CLIMATE ALARMISM COMES CRASHING DOWN

What's with global warming? The dependably alarmist *Scientific American* suddenly has become downright reasonable, noting that climate change is likely to be a minor overlay in a world increasingly insulated from the vagaries of nature. The cause: global economic growth, unfolding before our eyes.

Just last month, the popular ecomodernist journalist Will Boisvert wrote "How bad will climate change be? Not very." He went on to note what many of us have been saying for years—as long as there has been capital for innovation and civil order, we've been adapting to climate change all along, and will continue to do so. Boisvert neatly skewers horseman after horseman of the apocalypse—drought, hunger and heat, and notes our increasingly clean and efficient energy technology (and that wind and solar are bit players). But he can't quite bring himself to acknowledge that climate models are now known to have been forced to predict way too much warming.

Say *what?* Last week, with little fanfare—no doubt due to the embarrassing implications of the result, *Nature Communications* published an article by Yousuke Sato (and coauthors) from Nagoya University, showing that the controversial "indirect cooling effect" of particulates that often go in the air along with dreaded carbon dioxide is much smaller than what's in the climate models. The models are generally tuned with these aerosols to match the climate history of the 20th century, where a large warming occurs before much carbon dioxide is emitted, followed by a slight cooling for several decades as emissions ramped up. Because the aerosol cooling is large, the warming that they counter must be huge...which is why in recent decades the models predict so much more warming in the lower atmosphere than is being observed.

The largest warmings are driven by an emissions scenario that is now known to be impossible (it was similarly impossible when it was dreamed up in 2011). Researchers at the University of British Columbia recently noted there is simply not enough carbon-rich coal to drive it.

Yesterday (March 12) , in a *Wall Street Journal* essay, Oren Cass of the Manhattan Institute destroyed the "laughably bad economics" behind the doomsday scenarios, that refuse "to consider how society will evolve and adapt". It's based on a detailed report that you can download here.

A lengthy review of my book Lukewarming, which generally summarizes all of these trends, was recently published by Obama EPA general counsel John Hannon in the tony Berkeley Law journal *Ecology Law Quarterly*. It ends by noting that the lukewarm view may represent the new "cultural commitment" where "former climate change doubters can coalesce", and that you really ought to read the book. I agree.

The recent tectonic shifts on global warming notwithstanding, the Trump Administration has a teensy problem not very far offstage. Written largely in the last Administration, the fourth "National Assessment" of climate change impacts on the US is getting ready for publication. It is simply too kind to call it an alarmist screed, driven by those laughable bad economics and models that run way too hot. The authors, many careerists who made their mark flogging the heat, can't back down. I advised that the Administration simply tear up the report and start over with a new crew and something at least vaguely related to reality.

Otherwise, some really serious questions are going to be asked. People in the Administration are reading the same stuff noted here. They know the apocalyptic house of cards is crashing faster than Venezuela. How on earth are they going to defend letting this miscarriage of science see the light of day?

Patrick J. Michaels is Director of the Center for the Study of Science at the Cato Institute.