If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at *steve\_bakke@comcast.net*! Follow me on Twitter at *https://twitter.com/@BakkeSteve* and receive links to my posts and more!



*The power of accurate observation is frequently called cynicism by those who don't have it.* – George Bernard Shaw

I decided to tell the unfolding story of the very recent alarming reports about shrinking antarctic glaciers and the perceived implications. Obviously, dramatically shrinking polar ice isn't a good thing, but I think close scrutiny will demonstrate why the facts aren't always what they seem to be. First, I will present a few panic producing "sound-bites" that have appeared in the news reports; then some information that I found without much effort.

## Warnings of the impending catastrophe!

- Irreversible collapse of Antarctic glaciers has begun, studies say. Los Angeles Times
- *How Washington coastal cities will look when the Antarctic ice sheet melts.* Seattle Post-Intelligencer
- *Catastrophic collapse of Antarctic ice sheet now underway, say scientists.* Christian Science Monitor
- (Could lead to) rise in sea level of 10 feet or more ..... in coming centuries. The New York Times
- *The West Antarctic ice sheet has begun falling apart.* Conclusion by two papers published by two journals: Science; and Geophysical Research Letters.
- Unstoppable glacial collapse in West Antarctica will lead to meters rise in global sea *levels.* Independent (U.K.)
- *Inevitable, unstoppable, alarming –* examples of common descriptions.

## Some information I "kicked up" (with very little effort).

**Information out of the UK** - Liat Clark, investigative reporter with Wired.Co.UK has suggested that the science is rather too simplistic to draw such fatalistic conclusions. He bases this on a study conducted by Adrian Jenkins of the British Antarctic Survey. Jenkins stated:

My own personal opinion is that I don't think they've demonstrated that certainty portrayed. What they've done is an interesting sensitivity study, with relatively simple forcing. It's not so certain that collapse has already begun ...... I'm not sure that I see enough in way of sensitivity studies to be that firm about it.

Jenkins points out that the sensitivity analysis is a model that is based on observations in setting up the assumptions – and that the data available to set up this model is **based on only about 15 years worth of observations** of this area that has been considered fragile for much longer. Ice sheet evolutions cover time frames much longer than that – decades and centuries. He calls it a "nice" study but one that only illustrates what "might" or "could" happen. He's not convinced.

**Information from the Heartland Institute** – While the West Antarctic ice sheet is "falling apart," the discussion avoids the fact that the East Antarctic sea ice coverage reached a record 3.5 million square miles in April of this year. And a report I read indicates that the ice formation in that area continues at a record pace.

James Taylor, senior fellow at the Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News weighed in on this about a month ago. He points out that Antarctica has set another new record which surpassed the greatest month-of-April ice extent in recorded history. Regarding the fragile West Antarctic ice sheet, he points out that this is a long and inherently unstable glacier which may well collapse several hundred years from now. This is NOT a new development!

Taylor goes on to point out that:

...... real world scientific facts show Antarctic ice extent is undergoing a long term expansion. It's not just the Antarctic, either. Precise satellite measurements of both polar ice caps show absolutely no decline in polar ice since the satellite instruments were launched in 1979. Not only is total polar ice extent currently greater than the long-term average; polar ice extent has been greater than the long term average for nearly all of the past 16 months.

But so what! That suggests something is unusual but proves nothing. Facts are required! Here are the important questions: *Is there something subtly (or not so subtly) different about the West Antarctic ice sheet as compared with the East Antarctic? Might there be selective coverage going on?* 

*There IS something going on under the ice near the unstable ice sheet!* – A bit earlier in this report I referred to a U.K. scientist, Adrian Jenkins. He also points out that **in the area of the fragile glacier**, **there is known to be a fast flowing ice stream that is exposed to relatively warm waters.** Keeping this fact in mind, I found the potential of at least a partial answer to my questions. I came across this in some investigative research by intrepid reporter, Bruce McQuain.

McQuain has reported several times about a discovery under the ice in this area. In 2008 he wrote:

Scientists have just now discovered an active volcano under the Antarctic ice that "creates melt-water that lubricates the base of the ice sheet and increases the flow towards the sea." (quotes indicates the scientists' conclusion). That would include the Wilkins Ice Sheet as well as the Larsen A and B sheets.

Alarmists dismiss this since they point out that they are not concerned about the Larsen sheets. They ARE concerned about the glacier indicated in the first satellite photo (below) with a **red** dot. But that glacier is VERY close to the volcano which is indicated in the second satellite photo with a **green** arrow. That is very close proximity, ladies and gents! (The photos are of the same area, but they are of slightly different scale and are rotated slightly, relative to each other – just study them a bit). McQuain and others are correct in their speculation that it is totally plausible to imagine that: *the side of Antarctica most exposed to warmer South Pacific sea currents and experience volcanic activity might see some melting due to causes unrelated to CO2.* 





McQuain also pontificated a bit: *Science, properly practiced, is the search for truth. Science, properly practiced, rejects forecasting models that consistently produce inaccurate forecasts.* 

## And one more thing to ponder!

Some facts: Antarctica is generally considered to be 14 million square kilometers of ice and rock; if all the ice melted the land mass would be about seven million square kilometers; each winter the effective area of Antarctica roughly doubles to about 28 million square kilometers (this varies widely). In East Antarctica, the ice sheet rests on a major land mass, but in West Antarctica the bed can exten to more than 2500 m below sea level. So, much of the West Ice Sheet extends into the ocean. Did the alarmists who predict "meters rise in global sea levels" give consideration that much of the ice has considerable "floatation" effect? Remember, floating ice displaces an equal volume of water. If the floating ice melts, water levels are unaffected. Does their catastrophic prediction of sea level change take into account the "floatation" effect, or just the volume of melted water? I don't yet have the answer to that.

This "melting glacier" drama is just one example of the partial information, and panic producing tales being broadcast by the alarmist elements in the government and progressive groups in general. It's just one example of why I continue to be a skeptic about the global warming/climate change/climate disruption debate. All by itself the "Antarctic story" is merely anecdotal – but powerfully so! But this isn't an isolated example. I've written about others and there's more coming!

Hey SB! I'm disappointed in you! One of the things I consider noteworthy is that the alarmists' projections have this "total collapse" occurring somewhere between 200 and 1,000 years hence. And there is only recorded data on the science and characteristics of freezing and melting of glaciers going back less than two decades. And you let them get by with it with little or no comment! I don't want you going back and correcting the report! I want credit for pointing this out, my (former) star pupil! – Stefano Bachovich – obscure curmudgeon and wise political pundit – a prolific purveyor of opinions on just about everything – my primary "go to guy."

Ouch! - SB