the IPCC have been demonstrated to be far, far less than trustworthy. Like the theorists who invented epicycles to explain away the failure of Ptolemaic theory to account for astronomical observations, they have distorted science in the interest of something that resembles religious dogma.

The secular religion of global warming has all the elements of a religious faith: original sin (we are polluting the planet), ritual (separate your waste for recycling), redemption (renounce economic growth) and the sale of indulgences (carbon offsets). We are told that we must have faith (all argument must end, as Al Gore likes to say) and must persecute heretics (global warming skeptics are like Holocaust deniers, we are told).

People in the grip of such a religious frenzy evidently feel justified in lying, concealing good evidence and plucking bad evidence from whatever flimsy source may be at hand.

The rest of us, and judging from polls that includes most of the American people, are free to follow a more rational path. In his State of the Union address, Barack Obama alluded to "the overwhelming evidence on climate change." But he felt obliged to add, "even if you doubt the evidence" -- an admission that the evidence is less than overwhelming. On a par with, it seems, the claims of trial lawyers and the assurances of used car salesmen.

Macleans, Canada

[Credibility is what's really melting](#)

by Mark Steyn



Whenever I write about "climate change," a week or two later there's a flurry of letters whose general line is: la-la-la can't hear you. Dan Gajewski of Ottawa provided a typical example in our Dec. 28 issue. I'd written about the East Anglia Climatic Research Unit's efforts to "hide the decline," and mentioned that Phil Jones, their head honcho, had now conceded what I'd been saying for years—that there has been no "global warming" since 1997. Tim Flannery, Australia's numero uno warm-monger, subsequently confirmed this on Oz TV, although he never had before.

In response, Mr. Gajewski wrote to our Letters page: "Steyn's column on climate change was one-sided, juvenile and inarticulate."

Yes, yes, but what Steyn column isn't? That's just business as usual. A more pertinent question is: was any of it, you know, wrong?

Well, our reader didn't want to get hung on footling details: "The disproportionate evidence supports the anthropogenic cause of global warming," he concluded.

Yes, but how did the "evidence" get to be quite so "disproportionate"?

Take the Himalayan glaciers. They're supposed to be entirely melted by 2035. The evidence is totally disproportionate, man. No wonder professor Orville Schell of Berkeley is so upset about it: "Lately, I've been studying the climate-change-induced melting of glaciers in the Greater Himalaya," he wrote. "Understanding the cascading effects of the slow-motion downsizing of one of the planet's most magnificent landforms has, to put it politely, left me dispirited." I'll say. Professor Schell continued: "If you focus on those Himalayan highlands, a deep sense of loss creeps over you—the kind that comes from contemplating the possible end of something once imagined as immovable, immutable, eternal . . ."

Poor chap. Still, you can't blame him for being in the slough of despond. That magnificent landform is melting before his eyes like the illustration of the dripping ice cream cone that accompanied his eulogy for the fast vanishing glaciers. Everyone knows they're gonna be gone in a generation. "The glaciers on the Himalayas are retreating," said Lord Stern, former chief economist of the World Bank and author of the single most influential document on global warming. "We're facing the risk of extreme runoff, with water running straight into the Bay of Bengal and taking a lot of topsoil with it. A few hundred square miles of the Himalayas are the source for all the major rivers of Asia—the Ganges, the Yellow River, the Yangtze—where three billion people live. That's almost half the world's population." And NASA agrees, and so does the UN Environment Programme, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and the World Wildlife Fund, and the respected magazine the New Scientist. The evidence is, like, way disproportionate.

But where did all these experts get the data from? Well, NASA's assertion that Himalayan glaciers "may disappear altogether" by 2030 rests on one footnote, citing the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report from 2007.

In fact, the Fourth Assessment Report suggests 2035 as the likely arrival of Armageddon, but what's half a decade between scaremongers? They rate the likelihood of the glaciers disappearing as "very high"—i.e., more than 90 per cent. And the IPCC was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for that report, so it must be kosher, right? Well, yes, its Himalayan claims rest on a 2005 World Wildlife Fund report called "An Overview of Glaciers."

WWF? Aren't they something to do with pandas and the Duke of Edinburgh? True. But they wouldn't be saying this stuff if they hadn't got the science nailed down, would they? The WWF report relies on an article published in the New Scientist in 1999 by Fred Pearce.

That's it? One article from 12 years ago in a pop-science mag? Oh, but don't worry, back in 1999 Fred did a quickie telephone interview with a chap called Syed Hasnain of Jawaharlal Nehru University in Delhi. And this Syed Hasnain cove presumably knows a thing or two about glaciers.

Well, yes. But he now says he was just idly "speculating"; he didn't do any research or anything like that.

But so what? His musings were wafted upwards through the New Scientist to the World Wildlife Fund to the IPCC to a global fait accompli: the glaciers are disappearing. Everyone knows that. You're not a denier, are you? India's environment minister, Jairam Ramesh, says there was not "an iota of scientific evidence" to support the 2035 claim. Yet that proved no obstacle to its progress through the alarmist establishment. Dr. Murari Lal, the "scientist" who included the 2035 glacier apocalypse in the IPCC report, told Britain's Mail on Sunday that he knew it wasn't based on "peer-reviewed science" but "we thought we should put it in"—for political reasons.

I wonder what else is in that Nobel Peace Prize-winning report for no other reason than “we thought we should put it in.” Don’t forget, the IPCC’s sole source was the cuddly panda crowd over at the World Wildlife Fund. Donna Laframboise, a colleague of mine from the glory days at the National Post, did a simple search of the online version of the IPCC report and discovered dozens of citations of the WWF. It’s the sole source cited for doomsday predictions of glacier melt not only in the Himalayas but also the Andes and the Alps, as well as for a multitude of other topics, from coral reefs to avalanches. This would appear to be in breach of the IPCC’s own guidelines. The WWF is a pressure group. They’re not scientists. They’re not even numerate: one of their more startling glacier-melt claims derives entirely from an arithmetical miscalculation arising from a typing error.

Go back to that Berkeley professor mooning over the loss of that “magnificent landform” he once thought “immutable, eternal.” From his prose style, one might easily assume Orville Schell was a professor of creative writing or some such. In fact, he’s the former dean of the Graduate School of Journalism. Yet, for all the limpid fragrance of his poignant obsequies, professor Schell would seem to lack the one indispensable quality of a journalist: basic curiosity—the same curiosity that led Miss Laframboise to see just how much of the “science” in the IPCC report rested on the assertions of the panda-cuddlers. So instead, professor Schell bid a teary farewell to his beloved landform, even though the glaciers of the western Himalayas are, in fact, increasing.

Likewise, in the years since Syed Hasnain “speculated” about glacial melt, the BBC, the CBC, CNN and thousands of newspapers around the world have hired specialist Environmental Correspondents on lavish salaries. Yet not one of them gave any serious examination to the claims of the IPCC report, or the “science” on which they rested. And, now that the IPCC and WWF have conceded their error, the eco-correspondents are allowing NATO and other dupes to vacuum their records without having to explain why they fell for the scam.

V. K. Raina, of the Geological Survey of India, produced a special report demonstrating that the run-for-your-life-the-glaciers-are-melting IPCC scenario was utterly false. For his pains, Dr. Rajendra Pachauri, the self-aggrandizing old bruiser and former railroad engineer who serves as head honcho of the IPCC jet set, dismissed Mr. Raina’s research as “voodoo science.” He’s now been obliged to admit the voodoo was all on his side. But don’t worry. By 2008, Syed Hasnain’s decade-old casual chit-chat over the phone to a London journalist had become “settled science,” so Dr. Pachauri’s company TERI (The Energy & Resources Institute) approached the Carnegie Corporation for a grant to research “challenges to South Asia posed by melting Himalayan glaciers,” and was rewarded with half a million bucks. Which they promptly used to hire Syed Hasnain. In other words, professor Hasnain has landed a cushy gig researching solutions to an entirely non-existent global crisis he accidentally invented over a 15-minute phone call 10 years earlier. As they say in the glacier business, ice work if you can get it.

“Climate change” is not a story of climate change, which has been a fact of life throughout our planet’s history. It is a far more contemporary story about the corruption of science and “peer review” by hucksters, opportunists and global-government control-freaks. I can see what’s in it for Dr. Pachauri and professor Hasnain, and even for the lowly Environmental Correspondent enjoying a cozy sinecure at a time of newspaper cutbacks in everything from foreign bureaus to arts coverage.

But it’s hard to see what’s in it for Dan Gajewski of Ottawa and the millions of kindred spirits who’ve signed on to this racket and are determined to stick with it. Don’t be the last off a collapsing bandwagon. The scientific “consensus” is melting way faster than the glaciers.

New Episodes Of Scientists Behaving Badly

by Eric Felten

This has not been the proudest of weeks for science. Twelve years after publishing an article purporting to prove a link between childhood vaccines and autism, the prominent British medical journal *Lancet* finally retracted the paper in its entirety. But only after Britain's General Medical Council found that the author of that article had been "irresponsible and dishonest" in his research, bringing medical science "into disrepute."

That wasn't the only controversy involving scholarly journals and the reputations of researchers to flare up this week. Also in Britain, two prominent stem-cell researchers went to the BBC with their complaint that the peer review system has become corrupt. Flawed and unoriginal work gets published and promoted, while publication of truly original findings is often delayed or rejected, according to Austin Smith of Cambridge University and Robin Lovell-Badge of the National Institute for Medical Research.

Why would that happen? To sabotage one's academic competitors, Prof. Smith said. For example, the scientists judging a paper submitted to a journal may be working on similar work themselves, he told the BBC, and can publish their work first if they succeed in hobbling the competition. "It's hard to believe, except you know it's happened to you that papers have been held up for months and months by reviewers asking for experiments that are not fair or relevant."

Those who have followed the tawdry "Climategate" spectacle won't find such allegations all that hard to believe. The more journalists dig into the internal emails of top climate scientists—communications hacked and made public last year—the more examples of manipulation of scholarly journals they find. Just this week, the *Guardian* newspaper noted that Prof. Phil Jones, then head of the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia in England, bragged about scuttling the work of scientists who might have called his own work into question. "Recently rejected two papers [submitted to scholarly journals] from people saying CRU has it wrong," Prof. Jones crowed to another prominent global-warmist, Prof. Michael Mann. "Went to town in both reviews, hopefully successfully." Prof. Jones and his defenders have suggested that anyone shocked by such machinations is naive about the ways of science. That's not exactly the most reassuring of assertions.

Not all such news comes from Britain, of course. Scott S. Reuben, formerly of Baystate Medical Center in Springfield, Mass., and until recently a prominent researcher in pain medications, agreed last month to plead guilty to a federal charge of fabricating scientific data. The anesthesiologist had phoned-up results in as many as 21 articles published in scientific journals to secure funding from credulous pharmaceutical companies.

Or how about the case of Cello Energy of Alabama? Investors had poured millions into the company, which claimed it had devised a high-tech process for turning wood pulp and grasses into biodiesel. The Environmental Protection Agency had been counting on the firm to produce more than half of the "cellulosic biofuel" in the country this year. Belatedly, the moneymen decided to do some due diligence and took a sample of Cello's biodiesel to an independent lab—and found that it was just old-fashioned fossil fuel dressed up in a new green bottle. In June a federal jury in Alabama found that investors had been defrauded and ordered Cello to pay \$10.4 million in punitive damages. What are the odds that, with the government belching billions into green technology research, we will see repeats of the Cello fiasco?

In the popular mind, there have been three basic cultural templates for science. The first is the white-coated demigod whose selfless, often self-sacrificing, quest for knowledge unlocks the secrets of the universe and rescues humanity. The real-life exemplars are the Marie Curies and Jonas Salks, but the paradigm informs even such confections as the film "Stallion Road," where Ronald Reagan plays a veterinarian who risks death to battle an anthrax outbreak. More common in pop culture has been a second image, of scientists who dare to reveal secrets best kept under padlock, and who destroy themselves or others in the process. Drs. Frankenstein, Jekyll and Strangelove may be mad, but at least they're capable. The third basic image is

the comic one, featuring the nerdy, distracted, nutty professors who shrink the kids when they aren't coming up with flubber.

Will the parade of dime-store doomsayers, high-tech patent-medicine merchants and bureaucratic grant-grubbers establish a fourth stock scientist: the cheat, the humbug, the phony? Call him Professor Marvel, who wasn't a whiz of a wiz if ever a wiz there wasn't.

Maybe the recent misadventures among the laboratory set will go largely unnoticed. That's what climate honcho Rajendra Pachauri hopes. He's been busy trying to shrug off the definitive revelation late last year that Himalayan glaciers will not disappear in a few decades, as had been claimed with high confidence by his U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. It turns out that there was no scientific evidence for the apocalyptic assertion, although Mr. Pachauri keeps insisting that we should be satisfied to learn it was an honest mistake and that he had no idea it was bunk.

Perhaps such spectacles won't penetrate too deeply into the public consciousness. But I suspect they already have. Just this week I was chatting with a friend who, over the years, has helped her kids slog through the obligatory science-fair projects.

"The experiments never turned out the way they were supposed to, and so we were always having to fudge the results so that the projects wouldn't be screwy. I always felt guilty about that dishonesty," she said, "but now I feel like we were doing real science."

Denver Post

[Are we that thin-skinned?](#)

by David Harsanyi

White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel is notoriously profane and uncouth. So it's not surprising that The Wall Street Journal reported this week that Emanuel had referred to some congressional Democrats as "retarded" in a private meeting with strategists. This has sparked a national kerfuffle.

Who can quarrel about the word "retarded" in this context? It is obnoxious and unnecessary. We should do our best to avoid it. After all, our goal as Americans must be to offend the guilty (some congressional Democrats) without dragging the innocent (the mentally disabled) into the fray.

But what was even more disturbing than finding out that political hacks use demeaning references in private assemblies? It was watching those who usually complain about political correctness dig deep for some of their own artificial outrage and begin play-acting the victim.

Do conservatives really believe that an impolite utterance in private should be a firing offense? To begin with, the word "retard," unlike many other purposefully disparaging words, has legitimate meanings beyond insult. An example? Rahm Emanuel has a severe case of ideological retardation.

What is this guy supposed to do now, anyway? Emanuel apologized to the mental disabled. He *sincerely* apologized to the mentally disabled. He apologized to the head of the Special Olympics for his remark (he was rejected). He probably apologized to God himself — and the president, in return, almost surely forgave him.

Emanuel even joined a group whose sole mission is to eradicate the use of the word "retarded" from the English language.

Does intent matter? When a person uses the n-word, without a doubt, he has a very specific subset of the population in mind. He uses it to smear an entire race. When a person drops what will be henceforth known

as the r-word, as many of us did regularly during childhood, there is no intent to denigrate those with disabilities.

Sarah Palin, whose youngest son has Down Syndrome, asked the overwrought question, "Are you capable of decency, Rahm Emanuel?" and demanded that the president fire Emanuel, as the word "retarded" was "a slur on all God's children with cognitive and developmental disabilities."

So dragging God's children with cognitive and developmental disabilities into a political tussle isn't offensive?

Now, inevitably, someone will ask: What would happen to Karl Rove or another Republican had he made a similarly insensitive remark? Well, though this kind of proxy outrage has recently become a bipartisan affair, I suspect it would look very much like the over-the-top reaction we're witnessing today.

Palin went on to write that "every day they suffer its dehumanizing effects — mockery, stigma, ridicule. This is a word that is incredibly damaging — not only to the seven million people with intellectual disabilities in the United States, but also their friends, family and to all of us."

In truth, in nearly every way the lives of the mentally disabled have vastly improved, from the care they receive to the quality of their lives to the respect they are given.

Though I've heard the r-word thrown around plenty (often, I'm sure you'll be shocked to learn, directed at me) I can't recall anyone using it as a pejorative to describe a person who was actually disabled. Far from ridiculing the disabled, our culture has humanized them.

Emanuel certainly deserves to be reprimanded. But if his offense is worthy of losing a job, you have to wonder if we really are a nation of the perpetually offended.

American.com

The Quiet Energy Revolution

How ironic that during the 'drill, baby, drill' demonstrations as gasoline prices spiked in 2007 and 2008, a silent revolution with natural gas was already underway that will make those concerns largely irrelevant.

by Max Schulz



The 20th century was the century of oil. Wars were fought over it, and the outcomes of the century's biggest conflicts hinged on the stuff. In World War I, for instance, Churchill's conversion of the British Navy to oil gave the crown's ships supremacy over German vessels. In World War II, when the Nazis and Japanese each failed to secure supplies of oil, they were doomed. Later, President Ronald Reagan, CIA Director William Casey, and America's Middle Eastern partners manipulated global oil production to bankrupt the Soviet Union and win the Cold War. In the first half of the century, oil policy served as the catalyst for military victory. In the second half, oil helped propel the greatest economic expansion in the history of the world, and liberated mankind from the tyranny of immobility.

All hail oil! But not too much, because the 21st century won't be defined by oil. It is more likely to be defined by a different fossil fuel: natural gas.

Two monumental shifts in the world of energy are underway right now: one technological, the other financial. They will change the way we power our lives (especially our cars), provide a real measure of energy security, and help curb greenhouse gas emissions. Neither shift has anything to do with the turn to a green renewable energy economy promised by President Obama. Physics ensures that will never happen, no matter how much wishful thinking (and government subsidy) is applied. Sorry, greens, carbon-based energy will continue to dominate our energy future, not windmills or solar panels.

The first profound shift was made possible by a little-noticed technological breakthrough in the last three years that has changed the way we extract natural gas. Engineers now make use of two important innovations. One is horizontal, or directional, drilling, which permits wells to move laterally beneath the surface instead of going straight down. This technology minimizes the number of holes that have to be drilled, leaving a smaller surface footprint and accessing a larger area. The other technology is hydraulic fracturing, used to extract gas trapped in porous shale rock. In this process, also known as fracking, water and chemicals are pumped at tremendous pressure into shale rock formations to push gas into pockets for easier recovery.

By marrying and perfecting the two processes into a technology called horizontal fracking, engineering has virtually created, from nothing, new natural gas resources, previously regarded as inaccessibly locked in useless shale deposits. Suddenly, the mammoth shale formations in Texas, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York, North Dakota, and elsewhere have the potential to produce abundant amounts of gas for decades to come.

How significant are these developments? Exxon Mobil announced in December that it will pay \$41 billion—that's right, *billion*—to acquire XTO Energy and its expertise at extracting unconventional natural gas resources. The French energy company Total SA, meanwhile, is paying \$2.2 billion to acquire a 25 percent stake in Chesapeake Energy's Barnett Shale operations in Texas.

Human ingenuity has turned theoretical gas reserves—too costly ever to be exploited—into practical resources. And just in time. Less than a decade ago, experts were noting that conventional natural gas production had begun to plateau, despite annual increases in the number of wells drilled. The National Petroleum Council warned in 2003 that "North America is moving to a period in its history in which it will no longer be self-reliant in meeting its growing natural gas needs." In the spring of 2004, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan warned that, driven by these looming shortages, wellhead natural gas prices might top \$6 per thousand cubic feet by summer, roughly double 2002 prices; and indeed, until the recession brought down demand, natural gas did sell in the \$5–\$9 per thousand cubic feet range.

Horizontal fracking has helped eliminate many of those grave worries. As Pulitzer-prize winning author and energy analyst Daniel Yergin and his colleague Robert Ineson [wrote recently in the Wall Street Journal](#), production in the lower 48 states "surged an astonishing 15 percent from the beginning of 2007 to mid-2008." And this is just the tip of the iceberg, as production ramps up in the nation's shale formations, such as in Marcellus, Bakken, and Haynesville. What was once a shortage has given way to a glut, or, as Yergin and Ineson put it, a "shale gale."

Proven reserves of natural gas in the United States have been revised upward by 50 percent in the last decade, and those numbers are sure to climb higher as more shale gas is discovered. Perhaps not surprisingly, other nations are sending geologists to the United States to study techniques for extracting gas from unconventional sources. China, India, and Australia all have enormous shale fields. In the coming decades, the shale gale won't be just an American phenomenon; it will blow all over the globe.

A technological advance created the first shift, driven by free markets not by government edict. The second shift complements the first, and has taken place again because of the way free markets work. That is the formation of a global market for natural gas, much the same as the global petroleum market.

We are accustomed to think of crude oil as a global commodity, its price the same roughly all over the world. Partly that is because oil is so easily transported. Turn on the taps, and a tanker ship can be filled with liquid crude before heading for any seaport on the planet. On land, oil can travel by pipeline, by truck, or even by the barrel or the one-gallon container. The portability of oil helped an international market begin to blossom more than a century ago.

Natural gas and natural gas markets, however, are different. Ethereal and highly flammable, natural gas poses significant transportation problems. A tanker ship can't simply fill up and shove off. For this reason, there has been no single global market for gas, but a number of balkanized, regional markets all over the planet. The price of natural gas in one region has little connection to the price in another, and for many years regions facing shortages could not be relieved by gas from regions with excess capacity.

That is changing, not as rapidly as the shale gale has transformed America's gas picture, but still rapidly compared with other business transformations. The reason is liquefied natural gas (LNG). Innovations in liquefaction and re-gasification technologies allow gas to be condensed to 1/600th its size, which then can be shipped by sea. Major infrastructure investments by energy companies and governments, along with the development of specially designed double-hulled tankers to transport LNG, are creating a robust, integrated market for natural gas.

The implications are profound and largely positive. The new mobility of LNG will bring a sorely needed measure of market stability after the past five years of unpredictability in price and supply.

On the other hand, some observers fear that creating a global marketplace will spur the establishment of a nefarious natural gas cartel similar to oil's OPEC. Such worries, however, overstate a potential cartel's capacity to manipulate a diversified, global market, particularly one in which nations like Australia, Canada, and the United States will be heavyweights. Indeed, one truly positive benefit is that the emergence of a market for LNG will severely limit Russia's ability to use its significant gas resources as a political and economic weapon, as Moscow has done in recent years with its European neighbors.

LNG, along with the shale gale, should help keep natural gas prices low for a long time. The average wellhead price for natural gas in the United States had crept to \$8 per thousand cubic feet in 2008. There is little doubt that high energy prices were among the contributing factors to the economic downturn that began in the latter half of 2008. An ocean of cheap gas augurs well for America's and the global economy's future.

Natural gas may also change how we drive, and enable ordinary consumers to break oil's monopoly on transportation. As my colleague, [Peter Huber, notes](#) in a recent Manhattan Institute report, "Gas-handling technologies [have] improved quite enough to make natural gas a practical alternative" to oil. After all, gas is cheaper than gasoline and diesel per unit of energy. That's why large stationary power plants that used to run on oil switched to natural gas long ago.

The chief obstacle to developing a natural gas infrastructure capable of supplying service stations and highway rest stops is regulatory. If that is removed—and here we do need government action—we could expect to see trucks, buses, and cars running on natural gas in a relatively short period of time. The reduction in greenhouse gas emissions would be considerable.

We may also see continued inroads of gas into the electricity-generating sector (which can also affect transportation as we move to hybrid and electric vehicles). Gas emits about half as much carbon per unit of energy as coal. With worries about long-term gas supplies allayed, expect regulators and utilities to favor construction of new gas-fired power plants over controversial coal plants, which are more expensive to build anyway. This same thing happened during the 1990s, and gas shot to a 20 percent share of America's electricity economy as a result.

The Energy Information Administration estimates that U.S. demand for electricity will rise 26 percent by 2030. Gas-fired power is slightly more expensive than coal-fired electricity today and much more expensive when the wellhead price of gas soars. But stable, lower long-term gas prices brought on by the shale gale and the emerging LNG market will ensure that coal's pricing advantage is not so pronounced. Gas is well positioned to help meet that increase.

The age of oil took off with a boom when the Spindletop gusher blew in 1901. A century later, as the price of oil hit new records, our politics were inflamed by an acrimonious debate over offshore oil drilling and breaching the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve. How ironic that during the "drill, baby, drill" demonstrations as gasoline prices spiked in 2007 and 2008, a silent revolution with natural gas was already underway that could make those concerns largely irrelevant.

Max Schulz is a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute.





THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.



"Would it kill you to devote one little wall to gathering?"



"Does doubling the number of nominations mean the show's going to be twice as long?"

TOYOTA