

“Climate Changes Everything: The Coming Revolution in the Energy Industry” Discussion

Editor’s Note: JPT received several letters regarding Joseph Stanislaw’s Guest Editorial in the June issue on “Climate Changes Everything: The Coming Revolution in the Energy Industry.” Excerpts of some appear below.

To the Editor:

I found the June 2008 Guest Editorial authored by Joseph Stanislaw interesting, but not necessarily believable.

Like so many climate change articles, the author combines the issue of climate change with energy independence. I am neither an atmospheric physicist nor a meteorologist, but I have read extensively on climate change. Stanislaw concludes that anthropogenic greenhouse gasses, e.g., CO₂, cause increased global temperature. He supports that position by referring to an Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report. My reading convinces me that

the IPCC conclusion is based on computer simulation using wholly inadequate programs. The research conducted by Dr. Willie Soon (Horner 2007, Fig. 3, 146), demonstrates no correlation between CO₂ and temperature change. Dr. S. Fred Singer, in personal communication (2008), states that CO₂ is a lagging indicator of climate change and this lag is on the order of 600 years.

Interestingly, on 23 March 2008, the Hadley Climate Research Unit in Britain, the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, the Christy Group at the University of Alabama, and Remote Sensing Systems Inc. in California reported that global temperatures decreased 0.7°C during 2007. These measurements could be interpreted as a sign of global cooling rather than global warming.

Stanislaw’s discussion regarding the need for energy research is on target. We need energy to sustain our standard of living and help emerging countries with their energy needs. But, justifying this research on the basis of questionable climate prediction is wrong.

G. H. Holliday

Reference

Horner, C.C., 2007. *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Global Warming and Environmentalism*, 146. Regnery Publishing Inc.

To the Editor:

I just read Joseph A. Stanislaw’s Guest Editorial, “Climate Changes Everything: The Coming Revolution in the Energy Industry” in which he

**One week at SMU
can put your career
years ahead.**

Financial Skills for Oil & Gas Professionals

September 22-26, 2008, in Dallas

For more info: www.exed.cox.smu.edu/sfs

Learn to master the financial side of the industry from SMU Cox instructors who have decades of experience.

In association with Maguire Energy Institute.

SMU  **COX**
EXECUTIVE EDUCATION

Southern Methodist University will not discriminate in any employment practice, education program, or educational activity on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability, or veteran status. SMU’s commitment to equal opportunity includes nondiscrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

presents as fact his alarmist opinion that global warming is caused by humans and that humans can therefore halt or reverse the warming trend. The scientific community does not have a consensus on whether the warming trend is natural or caused by man, and there is no consensus among scientists that the warming trend will cause damaging climate change. A search of the internet can find many scientists providing convincing arguments that global warming is not caused by man and that the warming trend is natural and beneficial, and that increasing CO₂ levels are actually beneficial also. Many of these scientists have also reviewed the results of the computer climate modeling purported to predict warming as a result of CO₂ greenhouse effects and have found the models to be flawed and incapable of matching observed climate trends.

I am very concerned, as we all should be, that erroneous and very costly decisions will be made based on bad science or “facts” as determined by politicians rather than healthy scientific debate. Decisions based on flawed science or unfounded political consensus could lead to a completely unnecessary decline in the quality of life of the people of our planet. One other comment: why is it that Stanislaw does not even mention nuclear power, a seemingly good solution to the fears he expresses?

Kerry Davis

To the Editor:

I appreciate that Joseph Stanislaw is entitled to his rather pompous opinions concerning climate change, and I know that, politically, “Big Oil” is in such a weak position that it has to be seen to conform to the mass hysteria of the moment. There is no “certainty” about the issue, despite what the IPCC summaries say. Careful reading of the main IPCC report reveals a very different picture in which the limitations of the models are recognized.

It is on such tenuous science that we are being asked to make massive economic sacrifices, taking actions that will have no measurable impact on what might happen.

John L. Thorogood
Drilling Global Consultant LLP

To the Editor:

I enjoyed reading Joseph Stanislaw’s broadly informed and well-intentioned article titled “Climate Changes Everything: The Coming Revolution in the Energy Industry.” However, I found his assertion that “reduced demand is potentially the largest source of supply” to be an unfortunate misstatement. As an economist, Stanislaw surely knows that reduced demand (an “inward” shift of the demand curve) is strictly not the same as increased supply (an “outward” shift of the supply curve). Increased supply and decreased demand may well have identical effects on the price of a given commodity. But those two phenomena will, by definition, have opposite effects on the quantity of commodity that is sold.

Nowhere is this distinction more important than in energy markets, where small shifts in demand can have enormous impact on prices, and where almost every unit of consumption is linked to carbon emissions and climate change. Stanislaw argues for “monitor[ing]... based on rigorous assessment” and for government’s role in creating a “level playing field that transparently accounts for costs.” While I fully support both of those assertions, I think it is unlikely that either will come to pass if the key stakeholders (energy professionals, lawmakers, and individual consumers) are lax with energy and economic fundamentals.

A.J. Simon
Energy Systems Analyst Global
Climate and Energy Project,
Stanford University

JPT

SI METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS

The list below includes SI Metric conversion factors for common engineering units. *The SI Metric System of Units and SPE Metric Standard*, the Society’s official standard, is available from SPE Book Order Dept., P.O. Box 833836, Richardson, TX 75083-3836.

acre × 4.046 873	E+03 = m ²
acre × 4.046 873	E-01 = ha
acre-ft × 1.233 489	E+03 = m ³
ampere-hr × 3.6*	E+03 = C
Å × 1.0*	E-01 = nm
°API 141.5/(131.5+°API) = g/cm ³	
atm × 1.013 250*	E+05 = Pa
bar × 1.0*	E+05 = Pa
bbbl × 1.589 873	E-01 = m ³
Btu × 1.055 056	E+00 = kJ
Ci × 3.7*	E+10 = Bq
cp × 1.0*	E-03 = Pa•s
cycles/sec × 1.0*	E+00 = Hz
dyne × 1.0*	E-02 = mN
eV × 1.602 19	E-19 = J
ft × 3.048*	E-01 = m
ft ² × 9.290 304*	E-02 = m ²
ft ³ × 2.831 685	E-02 = m ³
°F (°F - 32)/1.8	= °C
°F (°F + 459.67)/1.8	= K
gal (U.S. liq) × 3.785 412	E-03 = m ³
hp × 7.460 43	E-01 = kW
hp-hr × 2.684 520	E+00 = MJ
in. × 2.54*	E+00 = cm
in. ² × 6.451 6*	E+00 = cm ²
in. ³ × 1.638 706	E+01 = cm ³
kip × 4.448 222	E+03 = N
knot × 5.144 444	E-01 = m/s
ksi × 6.894 757	E+03 = kPa
kW-hr × 3.6*	E+06 = J
lbf × 4.448 222	E+00 = N
lbm × 4.535 924	E-01 = kg
mL × 1.0*	E+00 = cm ³
mho × 1.0*	E+00 = S
mile × 1.609 344*	E+00 = km
oz (U.S. fl) × 2.957 353	E+01 = cm ³
psi × 6.894 757	E+00 = kPa
psi ² × 4.753 8	E+01 = kPa ²
sq mile × 2.589 988	E+00 = km ²
stokes × 1.0*	E-04 = m ² /s
ton × 9.071 847	E-01 = Mg
ton (metric) × 1.0*	E+00 = Mg
tonf × 8.896 444	E+03 = N
tonne × 1.0*	E+00 = Mg

*Conversion factor is exact.

These conversion factors are from *The SI Metric System of Units and SPE Metric Standard*, SPE, Richardson, Texas (1984).