Global warming science uncertain

National Academy of Sciences finds evidence of warming, but no link to human activity

BY JAMES TAYLOR

Major uncertainties exist as to whether human activity has caused any warming of the planet, concluded a much-anticipated study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS). Nevertheless, the ambiguous report touched off a media and political frenzy trumpeting the "uncontestable truth" about human-induced warming.

President George W. Bush had requested the study for clarification of the science regarding global warming issues.

The NAS panel concluded that greenhouse gases have been accumulating in the Earth's atmosphere and that global temperatures have increased slightly since the start of the industrial age. The report's summary links the warming to human activity, but the study itself does not. While the summary speaks of potential catastrophic harms associated with future warming, the study itself notes such results are impossible to predict right now.

Alarmsists claim study supports them

Leading Democrats trumpeted the study's summary and blasted the Bush administration for holding out for more scientific data before taking decisive action. "It confirms in stark terms the reality that many of us had accepted a considerable amount of time ago and refutes an effort by the White House to seek some sort of escape hatch from that reality," said Senator John Kerry (D-Massachusetts). "The report underscores the full measure of the vacuum in the administration's leadership on this issue."

"Frankly, the time for study has to yield to leadership," Senator Joe Lieberman (D-Connecticut) concluded after receiving the report.

California energy debate heats up

Governor Davis hires former Gore political operatives Lehane and Fabiani; blames Bush administration and "price-gouging" oil companies

BY JAMES TAYLOR

Political rhetoric on energy issues from the state of California continues to heat up along with the rising summer temperatures. Democratic Governor Gray Davis has escalated the war of words by placing blame for the state's energy troubles squarely on President George W. Bush and his political allies.

Davis, facing plummeting poll numbers in the wake of the state's energy troubles, signaled an escalation of the political rhetoric when he announced on May 18 that the state had hired jaded former political operatives from the Al Gore presidential campaign.

Facing state polls showing his popularity dropping well under 50 percent, including a 20 point drop from January to May 2001, Davis spent California taxpayers' money to hire former Gore press secretary Chris Lehane and former Gore deputy campaign manager Mark Fabiani as state energy advisors. Davis said the former Gore operatives will coordinate the governor's communications staff regarding energy issues.

Outraged Californians noted that Lehane and Fabiani, the self-proclaimed "Masters of Disaster" for their aggressive tactics in turning Clinton-Gore political scandals into attacks on the opposition, have no energy experience, and asserted that Davis was spending taxpayer money for inappropriate partisan purposes.

"California taxpayers should not be asked to finance political consultants," averred State Senate Republican Leader Jim Brulte and...
Federal study concludes nuclear storage is safe

New Senate Majority Leader nevertheless declares Yucca Mountain proposal dead

BY JAMES TAYLOR

Persons on both sides of the Yucca Mountain, Nevada nuclear storage debate have found reason for encouragement and reason for concern as control of the U.S. Senate was given over to the Democrats.

As South Dakota Senator Tom Daschle prepared to assume power as Senate Majority Leader, he asserted that the federal government’s proposal to construct a permanent underground storage facility at Yucca Mountain for the nation’s nuclear waste is dead on arrival in the U.S. Senate.

At a May 31 Las Vegas fundraiser for Nevada Democratic Senator Harry Reid, Daschle stated, “As long as we’re in the majority, it’s dead.”

Daschle’s remarks were warmly received in Nevada, where the entirety of the state’s congressional delegation, regardless of party affiliation, opposes storage of the nation’s nuclear waste in their state.

Science supports Yucca Mountain safety

Shortly after Daschle’s speech, however, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) released a report concluding that underground storage is safe and that governments must act quickly to alleviate the accumulating waste in above-ground temporary storage facilities. The scientists say the problem of nuclear waste disposal is purely political and that waste disposal is completely safe from a scientific standpoint.

The NAS report, issued June 6, came on the heels of a U.S. Department of Energy report finding nuclear waste could be safely stored at the Yucca Mountain site.

“This report on years of scientific study offers further support of the suitability of Yucca Mountain as a permanent repository for used fuel from the nation’s commercial nuclear power plants and high-level radioactive waste from the nation’s defense programs,” summarized Joe Colvin, president of the Nuclear Energy Institute. “The report clearly demonstrates there is ample scientific basis for making a decision to dispose of used nuclear fuel at Yucca Mountain.”

The Bush administration built on the momentum of the two studies, announcing on June 5 new rules for the disposal of nuclear waste. The Bush rules are virtually identical to rules proposed by the Clinton administration … and at the time stridently opposed by conservatives as excessively stringent and scientifically unnecessary.

The Bush announcement may finally create congressional consensus for the Yucca Mountain site, as many Republican former opponents of the rules are expected to fall into line with their President in supporting the Clinton proposal.

Russia sees economic boom in waste

While opponents of the Yucca Mountain proposal placed their faith in the powerful Daschle-Reid tandem to block implementation of the plan, breaking news overseas further stirred the nuclear storage debate.

On June 6, the same day the NAS issued its report, the Russian Duma approved a plan to import massive amounts of international nuclear waste for storage and possible reprocessing at a facility in the Urals Mountains.

Disregarding general public opposition to the plan, the Duma voted almost 2-1 to take advantage of the significant economic windfall that such a plan would entail. The Russian Atomic Energy Ministry estimates the nation can earn over $20 billion in the next two decades by accepting 20,000 tons of nuclear waste from countries willing and able to ship their spent nuclear fuel to Russia.

The 20,000 tons represents just a fraction of the overall potential market in spent nuclear fuel, as the United States alone currently has 78,000 tons awaiting disposal. Countries such as France, England, Germany, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan also produce significant amounts of nuclear energy, with the resulting need to store nuclear waste.

The NAS study left no doubt as to the scientific ability to safely store nuclear waste, but researchers noted the political will to do so has been sorely lacking. In Moscow, supporters of the plan to import nuclear waste count on overcoming public opposition by earmarking profits from the new industry for expensive environmental clean-up programs made necessary by massive Soviet-era environmental abuses.

Proponents hope Russian citizens will be persuaded by the prospects of a greener Russia and the empirical safety of using modern nuclear storage technologies. Even so, the importation plan faces high hurdles.

More than 90 percent of the waste from Russian reactors would be imported originated in American-designed nuclear reactors. Even when those reactors are built overseas, the U.S. reserves the right to veto any plans for nuclear waste disposal. Tensions over Russia’s assistance to Iran in building several nuclear power plants make it unlikely the U.S. will quickly approve plans by any nation under the American nuclear reactor umbrella to send spent nuclear fuel to Russia.

With scientists possessing the technology to reprocess spent fuel into nuclear weapons-grade fuel, the U.S. government will be unlikely to approve nuclear waste shipments to Russia until it halts its nuclear assistance to nations deemed a terrorist threat to the United States.

“The scientists [at the National Academy of Sciences] say the problem of nuclear waste disposal is purely political and that waste disposal is completely safe from a scientific standpoint.”
Supporters of Bush energy plan deflect criticism

BY JAMES TAYLOR

After the euphoria surrounding its unveiling, the Bush energy plan is experiencing the hangover of biting criticism from both free-market and anti-market interests. Hoping to deflect the attacks, Bush officials have stepped up their bargaining efforts with anti-production interests and have doggedly asserted that perfectly pleasing neither flank proves they got the plan just right.

Democrats fix blame on producers

From the left, House Minority Leader Dick Gephardt (D-Missouri) blasted Bush for failing to place the blame for the nation's current energy concerns squarely on the backs of industry.

"In 1982 we had a president who went on television and called the steel officials into his office and berated them, dressed them down and told them they had to do something," stated Gephardt at a specially called press conference. "I don't see that going on. Instead, they're having a fundraiser."

California Democratic Governor Gray Davis took Gephardt's scathing of energy companies even further. "We are literally in a war with energy companies who are gouging us," proclaimed Davis. "Many of which reside in Texas," Davis continued, insinuating the President's proposal was designed to help Texas state businesses at the expense of the rest of the country.

Even former President Jimmy Carter jumped in to attack the Bush plan, decriying the proposal's "scare tactics" and asserting that "no energy crisis exists now that equates in any way with those we faced in 1973 or 1979." Most observers gratefully agreed.

Is conservation alone sufficient?

Anti-production interest groups argued that energy supply is already sufficient for the nation's present and future energy needs, and that increased conservation rather than increased production would solve any potential energy concerns. "The Bush administration energy plan ignores high-tech, energy-efficient solutions in favor of increased oil, gas, coal, and nuclear production, while his budget proposal slashes funding for renewable energy and efficiency by a third," declared a Sierra Club press release.

"The Sierra Club realizes that we can't drill, dig, or destroy our way out of our energy problems. That's why we're pushing for a more honest, balanced policy that promotes energy efficiency, uses clean renewable energy like wind and solar power, and emphasizes responsible production."

"If conservation alone could solve the problem, California wouldn't be facing high rates and rolling blackouts," countered Ed Gillespie, director of the Frontiers for Freedom 21st Century Energy Project. Gillespie observed that California leads the nation in energy conservation programs, yet still faces drastic energy shortages.

Bruce Bartlett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis, noted that America is already "the most energy-efficient major country on Earth." Bartlett pointed out that "for every $1 million of GDP produced here, just 76 tons of oil-equivalent were needed," while the oil-equivalent average for other nations was nearly double that, at 151 tons.

Former New York Congressman Jack Kemp agreed that conservation alone could not solve America's future energy needs. "If conservation and renewables were the key to energy abundance, California would be the showplace of the future, not the national embarrassment it has become where energy policy is concerned. Governor Gray Davis may try to shift the blame to Washington all he wants, but no one's suggesting the rest of the nation emulate California."

Kemp highlighted a key component of free-market environmentalism that often gets lost in the mainstream media's coverage of environment issues. "Energy and the environment don't need to be at war with each other, whether in the Alaskan wilderness, on the Outer Continental Shelf, or in siting new pipelines and transmission capacity."

Free-marketers note plan's shortcomings

While praising in general the Bush plan's "balance between ecological values and surging energy demand," Kemp nevertheless found some free-market shortfalls in the plan. "Unfortunately, they also bow to political correctness by adding to the mix a bunch of subsidies and tax credits, i.e. "incentives", to conserve energy and produce more energy from what I call 'boutique renewables'—wind, solar, biomass—all of which have failed to demonstrate market viability despite massive government subsidies since the so-called energy crises of the 1970s."

Kemp's remarks mirrored those of many other leading free-market environmentalists, who liked the plan in general but expressed concern over some of its anti-market aspects.

Observe, Myron Ebell, director of global warming and international environmental policy at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, "The Bush energy plan will turn America away from the increasingly painful path of sky-high gas prices, exorbitant heating and cooling bills, and rolling blackouts. The long-range shift from forcing Americans to use less energy to allowing the nation's suppliers to produce more energy is good news for America's working families."

CEI President Fred Smith agreed, "The administration should be congratulated for not giving in to the all-too-common idea that using energy is a sin, environmental degeneracy, or political correctness."

EPA panel pushes tough new dioxin rules

Proposal is based on one badly flawed study that hasn't been verified by independent researchers

BY JAMES TAYLOR

Strident new regulations on low-level dioxins are being pushed by an Environmental Protection Agency advisory panel even though scientific studies cannot show any link between current dioxin levels and adverse effects on human health.

The panel voted unanimously to send a report to EPA Administrator Christie Whitman that would clear the way for federal regulators to impose strict new limitations on low-level dioxin emissions, as well as trace amounts of dioxins in food and chemicals.

New regulations would particularly affect the milk, beef, fish, paper, chemical, and medical products industries, where very small amounts of dioxins in their products are currently considered safe.

The panel based its recommendations on experiments by a University of Missouri researcher, whose work supposedly demonstrated that low-level exposure to dioxins caused male laboratory mice to develop increased prostate weight and female laboratory mice to enter early puberty. Outside researchers, however, have been unable to reproduce the Missouri researcher's findings.

In agreeing to consider the Missouri researcher's work, the EPA panel broke its own rules aimed at ensuring the verifiability of scientific studies. The agency's rules require researchers to submit the raw data driving their conclusions, so independent researchers can be allowed to verify each study's results. The Missouri researcher did not submit his data. Moreover, the researcher based his findings on a unique strain of inbred mice that he killed after concluding his study. Other scientists have been unable to reproduce the study's alleged results using various mice control groups.

Except for the Missouri study, scientists have found no link between low-level dioxin exposure and human health.

Steven Milloy, adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute and publisher of JunkScience.com, noted, "The dose makes the poison. All substances—including water, salt, and sugar—are poisons in sufficiently high amounts or doses. Below their 'toxic' doses, substances aren't poisons."

Michael Gough, the Cato Institute's director of science and risk studies, noted that even in larger doses, dioxins have not been shown to be very harmful to humans. "Dioxin is such a strong word in the environmental lexicon that literally everyone knows it causes cancer and birth defects and all kinds of other diseases. The common knowledge is wrong," said Gough.

Warning Milloy, "The implications of the panel's report are unsettling. The panel recommended that EPA consider changing its guidelines for assessing risk of reproductive and developmental effects from chemicals. The recommendation is likely to spread to other national and international regulatory agencies."

To put tight new controls on low-level exposure to chemicals without a verified correlation with human health effects "puts virtually every industrial chemical and many consumer products at risk of being stringently regulated or banned without a scientific basis," said Milloy.
The ultimate in pedestrian-friendly design

BY RANDAL O'TOOLE

If we've heard it once, we've heard it a hundred times: There is no point in building new road capacity because added capacity simply leads people to drive more. We can find one test of the truth of this myth in the data gathered by the Texas Transportation Institute for its annual mobility report.

The institute's raw data cover 68 urban areas and include the following information for each year from 1982 through 1999:

- number of lane miles of freeway;
- number of lane miles of other arterials;
- total number of miles of roads;
- number of miles driven on freeways;
- number of miles driven on other arterials;
- total number of miles driven on all roads;
- population; and
- density.

Comparing data

If building more roads leads people to drive more, then per-capita driving will increase faster in urban areas that rapidly expand their road systems than in urban areas that build few new roads. This can be tested with a simple statistical calculation known as the correlation coefficient, or r-squared.

The r-squared of two sets of data is a number between zero and one. If it is one, then the two data sets perfectly correlate with one another. For example, if one data set were 1, 2, 3, 4, and another were 2, 4, 6, 8, then they would perfectly correlate and the r-squared would be 1.0. 1, 2, 3, 4 is also perfectly correlated with 8, 6, 4, 2. But if the second data set were 4, 8, 6, 2, they would not be well correlated, and the r-squared would be close to zero.

Using my spreadsheet's random number function for two sets of 68 numbers, I get r-squareds from less than 0.001 to 0.066. So any r-squareds in the Texas data sets that are less than 0.066 are no better than random.

Correlation, of course, does not imply causation. If data set A correlates with data set B, it could mean that A causes B, B causes A, or both A and B are influenced by some other factor C. The way to ferret out causation is to compare lots of data sets measuring many different factors, as well as apply a little common sense.

The raw data used by the Texas Transportation Institute for major urban areas are supplied by individual state transportation offices to the Federal Highway Administration. For smaller urban areas, the institute went directly to the states. Only some states cooperated, which is why most of the institute's smaller urban areas are in Texas, Oregon, and a few other states.

How reliable are these data? The states know to the hundredth of a mile how many roads they have, so road miles and lane miles should be pretty reliable. Miles of driving (vehicle miles traveled, or VMTs) is not quite so reliable, but the states monitor traffic at scores of locations in every urban area so they should have a good idea about trends.

Population data are estimated each year by the Census Bureau, and while the estimates aren't perfect they are at least as good as miles traveled.

Perhaps the most questionable data provided by the states is the land area of each urban area. Some states update this every year; Atlanta's land area increases by about 20 square miles each year. Other states aren't as meticulous, so that the land areas of some regions remain the same for several years then suddenly grow a huge amount, then stay constant for a few more years. It is likely that these problems average out over the 17 years from 1982 to 1999.

"Freeways are thus the ultimate pedestrian-friendly design: If you want to make your city safer for pedestrians, then build more freeways."

Population, density, and driving

If the data are reliable, what do they tell us about the rate of growth in driving? First, Table 1 shows there is a strong correlation between changes in population and changes in driving (VMTs). Per-capita driving increased in all urban areas except Colorado Springs and Oklahoma City. Per-capita driving in those two regions declined by 4 percent. However, both of these urban areas registered large increases in per-capita driving on freeways and arterials.

Smart-growth advocates argue that sprawl leads people to drive more. If true, then there should be a strong correlation between changes in population density and per-capita driving. Yet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Correlations Between Driving and Demographics (r-squareds of changes from 1982 to 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population vs. total VMTs</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density vs. per-capita VMTs</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>Correlations Between Freeway/Arterial Driving and Miles (r-squareds of changes from 1982 to 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeway lane miles vs. total freeway VMTs</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway lane miles vs. per-capita freeway VMTs</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial lane miles vs. total arterial VMTs</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial lane miles vs. per-capita arterial VMTs</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
<th>Correlations Between Total Driving and Road Miles (r-squareds of changes from 1982 to 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total road miles vs. per-capita VMTs</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway lane miles vs. per-capita VMTs</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial lane miles vs. per-capita VMTs</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
<th>Correlations Between Congestion and Driving (r-squareds of changes from 1982 to 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel time index vs. VMTs</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time index vs. per-capita VMTs</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advances in diesel technology point to cleaner air

New diesel technologies show promise of clean-air driving in the near future, according to a pair of newly released studies

BY JAMES TAYLOR

On May 8, International Truck and Engine Corporation (ITEC) released “Performance, Environment, Safety, Health: The Facts About New Diesel Technology.” According to the report, ITEC’s new Green Diesel Technology reduces particulate emissions to levels at or below emissions produced by environmentalist-championed natural gas. Green Diesel Technology makes possible the nation’s first smokeless, odorless diesel school bus, entering the market this year.

Central to the success of Green Diesel Technology is ultra-low-sulfur diesel fuel. BP, Equilon, and Tosco have committed to producing the fuel, which is already commercially available in California. ITEC expects ultra-low-sulfur diesel fuel to soon be commercially available across the nation as a whole.

According to the report, the new diesel bus engine emits just one-fifth the particulate matter and one-fourth the hydro-carbon of natural gas engines. The new engine also results in lower greenhouse gas emissions due to its greater fuel mileage (diesel engines use between 40 and 60 percent less fuel per mile than natural gas engines, according to the report) and its lack of methane emissions during refueling.

“According to the [International Truck and Engine Corporation] report, the new diesel bus engine emits just one-fifth the particulate matter and one-fourth the hydro-carbon of natural gas engines.”

The bane of diesel engines has traditionally been their heightened release of nitrogen oxide (NOx). Natural gas engines in the past have produced 25 to 75 percent fewer NOx emissions than diesel engines. However, the new diesel bus engine has gained approximate parity with natural gas engines, producing only 11 percent more NOx than its natural gas counterparts. When this small differential is placed in the context of the diesel engine’s significant advantages regarding other pollutants, the new engine is clearly the “greener” technology, asserts ITEC. While natural gas advocates have in the past attacked diesel engines as risky to human health, due to their particle emissions, research has failed to support that assertion. ITEC notes the significantly reduced emissions in its new Green Diesel Technology makes any such attacks obsolete.

Greener automobiles

Researchers at the U.S. Department of Energy’s Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) have developed a way to cut in half the NOx emissions from diesel automobile engines. The reduction is achieved by combining an electrically charged gas, called plasma, with a specialized catalyst. The process converts harmful NOx emissions to pure nitrogen—a component of clean air.

“Our scientists began looking at various materials and found a specialized catalyst that selectively reduces oxides of nitrogen,” stated Chuck Peden, principal investigator for the project, in a press release issued by PNNL. “Those initial laboratory studies showed the process reduced NOx by 70 percent.” But our lab results over the past six months now show that greater than 90 percent reduction can be achieved,” Peden said.

“We continue to make progress toward achieving the goals with this technology,” said Peden. “There is more work to be done to reduce the amount of electrical power required to operate the reactor and to increase the overall NOx reduction from 50 to 90 percent on a real engine.”
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Motor vehicle mileage rules: Making matters worse

BY JAMES JOHNSTON

Global climate change is in the news again, this time as a reason for enacting stricter motor vehicle fuel economy standards for light-duty trucks, including SUVs, vans, and pickups.

But we should be leery of this claim, especially in light of the substantial cost and safety risk tighter fuel economy standards pose to passengers.

Remember global cooling? In 1975, when Congress passed the original fuel economy law, climate change was also in the news, but not as a rationale for federal fuel economy controls.

In its April 28, 1975 issue, Newsweek magazine reported that “weather patterns have begun to change dramatically” and that “these changes may portend a drastic decline in food production—with serious political implications for just about every nation on Earth.”

The magazine concluded, “The central fact is that after three-quarters of a century of extraordinarily mild conditions, the Earth’s climate seems to be cooling down.”

Back then, instead of fuel economy regulations, this “news” prompted calls for storing food for use when the cooling shortened growing seasons. One proposal called for melting the ice caps by spreading soot on them to retain the heat of the sun. Concern was expressed that governments would delay too long before taking action to meet the coming crisis.

In his foreword to a book titled The Cooling, by Lowell Ponte, Senator Claiborne Pell (D-Rhode Island) wrote, “This book is as disquieting an Silver Spring in its analysis of environmental hazards…” Author Ponte wrote, “It is a cold fact: The global cooling presents humankind with the most important social, political, and adaptive challenge we have had to deal with for ten thousand years.”

Now it’s global warming. Today we are being warned about global warming. In introducing his legislation to make gasoline mileage regulations (known as CAFE for corporate average fuel economy) tougher, U.S. Representative John W. Olver (D-Massachusetts) said, “This is an essential first step toward improving energy efficiency and slowing global climate change.”

Of course, the climate has always changed and always will. Ice caps have oscillated over much of the Earth’s surface for millions of years, and scientists say we are in an interglacial period—meaning they expect the ice to come again. While there are theories about why these drastic changes have taken place, there is no consensus among scientists about the causes.

Anyone reading the scientific reports today, including those of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, will see there are also a multitude of uncertainties about what is happening to our climate.

“A major reason politicians back CAFE is because it is politically safer to punish the voters indirectly by changing the kinds of vehicles they can buy through fuel economy regulations.”

Dr. Richard S. Lindzen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a member of the National Academy of Sciences group that issued its climate change report in June, has written that the report “represented the span of views” thereby “making clear that there is no consensus, unanimous or otherwise, about long-term climate trends and what causes them.” Do we really know enough to use climate concerns to justify more severe regulations?

Reducing oil imports

The second most popular reason for promoting tougher CAFE rules is to reduce oil imports. Of course, since CAFE was enacted, oil imports have gone dramatically up, not down. Foreign oil is cheaper, and cheaper oil will always flow into the U.S. market unless blocked from entry by trade barriers. Such barriers, of course, would bounce gasoline and heating oil prices still higher—not a very popular position with the voters. A major reason politicians back CAFE is because it is politically safer to punish the voters indirectly by changing the kinds of vehicles they can buy through fuel economy regulations.

Technology is not enough

Another misleading notion is that, in Rep. Olver’s words, “The technology exists to improve fuel efficiency…” According to his bill’s co-sponsor, U.S. Representative Wayne Gilchrest (R-Maryland), “The technology has already been developed to improve fuel efficiency…”

Their statements appear to assume there is some secret reason automakers do not want to offer more fuel-efficient vehicles to their customers. If automakers could offer vehicles with higher fuel economy but with the same size, weight, utility, and cost of today’s vehicles, they would be scrambling to do it.

Unfortunately, the “technology” that has brought about the most mileage improvement in cars and light trucks is the reduction of average size, weight, and utility of these vehicles. This is what happened to the family-size passenger car under CAFE.

When CAFE was enacted, about 70 percent of U.S.-made passenger cars could tow a small boat or trailer weighing up to 2,100 pounds. Americans wanting to take their children, and maybe grandmother and grandfather, to the movies could use a big family-size station wagon. And when young son or daughter started to drive, parents could start them with a full-size car with the weight and structure that could protect them in a crash.

Today, less than 6 percent of passenger cars, which now must average 27.5 miles per gallon, have that towing capacity. To meet fuel economy regulations, manufacturers have had to reduce car size and cut weight by 1,000 pounds, eliminating the full-size station wagon from the market. As a result, cars are less useful and, on average, less safe than they would be if CAFE did not exist.

All other things being equal, it is a simple matter of the laws of physics that smaller cars provide less protection for their occupants. This may be
Bush upholds Clinton air particle rules

But science casts doubt on need for tightened standards

BY JAMES TAYLOR

Controversial new air quality rules regarding fine particulate matter, announced by the Clinton administration in 1997 and subject to numerous scientific and legal challenges since, will be kept in place by the Bush administration.

Implementation of the rules had long been delayed in the courts, but a February 2001 Supreme Court decision removed most of the legal obstacles. The only remaining question was whether the Bush administration would give its political stamp of approval to the Clinton rules.

The 1997 fine particulate matter rules were among the Clinton administration’s most controversial environmental efforts. The Environmental Protection Agency already had established standards, supported by scientific findings, governing the emission of fine particulate matter. The 1997 rules significantly tightened the standard for the smallest of particles, those measuring less than 2.5 microns (PM2.5) in diameter.

The 1997 rules are likely to be the costliest ever in the 30-year history of the Clean Air Act. EPA estimates it will cost several billion dollars to implement the new standards, while analysts outside the agency calculate the new standards may cost over $50 billion per year.

Science raises doubts regarding the new rules

Numerous scientific studies have cast doubt on the need for stricter standards. George Wolff, chair of the Competitive Enterprise Institute’s Science Advisory Committee (CASAC), noted in a Congressional hearings that co-pollutants (pollutants separate from, but often associated with, fine particulate matter) may be the cause of adverse health effects alleged to be associated with fine particulate matter. To the extent particulate matter is a culprit, evidence did not clearly establish that the smallest (PM2.5) particles were to blame.

Although the advisory committee agreed that a new PM2.5 standard was advisable, Wolff said “only a minority of the panel members supported a range that includes the present EPA proposals.”

According to “The Ongoing Clean-Air Debate,” a recently released Competitive Enterprise Institute study by Kay Jones and Ben Lieberman, scientific research conducted since the 1997 rules were crafted casts further doubt on the need for the new standard. Jones and Lieberman note the 1997 rules relied heavily on a pair of studies, known as the Harvard Six Cities and the American Cancer Society studies.

“EPA estimates it will cost several billion dollars to implement the new standards, while analysts outside the agency calculate the new standards may cost over $50 billion per year.”

Reanalysis disputes earlier findings

Eventually, Congress forced EPA to allow the Health Effects Institute (HEI) to conduct a reanalysis of the two controversial studies. When results of the reanalysis were announced in July 2000, the Clinton EPA immediately trumpeted them as vindicating the prior studies. However, according to Jones and Lieberman, the HEI research reached just the opposite conclusion.

The Harvard Six Cities Study compared chronic mortality data to air pollution levels in six cities with varying PM2.5 levels. Reanalysis of the study showed no appreciable association between PM2.5 and mortality among non-smokers, suggesting co-pollutant tobacco smoke may be the true cause of any adverse health effects alleged to be associated with fine particulate matter. Even including smokers, the reanalysis showed a statistically significant increase in mortality in four of the six cities studied. Finally, reanalysis showed the same relative risks for other pollutants as for PM2.5.

Reanalysis similarly cast doubt on the American Cancer Society study’s initial findings. The study addressed chronic mortality in 50 cities relative to PM2.5 and sulfur dioxide levels. Reanalysis demonstrated there was no significant association between PM2.5 levels and mortality among persons with higher levels of education. Any association between PM2.5 levels and mortality was found to be insignificant after co-factors were taken into account. Finally, reanalysis showed that sulfur dioxide, rather than PM2.5, was the likely true cause of adverse health effects in the 50 cities.

New studies cast further doubt

Beyond the reanalysis of the Harvard Six Cities and American Cancer Society studies, other scientific studies have been conducted since announcement of the 1997 rules.

In addition to its reexamination of the earlier two studies, the Health Effects Institute conducted a National Morbidity, Mortality, and Air Pollution Study. The HEI study addressed PM10 rather than PM2.5 particles, but its results are noteworthy: The study found no significant association between PM10 and acute mortality in 81 of the 90 cities in its survey.

The lack of association between PM10 and acute mortality is particularly striking because the smoking status of study subjects was not taken into consideration, even though reanalysis of the Harvard Six Studies had shown smoking may be the true cause of alleged particulate matter harms.

A separate study, the Washington University/EPR Institute’s Veterans’ Cohort Mortality Study, cast even further doubt on a correlation between PM2.5 levels and adverse health effects. The WUEPRI study examined a population of 90,000 U.S. veterans who were highly susceptible to air pollution effects due to pre-existing hypertension heart disease. The study found no statistically significant association between mortality and PM2.5 regardless of other variables. The study further found that mortality was more strongly associated with ozone and nitrogen dioxide than with particulate matter.

Reviewing the various studies, Jones and Lieberman conclude “there is no evidence that the PM2.5 standard is supportable at this time. In fact, CASAC’s 1996 conclusion still holds true today, that ‘the diversity of opinions also reflects the many unanswered questions and uncertainties associated with establishing causality of the association between PM2.5 and mortality.’”
Bush reaffirms Kyoto opposition

A
armed with the National Academy of Sciences just-released study of climate change science, President George W. Bush began to lobby Europe on revisions to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol.

Bush noted that “developing nations” with nearly half the world’s population, including the two most populous nations (China and India), are free to increase greenhouse gas emissions as much as they want under Kyoto. China is already the world’s second-largest producer of greenhouse gases.

“While pressing for a more uniform application of emissions reduction requirements, Bush announced his support for unilateral measures on the part of the U.S. to increase scientific understanding of climate change.”

“We recognize our responsibility to reduce our emissions,” Bush stated. “We also recognize the other part of the story—that the rest of the world emits 80 percent of all greenhouse gases and many of those emissions are from developing countries.”

While pressing for a more uniform application of emissions reduction requirements, Bush announced his support for unilateral measures on the part of the U.S. to increase scientific understanding of climate change. Bush called for greater funding of climate research and increased cooperation between U.S. and international researchers. He also stated he would support programs to develop new technologies to reduce greenhouse gases in transportation and industrial production.

Bush’s advocacy of such unilateral measures had little initial effect on opinion in Western Europe, where the nations’ leaders object to U.S. insistence on weighing mitigating factors in each nation’s greenhouse emissions goals. For example, carbon dioxide emissions in the U.S. are partially or possibly entirely negated by extensive forests and farms that capture greenhouse gases. Western Europe contains far fewer such carbon “sinks.”

“Science, in the public arena, is commonly used as a source of authority with which to bludgeon political opponents and propagandize uninformed citizens…. It is a reprehensible practice that corrodes our ability to make rational decisions.”

RICHARD LINDZEN
PROFESSOR OF METEOROLOGY, MIT

...and probably a lot less by 2100.”

Lindzen noted that global surface temperatures are slightly warmer today than they were a century ago. “But—and I cannot stress this enough—we are not in a position to confidently attribute past climate change to carbon dioxide or to forecast what the climate will be in the future.”

Continued Lindzen, “Science, in the public arena, is commonly used as a source of authority with which to bludgeon political opponents and propagandize uninformed citizens. This is what has been done with both the reports of the IPCC and the NAS. It is a reprehensible practice that corrodes our ability to make rational decisions. A fairer view of the science will show that there is still a vast amount of uncertainty…and that the NAS report has hardly ended the debate. Nor was it meant to.”

“The report,” added Kenneth Green, director of the environmental program at the Reason Public Policy Institute, “confirms important points that many analysts critical of mainstream portrayals of climate change science and policy have argued for years.” For example, “When it comes to the all-important questions of causality, the NAS report contains cautionary statements far stronger than those seen from other August scientific panels.”

Steve Milloy, an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute and publisher of junkScience.com, further noted that even the slight surface warming measured this century is suspect. The measured warming occurred just after the end of the “Little Ice Age,” he explained, a period of cooling unequalled since the last major Ice Age. Moreover, surface temperature readings are often taken at weather stations near ever-growing cities, which serve as artificial heat islands.

“Science and other documents on the topic of climate change are available at ClimateSearch, a free Internet portal. Point your Web browser to http://www.climatesearch.com. The site provides an overview of the current scientific picture and identifies areas of research in need of further study.”
NAS summary distorted

BY S. FRED SINGER

The very first sentence of the Summary to the National Academy of Sciences' recently issued report on global climate change (NAS/S) makes clear that the politics of climate change continues to take precedence over the science of climate change, even among scientists.

That sentence states unequivocally: “Greenhouse gases are accumulating in Earth’s atmosphere as a result of human activities, causing surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to rise.” Only near the end of the report itself (page 17 of 24 pages) do we learn of the considerable uncertainties that could offset the clear and unequivocally stated conclusion of the first paragraph:

Because of the large and still uncertain level of natural variability inherent in the climate record and the uncertainties in the time histories of the various forcing agents (and particularly aerosols), a causal linkage between the buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and the observed climate changes during the 20th century cannot be unequivocally established. The fact that the magnitude of the warming in the past 50 years, there is no evidence (in the form of “fingerprints,” for example) that such a warming is human-related. On the contrary, the available evidence directly contradicts the idea that humans have made and are making a substantial contribution to temperature changes. The past century’s trends can best be explained in terms of natural variability, most likely caused by solar variability.

Furthermore, if one were to accept the claim that the climate has warmed in the past 50 years, there is no evidence (in the form of “fingerprints,” for example) that such a warming is human-related. On the contrary, the available evidence directly contradicts the idea that humans have made and are making a substantial contribution to temperature changes. The past century’s trends can best be explained in terms of natural variability, most likely caused by solar variability.

Finally, the NAS/S manages to sidestep the fact that the IPCC Summary, a political document, quotes the IPCC report selectively and exaggerates disasters while downplaying uncertainties. As the NAS/S puts it artfully: “The [IPCC] Summary for Policymakers reflects less emphasis on communicating the basis for uncertainty and a stronger emphasis on areas of major concern…” This change in emphasis appears to be the result of a summary process in which scientists work with policymakers on the document. Yes indeed.

Concluding thoughts

The NAS report stands or falls principally on whether the climate warmed in the past 50 years, and especially since 1980. The overwhelming bulk of data from different independent sources shows no such warming trend. We are not talking just about science but about evidence. A full-scale open debate is in order to settle this matter.

S. Fred Singer is professor emeritus of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia and president of the Science & Environmental Policy Project. Singer’s “The Week that Was” columns can be found on the Internet at www.sepp.org.
April 6, 2001, is a day that will live in infamy in the lives of thousands of people in the Klamath Basin region of Northern California and Southern Oregon. That was the day the Bureau of Reclamation, based on a federal judge’s ruling that sided with extremist “environmental” organizations, cut off irrigation water from a federally administered project to over 200,000 acres involving 1,400 farms and ranches in the basin.

In depriving these people of their water, Judge Sandra Armstrong’s ruling will result in an economic loss estimated at $400 million this year alone; the dislocation of hundreds of agriculture-dependent families; the bankruptcy of an estimated 40 percent of Klamath Project farmers and ranchers; and untold havoc to regional social services, schools, families, businesses, communities, and even wildlife dependent on water from this project.

And all of this will have been done in the name of threatened or endangered species protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

Rally attracts 20,000 protesters
As might be expected, people in the region are not taking this assault on their water rights and livelihoods lying down. On May 7, the largest rally the nation has yet seen over ESA-related issues was held to dramatize the need for reform. The Klamath County Sheriff Department, in charge of crowd control, estimated the number of participants at roughly 20,000.

That so many people from all over the United States would come to a relatively isolated area on a work day illustrates the gravity of a situation rapidly heading toward a major confrontation between the federal government and the people whose rights it was created to protect.

The Klamath River Basin situation is unlike other “run of the mill” ESA tragedies. Here, the federal government is slapping this calumny on WWI and WWII veterans and their descendants—who risked their lives defending the principles for which this nation stands.

A promise broken
In the interest of promoting agricultural production to feed our growing nation and the world, at the turn of the century the federal government proposed an irrigation project and lured homesteaders to the Klamath River Basin area. Once to WWI veterans and twice to WWII vets, the feds freely deeded water and land to them and their heirs in perpetuity, with the stipulation that the homesteaders repay the costs of the project.

The costs were repaid in full a number of years ago, and the annual costs of administering the program are also paid. The farmers have kept their end of the bargain.

Not so the feds. Between the National Marine Fisheries Service on behalf of the Coho salmon, and the Fish and Wildlife Service on behalf of two species of suckerfish, the feds claimed the entire amount of water flowing through the project this year and an estimated six out of 10 future years.

Drought is cited as the reason, although the lakes from which the water is drawn are at record levels and water is being spilled at exceptionally high volumes. Many residents along the Klamath River describe the river as “plumb full”…yet no water is being shared with farmers in urgent need.

“Buckets of water would be passed hand to hand from Klamath Lake through downtown Klamath Falls into an irrigation ditch at the other end of town—perhaps the longest bucket brigade on record!”

Environmentalists, ranchers, farmers disagree
Bill Gaines, of the California Waterfowl Association, stated the Klamath Basin is the most important nesting and staging area throughout North America for waterfowl, and it is crucial to the preservation of the Pacific flyway waterfowl popu-
of establishing at least a cover crop to prevent soil loss, estimated at 4 tons per acre this year.

Enter the Bucket Brigade
Grassroots activists from the region developed an idea, a variation on one that originated in Jarbridge, Nevada, to dramatize the situation. In Jarbridge, a “shovel brigade” was convened to open a road closed by federal government actions on behalf of another supposedly endangered fish. The Jarbridge folks were extremely successful in drawing national attention to a local ESA problem—and that was the outcome desired by the Bucket Brigade organizers.

Buckets of water would be passed hand to hand from Klamath Lake through downtown Klamath Falls into an irrigation ditch at the other end of town—perhaps the longest bucket Klamath Falls into an irrigation ditch at the other end of town—perhaps the longest bucket brigade on record! This act would not only symbolize whose water it was, but also illustrate the determination of the people to whom it belonged. As I put it at the time I proposed the concept to community leaders, it was “time to dump a little tea in the harbor.”

There were many in the region who felt the federal government’s action justified a far more radical response. It is a measure of the dedication these communities feel to this country’s ideals that respect for the process prevailed and a successful rally and follow-up in Washington, DC were held.

There is no telling what will ultimately transpire as a result of the sequestration of water rights in the Klamath Basin. But the history books will surely record that the people in the region measured up in every way to the level of respect for American principles that prompted the original homesteaders to defend these ideals so honorably in battle on foreign lands.

Behind and beyond the Bucket Brigade
Before the Bucket Brigade, the agricultural community had focused its efforts on lobbying and legal wrangling. No attention had been paid to developing and organizing grassroots support for the area’s agriculture. As other natural resource development interests, most notably timber and mining, have found, this can be a fatal neglect.

Throughout the planning, staging, and follow-up to the Bucket Brigade, correcting this deficiency was the primary focus. The difficulty, as in any political effort, was how to motivate people to become involved. Americans often seem to have little sympathy for job loss, the attendant hardship, or even the economic and social withering of communities. There may, however, be growing recognition that there are limits to people’s tolerance for such hardship.

It is one thing for misfortune to befall families or communities as a result of market or other natural forces. It is quite another to have those tragedies take place as a result of government action…and it is particularly painful when government action violates the rights and spirit of justice that Americans regard as their birthright.

By uniting behind the principles that should guide the federal government’s relationship with its people, there may yet be hope to reform such misguided efforts as the ESA. The challenge is how to educate a population that is becoming less aware of these principles with each succeeding generation.

It will be far worse than taking their water, if the veteran homesteaders from the Klamath Basin are rewarded for their sacrifice by America’s abandonment of those hard-won ideals.

Ric Costales is a member of Frontiers of Freedom/People for the USA and was instrumental in organizing the Klamath Bucket Brigade.

Endangered Species Act hits Klamath again
Northwest logging, on public lands and private, challenged in two separate lawsuits
BY JAMES TAYLOR

Having just lost their water supplies to endangered sucker fish, residents of the Klamath River basin and much of the Pacific Northwest took another hit May 31 as a federal appeals court shut down logging in much of California, Oregon, and Washington.

The ban will prohibit timber harvesting on more than 130,000 acres of federal timberland while the federal government studies logging’s effect on cutthroat trout and coho salmon. The Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund and other anti-logging groups argued that the National Marine Fisheries Service must analyze the effects of each individual timber sale on its immediate environment.

The NMFS had been analyzing the effects of cumulative timber sales in the context of the entire watershed. Federal officials maintained that focusing on the larger watershed region ensured protection of the endangered species while still allowing multiple use of the public lands.

The Ninth Circuit Federal Court of Appeals disagreed. The court’s decision puts an indefinite hold up to 170 timber sales throughout the Pacific Northwest while the NMFS evaluates each individual sale. The proposed sales fall within the terms of the Clinton administration’s 1994 Northwest Forest Plan, which settled a dispute regarding the spotted owl.

“The decision upsets a settled interagency process for evaluating timber sales, without telling [the agencies] what to replace it with,” stated Mark Rutzick, an attorney for the Northwest Forestry Association.

According to Rutzick, exhaustive federal procedures already protect the trout and salmon in question. Anti-logging lobby challenges private landowners
At the same time that the appeals court was considering the federal government’s use of public lands, the Pacific Rivers Council and other anti-logging interests filed notice of their intent to sue the State of Oregon to block logging on private lands.

Similar to the public lands case decided by the Ninth Circuit, the new suit claims private property use is harming coho salmon. Specifically, the complaint alleges that Oregon unlawfully condones private citizens harvesting timber in areas that are too close to streams.

“We are not looking for a shut-down of the timber business, but what we do need to stop are the specific practices that are known to be harmful to fish,” said David Bayles of the Pacific Rivers Council.

“We proactively enforce existing rules,” countered Ted Lorenzen, forest practices director of the Oregon Department of Forestry. Lorenzen expressed confidence that private landowners will be found not in any way endangering the salmon.

We had a very good economy going.” Byrne’s daughter, Brianna, a Tulelake High School student and member of Tulelake Future Farmers of America, spoke for the young people of the basin, noting the youth of the Klamath Basin are concerned about their futures. “We are taught the value of hard work and learn to appreciate agriculture by working on our families’ and neighbors’ farms and ranches. This year, there will be none of that,” Byrne said. “How can I and the other members of my chapter of Future Farmers feel any sense of security of pursuing agriculture as a career when the government of the strongest nation on Earth takes away the core of our history and community based upon unproven and speculative science? We fear we will have to abandon our dreams and all that our parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents had worked for.”

Vernacio Hernandez, a Tulelake farmer, explained his situation to the committee, saying his main goal in life is to provide his children with the education he never had.

“My dreams of farming on my own and watching my children succeed are basically destroyed. The pain that I feel is made much worse when I look in my children’s eyes and I know their hopes and dreams are dying too,” Hernandez said.

An emotional Rep. Tim Leslie (R-Tahoe City) was shocked by what he had heard. “We during the hearing and stressed action must be taken to help the people and farmers in the Klamath Basin.”

“I feel like I need to apologize to the people who are here today because I was helpless to be able to help them the way a representative should. To listen to the report of the federal government and to learn an economic review was simply done and that the local community was excluded from participating or providing their input...it leaves one weak,” Leslie said.

He continued, “Today I’m not real proud of our federal government. I’m embarrassed by it. Use of fraudulent science that even ignores the impact on waterfowl. It leads me to the conclusion that the federal government is at fault.”

What happens next?
Following the two panels, committee members expressed possible actions they could take, such as educating urban committee members who were not present for the hearing about the crisis, and writing legislation that focuses on protection for landowners as well as fish. Members of the committee agreed to develop a report on hearing findings, which will be shared with the committee members and forwarded to the Bush administration.

Christine Souza is assistant editor of the California Farm Bureau Federation Ag Alert.
Kern County the answer to California energy woes?

Supporters of a balanced, market-based energy policy point to central California’s Kern County as an example for the rest of the state to follow.

Rural Kern County has welcomed oil drilling and the construction of power plants while the rest of the state, and indeed much of the nation, has taken a “not in my backyard” approach to energy production. Local environmentalists note that energy production has had little or no adverse impact on local wildlife. In fact, tax revenues from energy production have financed new schools and beautiful new parks and preserves.

“There should be power plants in everybody’s backyard,” proclaimed Paul Gipe, chairman of the Kern County Sierra Club. “If people are concerned about having too many power plants, they should think twice when they flip on the light switch.”

Assemblyman Roy Ashburn notes that for all the benefits of harmonizing energy and environmental concerns, Kern County still must pay the dues for other counties’ anti-production energy policies. Noting that Kern County pays the same high energy prices and suffers the same rolling blackouts as other members of the state’s energy grid, Ashburn asserts that “the people of California are either going to be part of the solution or part of the problem. And in Kern County, we have a long history of being part of the solution, especially when it comes to energy issues.”

“In other parts of the state, Ashburn sees “a lot of arrogance—people who enjoy the benefits of a very high quality of life, enjoy the benefits of electric power for jobs and for their personal life, but with an exclusivity that it’s someone else’s problem to create that for them. We don’t have that attitude in Kern County.”

While the rest of the state pays a particularly heavy price for its past energy production decisions, the Bush administration says help is on the way. In addition to a spate of belatedly constructed power plants that will begin to produce power this fall, the Bush energy plan would eliminate obstacles to conventional technology energy production and will provide incentives to encourage energy production using alternative sources.

“We’re committed to a new approach for a new century. Energy and the environment do not have to be competing priorities,” stated Bush.

Assembly Republican Leader Dave Cox in a letter to Davis, “Should you insist on maintaining this relationship, it would be most appropriate to pay the bill with campaign funds.”

Brulte and Cox also objected to Lehane and Fabiani’s involvement regarding energy policy formulation because the pair had previously advised Southern California Edison, which is requesting state help in avoiding bankruptcy. Such ties create an undeniable conflict of interest, asserted Brulte and Cox.

Objections to placing Lehane and Fabiani on public payroll reverberated as strongly outside the Republican Party. Harry Snyder of Consumers Union called the state’s hiring of Lehane and Fabiani “the worst abuse of power that I have seen in 25 years.”

Davis steps up the rhetoric

The influence of Lehane and Fabiani appeared immediately in the governor’s public appearances. Davis asserted in a May 17 press conference that the Bush energy plan lets power generators “get away with murder.”

“Any government that sets out to repair what it sees as a defect in the market mechanism runs the risk of causing even more serious damage elsewhere,” continued Blinder. “Investment in the industry generally dries up. Because price ceilings reduce the monetary returns that investors can legally earn, less capital will be invested in industries that are subject to price controls.”

Californians opposed price controls in previous attempts that are subject to price controls. “Any government that sets out to repair what it sees as a defect in the market mechanism runs the risk of causing even more serious damage elsewhere,” continued Blinder. “Investment in the industry generally dries up. Because price ceilings reduce the monetary returns that investors can legally earn, less capital will be invested in industries that are subject to price controls.”

Davis stepped up the rhetoric immediately in the governor’s public appearances. Davis asserted in a May 17 press conference that the Bush energy plan lets power generators “get away with murder.”

“Our literally in a war with energy companies which are price gouging us,” Davis told the news conference. Pulling Bush into the mix, he accused the administration of “turning a blind eye to the bleeding and hemorrhaging that exists in this state.”

Davis’ Attorney General, Bill Lockyer, followed the governor’s attacks in kind. “I would love to personally escort [Enron Corporation Chairman Kenneth] Lay to an 8 x 10 cell that he could share with a tattooed dude who says ‘Hi, my name is Spike, honey,’” stated Lockyer.

Davis called on the federal government to cap California energy prices, but his argument did not appear to be making much headway with the Bush administration. Vice President Dick Cheney affirmed the administration would not support price controls and chastised Davis for his political finger pointing. “We get politicians who want to go out and blame somebody and allege there is some kind of conspiracy, whether it’s the oil companies or whomever it might be, instead of dealing with the real issues.”

“There are peak problems right now because California hasn’t brought any new supply into place in 10 years, no new facilities, and so they’ve got an imbalance. But the way to solve it isn’t price caps, that only makes matters worse,” added Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham.

Davis advisor repudiated price controls

Complicating Davis’ efforts to sell his price control plan are the writings of one of Davis’ chief energy advisors, Alan Blinder, a Princeton economist and former member of President Clinton’s Council of Economic Advisors, has been retained by Davis to argue for energy price controls. However, Blinder’s own writings undercut the rationale of Davis’ appeal.

Refuting Davis’ argument that California price controls would create few if any harms because they are requested only as a temporary measure, Blinder writes, “Virtually every price ceiling or floor creates a class of people that benefit from the regulations. These people use their political influence to protect their gains by preserving that status quo, which is one reason why it is so hard to eliminate price ceilings or floors.”

“Any government that sets out to repair what it sees as a defect in the market mechanism runs the risk of causing even more serious damage elsewhere,” continued Blinder. “Investment in the industry generally dries up. Because price ceilings reduce the monetary returns that investors can legally earn, less capital will be invested in industries that are subject to price controls.”

James Hoecker, a Clinton appointee to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, agreed. “As disappointing as it may seem to some, we cannot ‘price cap’ California out of a supply shortage.”

Solutions to the California energy problem, according to the Bush administration, require the building of more California power plants, the easing of regulations restricting the generation and flow of power, and a more balanced approach to the zero-energy-growth policy of anti-market environmentalists.
Exploding the myths of soil erosion

Shifting Ground:

BY PETER H. LINDERT

Reviewed by D. Gale Johnson

The generally accepted opinion is that a large percentage of the world's agricultural land is degraded and is being further degraded year by year. The World Map of the Status of Human-Induced Soil Degradation, produced by the United Nations Environment Program in the late 1980s, is a major source of that opinion. In Shifting Ground, Peter Lindert argues persuasively in my opinion—that the basis for the conclusion that a large percentage of the world's agricultural land is degraded as a result of human action is wholly inadequate. The evidence used to reach this conclusion is not derived from historical comparisons of the status of agricultural lands, he notes, but on a description of lands at a particular moment in time. As Lindert writes, "It tries to measure change over time in the absence of data over time" (page 21).

Good data are available. Lindert (professor of economics and director of the Agricultural History Center at the University of California, Davis) utilizes data from soil surveys in China and Indonesia. These data—from the world's largest and fourth-largest countries (in terms of population)—have been available for decades. These surveys cover a period of approximately half a century, from the 1930s to the 1980s. The surveys provide measures of soil characteristics for a given location at a given time. While the surveys are not identical in all respects over time, there are many common elements: measures of the major nutrients, of organic matter, alkalinity, acidity, and the depth of the topsoil. Such surveys exist in other countries, including the United States, but apparently only Lindert has used them to provide a realistic picture of the changes in soils over time. Given the availability of such data, it is surprising they have not been used before to understand what has happened to the quality of the world's soils.

The reason may be that it is an enormous amount of work to effectively utilize the hundreds—thousands, probably—of these surveys. So far, Lindert has been the only one willing to make the required investment of time.

Erosion happens. That erosion exists cannot be questioned. After all, the Yellow River didn't get its name by accident. But in much of the discussion of erosion, as well as other aspects of soil degradation, it is seldom asked whether the erosion is human induced—it tends to be merely assumed that it is.

In addition, when and where there is erosion, little or no evidence is provided as to whether it occurs on farmland. Lindert directly addresses the issue of whether the erosion has taken a serious toll on the farmlands of two countries. As noted below, he finds no evidence that the depth of the topsoil has declined over a period of half a century in these two countries.

One can hope that future estimates of soil degradation, including the extent of soil erosion, will utilize the real evidence that is available rather than speculating on the basis of models not grounded in historical data.

Farming has not hurt soil quality in China. Based on the comparisons of the soil surveys in China, Lindert concludes there have been positive and negative changes affecting the quality and quantity of farmland. The negative factors have been declines in the nitrogen and organic matter in the soils, while potassium and potash contents have increased. The decline in nitrogen content of the soil seems to have little or no negative effect on yield; however, since nitrogen can be and is added as fertilizer.

Perhaps the most striking conclusion is that the depth of the topsoil has not diminished—erosion has not taken a toll on China's soils. And the quantity of farmland has apparently increased over the last half-century, as recently confirmed by the Chinese government, rather than decreasing significantly as has been often claimed by Lester Brown, Vaclav Smil, and others.

Lindert summarizes what has happened to soil quality in China: "The most reliable . . . basic inference is that the overall soil quality did not decline between the 1950s and the 1980s" (page 145). In fact, some of his estimates indicate a modest increase in soil quality. Thus in a period of rapid change—the creation of the communes, the period of the Great Famine, the Cultural Revolution, and the reforms of the late 1970s and early 1980s when the communes were abolished and the household responsibility system emerged—the evidence is very strong that the quality of the soil was not diminished.

Similar findings for Indonesia. In addition, Lindert finds no evidence that erosion of agricultural land in Indonesia was a problem. This conclusion is based on two types of evidence: the absence of a decline in the content of major nutrients, the soil, and the adjustment of the depth of topsoil data to account for certain problems in the data for the early years.

His overall estimate is that the average soil chemical quality declined by 4 to nearly 6 percent. This decline was due primarily to bringing new lands into cultivation in the outlying islands—the soil quality index for the established agricultural areas in Java and Madura may have increased by as much as 10 percent. The area under cultivation more than doubled between 1940 and 1990. If land is adjusted to the Javanese quality level and adjustment is made for the small decline in average quality, the increase in quality-adjusted land under cultivation during this period was more than 75 percent.

Farmers make good land stewards. To summarize the results presented in this very important book, Lindert shows that for two of the most populous countries in the world, farmers have taken very good care of their land. Yes, erosion occurs—but careful analysis is required to determine whether it is human induced and whether it affects agricultural land.

Lindert's careful analysis supports two important conclusions, though these conclusions are not stated explicitly by him. His work confirms that "farmers are as smart as the rest of us" and that "farm people of China and Indonesia have been good stewards of their land." Studies similar to this one should be made for other countries or areas for which soil surveys exist over extended periods of time to determine whether farmers elsewhere have been good stewards of their land. My expectation is that they have been. I do not believe the experiences in China and Indonesia were unique.


This article originally appeared on Economic History Services E.H.Net. E.H.Net operates the Economic History Services fileserver and several discussion lists to provide resources and promote communication among scholars in economic history and related fields. Its Web site is http://www.eh.net.
Free-market environmentalism: It’s about choice, not science

an interview with Jerry Taylor
by James Taylor

As the Cato Institute’s director of natural resource studies, Jerry Taylor challenges the “market failure” critique of capitalism as it pertains to energy policy and environmental protection. He believes that government failure to recognize private property rights leads to environmental degradation, and that economic growth is a vital prerequisite for ecological health.

Under Taylor’s direction, Cato’s scholars have become some of the nation’s most influential and outspoken critics of federal land management policy, various “sustainable development” initiatives, global warming control policies, federal environmental regulations, environmental “doomsaying,” energy conservation mandates, renewable energy management, federal energy policy, and public utility regulation in general. Since joining Cato, Taylor, a popular public speaker and debater, has emerged as a major voice in the environmental debate. A former editor of Environmental Monitor, Taylor is an adjunct scholar at the Institute for Energy Research and senior editor of Regulation magazine. He spoke recently with his favorite brother, ECN Managing Editor James Taylor.

ECN: What is the Cato Institute’s philosophy on environment and natural resource issues?

TAYLOR: Although environmental debates sound like they’re arguments about science and public health (with a smattering of economics tossed in), they’re really debates about preferences and whose preferences should be imposed on society.

Although participants argue that “sound science” ought to determine whose preferences determine the standards (it’s just that their science is better than their opponents’), science cannot referee the debate.

Consider the dispute about the regulation of potentially unhealthy pollutants, the central mission of the Environmental Protection Agency. The agency examines toxicological and epidemiological data to ascertain the exposure level at which suspect substances impose measurable human health risks. Even assuming that such analyses are capable of providing the requisite information (a matter, incidentally, that is hotly debated within the scientific and public health community), who is to say whether one risk tolerance is preferable to another?

The amount of resources one is willing to spend on risk avoidance is ultimately subjective, without a “right” or “wrong” answer. Everyone’s risk tolerance is different. Scientists can help inform our decisions, but they cannot pontificate to the “correct” decision.

Should experts—acting on behalf of regulatory agencies—decide what sort of environmental quality people should or should not have a right to consume? In no other area of the economy do scientists have the power to force in such a manner. After all, people are allowed to consume all kinds of things—such as power crystals, magnets, age-defying vitamins, and organic food—that scientists, doctors, and public health officials think are silly or even potentially counterproductive.

Many people—perhaps even a majority of voting Americans—want to secure cleaner air and cleaner water regardless of whether those improvements significantly reduce human health risks. Under the present political regime, however, no such improvements can occur without some alleged scientific justification.

That is why those who wish to improve environmental quality are forced to embrace whatever science they can—no matter how dubious—to get what they want. They should not, however, have to engage in such scientific gymnastics to secure desired goods or services.

The debate over public land use is likewise garbed in the dubious cloth of science. How do we know whether public lands are more “valuable” if left wild than if developed in some way? While methods such as contingent valuation surveys exist to measure the “existence value” of any particular parcel of land, they yield highly dubious information for the simple reason that what people say they’re willing to pay in surveys rarely comports with their actual behavior in the marketplace.

Likewise, there’s no objectively correct way to measure the economic benefits provided by certain ecological services (such as water filtration services provided by wetlands) because so many of the resources affected are—at the moment—outside of the marketplace. The debate, again, is more a battle of subjective preferences than a battle of ecological economics simply because the information necessary to inform the latter is unobtainable by government.

As a libertarian, I’m not comfortable having government tell us what tradeoffs we
should or should not make regarding environmental risks or how much consumption of environmental goods we should or should not prefer.

While Cato certainly seeks to better inform the public about the scientific issues, our main goal is to promote policies that would allow the maximum amount of freedom for individuals to pursue their preferences without impinging upon the equally valid preferences of others.

**ECN:** In what ways does the Cato Institute’s emphasis on the free market supplement traditional conservative ideas?

**TAYLOR:** Conservatives tend to think that scientists can and should tell people what risks they should be willing to bear and what level of environmental quality they should be happy with. I call this the “guys in white coats should make decisions” viewpoint. Good books on environmental issues are legion. For the best book on the nonsense surrounding the global warming issue, check out The Satanic Gases by Pat Michaels and Robert Balling. For the best book on the issues surrounding air pollution, I recommend Indur Goklany’s Clearing the Air.

For environmental policy in general, I recommend Terry Anderson’s Free Market Environmentalism and Wilfred Beckerman’s Through Green Colored Glasses. For public lands-related issues, I like Karl Hess’ book Visions Upon the Land. For generalized critiques of junk science, see anything by Steve Milloy and Michael Fumento. For a good book on how environmental and resource apocalyptic is not upon us, the absolute best book is Julian Simon’s The State of Humanity.

**ECN:** If you were to recommend a short list of books, journals, articles, or Web sites on free market environmentalism, what would be on that list?

**TAYLOR:** The best Web site for information about junk science surrounding environmental issues is Steve Milloy’s junkscience.com. The best Web site to keep up with the scientific fight over global warming is Pat Michaels’ greeningearth-society.org. Heartland’s Web site (heartland.org) is probably the best one-stop shop for links to policy analyses on environment-related topics. Cato’s natural resource studies pages (cato.org) aren’t too shabby either.

People should be to secure their preferences regardless of what they demonstrably do want out of environmental policy.

In the final analysis, environmental goods and services—to the greatest extent possible—should be treated like other goods and services in the marketplace. People should be free to secure their preferences regarding the consumption of environmental goods such as clean air or clean water regardless of whether some scientists think such preferences are legitimate or not. Likewise, people should be free to the greatest extent possible to make decisions consistent with their own risk tolerances regardless of scientific or even public opinion.

**ECN:** Some people contend that natural resources and environmental goods are not well suited for the free market. For example, how do you track and redress air or water pollution? How can we ensure a safe, affordable, and free flow of water or energy without government regulation?

**TAYLOR:** Economic growth is a vital prerequisite for environmental improvement, and to the extent that free markets lead to more economic growth than alternative arrangements, free markets are crucial prerequisites for environmental quality.

There are a number of reasons for this. First, it takes a healthy, growing economy to afford the pollution control technologies necessitated by environmental protection. A poorer nation, for example, could scarcely afford the nearly $200 billion this nation has spent on sewage treatment plants over the past 30 years.

Second, growing consumer demand for environmental goods—parks; recreational facilities; land for hunting, fishing, hiking; urban air and water quality—are largely responsible for the improving quantity and quality of both public and private ecological resources.

Virtually all analysts agree that, for the vast majority of consumers, environmental amenities are “luxury goods” that are in greatest demand in the wealthiest societies. Economic growth is thus indirectly responsible for improving environmental quality in that it creates the conditions necessary for increased demand for (and the corresponding increase in supply of) environmental quality.

Third, advances in technology, production methods, and manufacturing practices—both a cause and a consequence of economic growth—have historically resulted in less, not more, pollution. Even advances in non-environmental technologies and industries have indirectly resulted in more efficient resource consumption and less pollution.

Economists who have studied the data find that, with the exception of trends in air and water pollution track trends in per-capita income.

**ECN:** How has the debate over natural resources and environmental issues evolved during your years at Cato?

**TAYLOR:** The answer is: “debatably better.” The debate has become more informed, and that would not be accurate. Debates about environmental policy have always been and probably always will be debates about essentially religious beliefs concerning man’s proper role in the world. The flash points of the debate may change, but the nature of the debate does not.

**ECN:** Do you see the free market making many ideological inroads in the environmental debate?

**TAYLOR:** Not really. The encouraging developments that we have seen have less to do with an increased public acceptance of “free markets” than they do with an increased judicial acceptance of the importance of property rights and a properly construed Interstate Commerce Clause.

In your years in the environmental arena is if we unleash the fabled “laboratories of democracy” Congress will never allow such experiments to be run nationally out of EPA.

The only way to improve things is to encourage Congress to allow states to apply for regulatory waivers, much in the same way Congress allowed the states to apply for waivers under the old welfare regime. State and local governments could best advance the cause of “free market environmentalism” in the short run by actively campaigning for such waivers.

At the end of the day, the only way we’re going to see interesting regulatory experiments in the environmental arena is if we unleash the fabled “laboratories of democracy.” Congress will never allow such experiments to be run nationally out of EPA.

**ECN:** OK, I’ve got to ask: Do you drive a “gas-guzzling SUV”?

**TAYLOR:** Yes.
It’s time to protect our property ... again

BY JIM BEERS

I am not a lawyer. I have spent 35 years watching the federal government buy, mismanage, and sell up more and more private property. Many citizens are deeply concerned about these matters.

While attending a conference recently a lady from southern Virginia asked me to look at two new U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service brochures that discuss the purchase of private property for the refuge system and for state fish and wildlife agencies utilizing Pittman Robertson funds. She explained that many people were upset by the arrogance and intimidating tone of these brochures.

What struck me most in reading them was the constant and steady mention of the condemnation authority of the government (the Fish & Wildlife Service in this case). Like the bartender's shotgun on the bar as he tells a patron to leave, the mere mention (much less the repeated reminder) of the government's condemnation authority deeply affects the “negotiations to purchase” the home or livelihood of tax-paying American citizens.

An unlimited right to condemn?
The right of the government to take private property (with just compensation) is rightly and deeply imbedded in the Constitution and laws of the United States. Who could argue with the government’s right to condemn certain bluffs along the lower Potomac River to build forts to prevent the British Navy from coming back up the river to burn Washington? Certainly the government needs to condemn private property to build an interstate highway system or to place an anti-missile defense site where it is needed.

That said, should the authority to condemn be automatically applied to a pretty patch of farmland in central Ohio or a hay meadow in sight of a National Park drive, merely because a government agency believes it would be nice for the government to own that property?

The way it works today, the FWS (or NPS or USFS or BLM) writes up paperwork to justify to Congress why the pretty farms in Ohio, or the fields near a Refuge or Park or Forest, would be nice for the government to own. It gets all dressed up in the politically correct words of the day (biodiversity, viewsheesh, native species, access control, etc.).

Four to eight new Refuges are designated every year, plus even more parks, plus additions to currently authorized sites. Many of these originate with the anti-private property nongovernment organizations (NGOs), or with certain politicians, or as political cover for other things.

For instance, the recent CARA land purchase binge was supported by a couple of key states because they receive disproportionate shares of the acquisition money. NGOs like the National Rifle Association supported CARA after gaining assurance that some of the grant money would be available to them. State fish and wildlife agencies strongly supported it as an enormous new source of revenue to them — although their governors and legislators will have little or no say about the disposition of those funds. State agencies will become little more than vassals of the federal regulation-writers.

When Congress approves (authorizes) the new Congressman Jim Beers Refuge in Ohio, or the addition of Jim Beers’ home and hay field to the Bull Run National Park, the agency (in this case FWS or NPS) automatically gets condemnation authority. Never mind that they brag about how they seldom use it. Imagine as I shake you down for protection money, I introduce Vito, my 380 pound enforcer. If I tell you he has only rarely had to break an arm or a leg, does his presence not affect the outcome of our discussion?

With increasing frequency and magnitude, the federal government is acquiring private land for purposes that are neither emergencies nor urgent, reduce acreages that produce food and fiber, and limit public access for recreational and social uses. Increasingly, the land acquisitions are based on questionable and frivolous rationales.

A call to arms
Putting an end to this abuse of government authority will require a national effort by all who are concerned about the steady loss of freedom. Our goal should be a simple amendment to all laws that give the government condemnation authority. I think that means we need a lawyer.

Whenever Congress authorizes the acquisition of private property for purposes other than national defense (or interstate highways?), the bill must specifically authorize the use of condemnation power. Absent that specific authorization, the power to condemn would not exist, and only willing sellers would enter into negotiations.

If a government agency wants to fence off your family farm to install a cheap imitation of Middle Ages America, that agency should pay you at least the price willing sellers have gotten in your neighborhood.

If I was a mall developer and wanted the farm your great-grandfather started, does anyone believe I would ever get it for anywhere near the price your recently retired neighbor got for his farm? If land developers offered only the price that acreage had sold for over the past 10 years, would they ever get enough land? Of course not.

When the government lays the condemnation hammer on the table, people who do not want to sell at any price are forced to capitulate. Is that what we fought wars for? Is this the sort of citizen-government relationship our Founding Fathers framed in the Constitution and Bill of Rights? Of course not.

Congress should openly and forthrightly grant condemnation authority only to those land purchases that serve an important and overriding national interest. The other, nice-to-do purchases should involve only willing sellers in the true sense of the word.

If an American citizen desires to own property, the government should not be able to take it away for frivolous purposes. We fought and won a war against King George for this right, and we ought not tolerate losing it piecemeal for the politically correct expediencies of passing fads and individual political careers.

Talk about this and get your organizations to band together. Everyone from the farmer to the pet owner, medical researcher, hunter, trapper, logger, horse owner, gun owner, and a whole lot more share in this struggle to maintain our rights in an increasingly restrictive national environment.

Jim Beers is federal programs coordinator for the National Trappers Association.
Fly-in for Freedom rallies free-market environmentalists

BY JAMES TAYLOR

Environmental protection does not require evicting private property rights or heavy-handed federal government intrusion, concluded participants in the Alliance for America’s Eleventh Annual Fly-In for Freedom. The Fly-In, held May 19-23 in Washington, DC, enabled participants to share ideas, success stories, and recommendations for a balanced enjoyment of the nation’s environmental resources.

Alliance for America President Dale Anderson opened the conference expressing appreciation to The Heartland Institute and North American Motorized Recreation Coalition for their co-sponsorship of the Fly-In. Anderson then spoke of the importance of preserving the bond between recreational and economic interests in the utilization and enjoyment of our natural environment. Balanced enjoyment is the key to successful environmental policy, observed Anderson as he underscored the theme of this year’s Fly-In, “Access for All.”

“We can have sound environmental policy and extract the minerals. They must be interwoven, not separated.”

Anti-market voices skew debate

John Rishel, a staffer for the House Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources, warned that our dependence on foreign oil “is at an all-time high. He noted that America has abundant energy resources but anti-market environmentalists have removed some of the most productive reserves from the open market. Anti-market environmentalists have successfully used large PR firms to mislead the American public on the true nature of our environmental choices, asserted Rishel.

Paula Easley, an Alaska public policy consultant, contended Rishel’s theme of how anti-market liberals have shaped America’s environmental debate. Key to understanding the anti-market lobby, she said, is to realize that scare tactics and calling for more government help fill their coffers with public dollars.

In misrepresenting the environmental issues regarding drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the anti-market environmentalists have been particularly deceitful, asserted Easley. “ANWR has proven to be one of our biggest money-makers yet.”

Easley pointed out that a large body of peer-reviewed science shows drilling in ANWR presents few if any adverse environmental consequences. Nevertheless, the national media continues to give anti-market environmentalists a free pass on their unsubstantiated claims of environmental doom and gloom. “Why on Earth should we have to account for our knowledge when they [anti-market environmentalists] never have to account for their ignorance?” asked Easley.

Freedom protects the environment

Jay Lehr, The Heartland Institute’s science director and former managing editor of Environment & Climate News, presented the luncheon address: “Freedom vs. the Environment: A False Choice.” Lehr documented how freedom and environmental health are consistently linked through human history. Freedom is not only necessary for the uplifting of human conditions, he said, but for preserving a healthy environment as well.

Lehr professed he is “a bleeding heart liberal” who nevertheless recognizes that free markets are necessary for uplifting the downtrodden and successfully managing the environment. He noted that he assisted willingly in the writing of every piece of environmental legislation between 1967 and 1983 except the Endangered Species Act and the “wetlands” portion of the Clean Water Act. The Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act’s wetlands provisions, through their economic counter-incentives and their excessive encroachments on citizens’ rights, represent “the two most damaging pieces of environmental legislation ever passed,” asserted Lehr.

States’ rights under attack

In a breakout session titled “What Has Happened to Our Federalist System,” Jim Tenney and Bill Howell of Frontiers for Freedom traced the ever-growing national government’s encroachment on the states’ rights doctrine. Particularly noteworthy is the national government’s claims of sovereignty over rights-of-way on public lands, asserted Tenney and Howell. The national government increasingly places liens on private property and asserts authority over state and local roads.

Tenney and Howell’s observations were particularly timely as President Bush announced just a few days before, as part of his national energy program, an intention to give the national government greater power to take private property for energy transmission lines.

Supporting states’ rights is essential to preserving a balanced approach to environmental stewardship, urged Tenney and Howell, because the greatest assaults on free-market environmentalism are launched from Washington, DC. “The last thing the ‘environmental’ community wants to see is a return to state sovereignty as enumerated originally,” Tenney said. If states more aggressively exercised the right to weigh their citizens’ interests against the anti-market lobby in Washington, the results would reflect a healthy environmental balance that would deter the anti-market measures of national lobbyist groups.

Resolutions adopted

Fly-In attendees approved three resolutions calling for changes in federal policies. One called for financial restitution for citizens deprived of the use of their property by the Endangered Species Act.

All King, of Klamath County, Oregon, spoke in favor of the resolution. “Farmers, ranchers, foresters, ski operators, and others bear all the burden from the ESA, but the federal agencies that make the decisions get off scot-free. Federal agencies have used the ESA to ruin land values and to even take property from landowners. When a federal agency causes these losses because of the ESA, the federal government should be required to repay the full financial loss to the owner.”

King was speaking from experience. The federal government recently diverted waters from Klamath County farmers for the protection of endangered sucker fish. Drought-stricken farmers face financial ruin as a result of the federal government’s action. (See page 1 and center-spread articles in this issue of Environment & Climate News.)

The Fly-In approved a second resolution to allow island and coastal nations to continue their ancient tradition of whale hunting without “threat of economic sanction or censure” so long as the hunted whales are not threatened or endangered.

A final resolution called for amending the Marine Mammal Preservation Act to allow the Inuits of Arctic Canada to continue their ancient cultural practice of harvesting seals that exist in large populations.

United we stand

One of the predominant themes of the Fly-In was the political power of a united rural America. Speakers noted it was the rural vote that gave George W. Bush his victory in the 2000 Presidential election.

Rural Americans are particularly attuned to issues affecting a balanced approach to environmental resources because rural Americans are the year-round stewards of such locations. Party affiliation is less important to rural Americans, observed Bruce Vincent of Communities for a Great Northwest, than candidates’ recognition that heavy-handed environmental policies unduly harm the year-round residents of the affected areas.

“We don’t care what party they’re from as long as they stand with us,” stressed Vincent.
Red counties, blue counties and environmentalists

something to feel guilty about.”

US. imports 52 percent of its energy, it’s not clear why that’s a problem either. The pro-

industry and appealing for federal intervention. To watch the national media’s portrayal of environmental issues, one would believe that everybody in rural America (and particularly Western America) belongs to the Sierra Club and voted for Ralph Nader (if they voted on principle) or Al Gore (if they voted on practicality). The “environmentalists” belong to Greenpeace, while the “common citizens” merely vote for people they like.

Who needs a national plan? Wall Street Journal columnist Thomas Bray wondered whether a national energy program was necessary at all. Addressing the growing market share of foreign oil in U.S. consumption, Bray wondered why this is any more undesirable than American consumers importing other products that can be produced less expensively abroad.

“While the U.S. imports 52 percent of its energy, it's not clear why that's a problem either. The producing countries will always have an incentive to sell the oil somewhere, and in a world market, the U.S. will always be able to buy its portion. Moreover, foreign producers also tend to be the low-cost producers. Why make U.S. consumers pay higher prices to drain domestic reserves?” Bray also addressed the Bush plans subsidies for inefficient fuel sources. “The administration wants to offer $4 billion in tax credits for vehicles using hybrid gas-electric or fuel-cell technologies. Hybrids do get better gas mileage. Unfortunately, they aren’t price-competitive with conventional autos. Moreover, such technology takes space. The Honda and Toyota models simply dispense with the trunk, which isn’t a great selling point.” Bray’s observations were similar to those made in a June 2000 policy study released by The Heartland Institute. In “The Increasing Sustainability of Cars, Trucks, and the Internal Combustion Engine,” available on the Internet at http://www.heartland.org/studies/au
tomobility-ps.htm.

The Heartland Institute. In “The Increasing Sustainability of Cars, Trucks, and the Internal Combustion Engine,” Heartland President Joseph Bast and Science Director Jay Lehr demonstrated the performance, pricing, and efficiency problems with alternate fuel technologies. Bast and Lehr showed that hybrid gas-electric cars are more expensive, have a more limited range, offer less horsepower, reduce passenger safety, and provide less passenger and luggage space in comparison to gasoline-powered vehicles. Jerry Taylor, director of natural resource studies at the Cato Institute, asserted that a national energy program is no more necessary or desirable than Al Gore’s “comprehensive national Internet strategy,” former Clinton Labor Secretary Robert Reich’s “comprehensive national industrial strategy,” or Hillary Clinton’s “comprehensive national health-care strategy.”

Noted Taylor, “Energy prices after adjusting for inflation have been plummeting more or less for 15 years. ”Asserting that the current “crisis” is nothing more than a temporary blip in the trend of ever-more-affordable energy, Taylor pointed out that the free market was encouraging greater energy production and lower prices even before Bush unveiled his proposals. Taylor additionally observed that the Bush plan includes expanded federal power to seize private property for the creation of new transmission lines. “Having the feds step in and force private property owners to cut deals they don't want to make with power companies seems antithetical to an administration that likes to talk about its commitment to private property rights,” asserted Taylor.

Administration hoping for compromise Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham, speaking May 24 at the CEI Annual Dinner, attempted to deflect free-market criticism of the Bush plan. “Our plan is defined by a lack of faith in the capacity of government to pick and choose the best fuel or the best technology for the future. Ultimately, the market will answer that question.” But even as Abraham was speaking, Bush and his inner circle were considering more compromises with anti-marketinterest groups to deflect criticisms from the left. Abraham’s defense of the Bush plan’s overall desirability, despite various anti-market proposals, has to date been sufficient to sustain the backing of most conservatives and free-market environmentalists. “The President has given us a bold and sound energy plan, not a perfect one. But for now, let’s give the administration two thumbs up,” said Kemp.

Pete du Pont, chairman of the National Center for Policy Analysis, agreed. “There can be no doubt that the U.S. needs a new energy policy. California is the best example why,” he stated.

Testifying before the House Science Committee on May 23, William Martin of the Alliance for Energy & Economic Growth commended the Bush plan for its environmental and energy-supply balance. Martin observed that just as conservation alone cannot meet America’s future energy needs, neither can reliance solely on alternative energy sources. “We simply can’t afford to put all of our eggs into one basket,” Martin asserted.
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Linda Chavez:
“Still Fighting for the American Dream”

Linda Chavez is president of the Center for Equal Opportunity, a non-profit public policy research organization in Washington, DC. She also writes a weekly syndicated column that appears in newspapers across the country (including the Chicago Sun-Times), and is a political analyst for FOX News Channel.

Chavez is the author of Out of the Barrio: Toward a New Politics of Hispanic Assimilation (Basic Books, 1991), which the Denver Post said “should explode the stereotypes about Hispanics that have clouded the minds of patronizing liberals and xenophobic conservatives alike.” The Washington Post describes Chavez as one of “a new generation of intellectuals [seeking] to question the orthodoxies of the civil rights establishment.” Chavez is well known for her syndicated newspaper column and writings for other publications, including the Wall Street Journal, The New Republic, the Washington Post, and Reader’s Digest.

Mark Skousen:
“The Vindication of Adam Smith”

Mark Skousen is an investment advisor, author, and dynamic world-renowned speaker. A self-described “almost idealistic” proponent of liberty and political freedom with a Ph.D. in economics, Skousen is actively involved in some of the most prestigious free-market and liberty think tanks in the world.


Skousen has built a reputation for accurately identifying not only economic and political trends, but also the right investments for the times. Mark Skousen’s Forecasts & Strategies has grown to become one of the largest financial newsletters in the country.
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NONMEMBERS: $110 before August 15; $125 after; $150 at the door
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PLATINUM $7,500
GOLD $5,000
SILVER $2,500
RESERVED $1,500

DISCOUNTS
FIRST-TIME ATTENDEES, take $25 off your ticket price (does not apply to guests)
Buy five or more tickets and take 15 percent off the total price. All tickets must be purchased at the same time to qualify for group discount.

FOUR EASY WAYS TO BUY TICKETS!

PHONE Call us at 312/377-4000 and ask to reserve tickets for the 17th Anniversary Benefit. Have your Visa, Master Card, or American Express card ready.

FAX Complete the form on page 17 and fax it to us at 312/377-5000.

MAIL Complete the form on page 17 and mail it with your check, money order, or credit card information to The Heartland Institute, 19 South LaSalle Street #903, Chicago, IL 60603.

ONLINE Visit Heartland’s Web Site at www.heartland.org and click on the “Heartland Store” to register online.

REGISTER NOW AND SAVE $15 PER TICKET!
The Only National Conference to Bring INDUSTRY and GOVERNMENT together to explore:

- **Environmental Management**
  - Aligning EMS to Corporate Decision-making and Management
- **Measurement and Process Redesign**
  - Performance Metrics for Clean Air, Clean Water, Solid Waste and Energy Efficiency
- **Environmental Communications and Reporting**
  - Greening Your Company through Internal and External Environmental Performance Reporting
- **Regulation and Permitting**
  - Implementing Flexible, Streamlined and Performance-based Regulations for Beyond Compliance Results
- **The Marketplace for Environmental Solutions**
- **Innovations in Energy Management**
  - Enhancing Energy Efficiency and Ensuring a Stable Supply of Energy

**PLUS:** Comprehensive Coverage of the Latest Developments on Environmental and Energy Efficiency Policies and Model EMS Systems for Specific Sectors of Society

For more updates on sessions and additions to the speaking faculty, visit us on the internet at www.performanceweb.org/EIS2001.html