Greenpeace, WWF Repudiate Anti-DDT Agenda

by James Hoare

Spokesmen for Greenpeace and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), activist environmental groups that have led the effort to ban worldwide use of the pesticide DDT, have admitted to the New York Times that DDT may be necessary and desirable after all.

The admission comes after a de facto 30-year global ban on DDT that has... DDT p. 19

New Jersey Ignores Science on Mercury

by James M. Taylor

A report released February 16 by the Resources Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives shows mercury fears are largely overstated by environmental activist groups. Nevertheless, New Jersey government officials have opted to... MERCURY p. 5

Pork Producers, EPA Adopt New Emissions Rules

by James Hoare

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reached an agreement with the nation’s pork producers and other livestock operators to study and develop new emissions standards for livestock farms.

The agreement, reached January 21. PORK p. 17

Climate Scientist Quits IPCC, Blasts Politicized “Preconceived Agendas”

by James M. Taylor

IPCC announced warming-hurricane link despite “no global warming signal”

by James M. Taylor

Citing a politicized agenda and misrepresentations of climate science, prominent climate scientist Chris Landsea on January 17 resigned his post as a participant in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

Landsea’s announcement is the second recent major embarrassment for global warming alarmists, whose “hockey stick” representation of world temperatures during the past millennium was recently exposed as being based on faulty data and misleading statistical methods. (See “Climate Alarmists Playing Shell Game with Data,” page 9.)

Landsea is one of the world’s leading hurricane researchers, specializing in seasonal and climatic relationships of Atlantic tropical cyclones. He served as chair of the American Meteorological Society’s (AMS) Committee on Tropical Meteorology and Tropical Cyclones for the years... LANDSEA p.10
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ECOSYSTEMS

Missourians Seek Local Control of Watershed

by Henry Lamb

During the waning moments of last year’s state legislative session, Missouri policymakers approved a law (HB 1433) designed to protect clean water in the southwestern portion of the state. Gov. Bob Holder (D) signed the bill on June 30, 2004.

At the time, most people knew little of the bill. Now, however, citizens are speaking out against the new law, which the state government has been trying to impose on local officials and too much opportunity for bureaucratic mischief.

Reinventing Failed Approach

HB 1433 created a nine-county district in which water policy would be developed and enforced by appointed, not elected, officials. The plan, generally known as “ecosystem management,” is designed to manage natural resources on an “ecosystem” basis, rather than on the basis of state and county boundaries.

Ten years ago, Missouri government officials and environmental organizations attempted to impose the ecosystem management plan on the nine-county area by proposing the creation of a United Nations Biosphere Reserve for Southwest Missouri and Northwest Arkansas. The plan failed because local citizens learned how it would diminish private property rights and transfer authority from local elected officials to professional bureaucrats.

The proponents of ecosystem management regrouped, changed their tactics, and passed HB 1433.

Suspect Tactics

Many Missourians are troubled by the means employed to pass the law. In a February 16 column in the Springfield News-Leader, Bob Parker, a local cattle rancher and information chairman of the Texas County, Missouri, Farm Bureau, asked, “If this legislation has so many merits, why was it slipped through the legislature? ... [V]irtually no one was aware of the additions that were made to the bill since its inception.”

BOB PARKER, INFORMATION CHAIRMAN
TEXAS COUNTY, MISSOURI, FARM BUREAU

More than 200 local citizens packed a restaurant where a meeting was held to discuss the merits of HB 1433 and the efforts to repeal it. State Rep. Dennis Wood (R-Rikember City), a proponent of the nine-county water management district, explained the legislation would provide low-cost loans to people who would be required to upgrade their septic systems in order to comply with the law.

An unidentified woman said in response, “Why can’t you understand? We don’t want your ‘help.’ We don’t need your ‘law.’ Why can’t you get that?”

Aside from the particular regulations and fines imposed by the water district law, the larger question is one that faces virtually every community in the nation: Who shall govern—elected officials, or appointed professionals?

Potential for Abuse

When policies that carry the weight of law are enacted and enforced by appointed professionals, argue local citizens opposed to the new law, the people no longer have the means to control their government.

The creation of the nine-county district “causes those of us who have dealt with [the Missouri Department of Natural Resources] and the regulators in the past to shudder,” observed Parker in his column.

“If a county decides to implement HB 1433, all people living in that county will have to install expensive water meters on their own private wells, and report to a government agency the amount of water taken from the well,” noted local resident William Jud, a retired geologist, in a published commentary. “Of course, any water production [by residents’ wells] will eventually be designated as ‘excessive.’

“Whatever your rate of water use, bet on the bureaucrats and [activists] to try to reduce the water you get from your well, and eventually to tax you based on your use of water,” Jud warned.

“Yes, let’s keep our water clean; we all depend on it. But let’s do it in a reasonable, balanced fashion that considers the water needs of all of us,” said Parker in his column.

Henry Lamb is founding chairman of Sovereignty International (http://www.sovereignty.net) and founder of the Environmental Conservation Organization (ECO) (http://www.eco.freedom.org/el/). He is publisher of ECO’s Eco-logic Powerhouse, an online and print magazine.
Scientists, European press slam study’s hidden agenda

by James M. Taylor

European scientists and media, who susptected the Pew Charitable Trusts to withering criticism a year ago after Pew released a study claiming farm-raised salmon presents greater health risks than wild salmon, launched a new round of criticism of Pew in the fall, after further scrutiny uncovered more problems with the study.

Eco-Imperialism
Green Power, Black Death

The "national media mugging of the salmon farming industry stemmed not from any impartial, unsullied source, but from an organization with an agenda," summarized the Free Press in a separate editorial. "Their record stands rather on the wildest extremes of the environmentalist movement. Pew’s lavish amounts of money are used not for impartial scientific inquiry but to further the aims of that movement."

"The salmon scare which threatened last weekend to bring British salmon farming to its knees," noted the January 15, 2004 London Times, "is a sorry saga of flawed science, selective research and hidden commercial bias. That it was allowed into the pages of the apparently respectable journal Science is inexplicable. Its worldwide promotion by an organization with a vested interest in undermining farmed Atlantic salmon in favor of the wild Alaskan variety is a scandal."

"That well-planned and funded assault on the global seafood trade has European nations eying the credibility of the United States research community," added the International Foundation for the Conservation of Natural Resources. "Impeccious, incompetent, arrogant, and erroneous are reflective of the incentives being hurled at the so-called ‘U.S. study.’"

Criticism Continues

The Free Press remains incensed about Pew's questionable motives and tactics, as noted in a September 10, 2004 editorial: "Far from being an independent, uncommitted organization, Pew worked as publicists and financiers for militant ‘green’ groupings across the world... The level of incompetence involved in the research process was awesome—they did not know, it transpired, where the salmon they were testing came from. They did not even know whether it was wild or farmed. "Dr. David Carpenter himself has admitted that Pew Charitable Trust were on a mission. 'There may be some legitimacy,' he said, 'in saying the reason they chose to fund this study was that they had another agenda of bringing to an end the health effects.'

"We could not have put it better ourselves, the editorial concluded. "At the fifth Biennial Conference on Fish Processing, held September 16 in Grimsby, England, Scottish salmon expert Dr. John Webster delivered a presentation titled “Salmon Quality and Safety: Real and Perceived.” Said Webster, "There are a series of flaws in the work funded by the Pew Charitable Trust. The research methodology is regarded as scientifically flawed by the World Health Organisation and food safety agencies worldwide. And the research completely ignored the considerable body of data on environmental contaminants in foods, including salmon, in the public domain already."

U.S. Media Hyped the Study

The salmon scare began when the January 9, 2004 issue of Science magazine published a Pew-funded paper by David Carpenter of the University of Albany Institute for Health and the Environment. The beneficiary of a $2.5 million Pew grant, Carpenter claimed to have compared the PCB levels of wild and farmed salmon from various regions of the world. According to Carpenter, farmed salmon contained dangerously more cancer-causing PCBs than wild salmon, and humans could safely eat no more than one serving per month of farmed salmon. The study was particularly critical of salmon raised in Scotland and other northern European regions.

"Scientists, European press slam study’s hidden agenda..."
Mercury

Continued from page 1

ignore the evidence and are imposing increasingly severe restrictions on mercury.

On February 14 the New Jersey Senate passed a bill requiring automakers to pay recyclers a fee for every mercury switch—commonly used to light glove compartments, trunks, and vanity mirrors—that recyclers recover. The fee is designed to encourage recyclers to ferret out the mercury in such switches before melting down the vehicle into recyclable metal.

Bradley Campbell

Bradley M. Campbell announced the adoption of new rules establishing the strongest mercury and arsenic standards in the nation.

According to a DEP news release, the November 4 regulations will require the following mercury emission reductions:

■ from the state’s 10 coal-fired boilers in power plants, a 90 percent reduction from current levels by the end of 2007. Plants may defer meeting the standard until 2012 if they also make major reductions in their emissions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and fine particulates;

■ from the state’s six iron and steel smelters, a 75 percent reduction from current levels by year-end 2009; and

■ from the state’s five municipal solid waste incinerators, a 95 percent reduction from 1990 levels by 2011.

Mercury Not a Threat

Several recent studies have shown there is no need for mercury emission restrictions like those adopted by New Jersey.

In the new government report, Mercury in Perspective: Fact and Fiction About the Debate Over Mercury, House Resources Committee Chair Richard Pombo (R-CA) and House Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee Chair Jim Gibbons (R-NV) summarize several studies showing that current levels of environmental mercury pose little or no threat to humans.

“Our conclusion is no need for mercury emission restrictions,” says Pombo.

“After an exhaustive review of the science surrounding the mercury debate, it is clear that some special-interest groups are crying wolf. ... [T]he conclusions drawn in this paper are not drawn by us, but rather by a vast number of scientific and government studies.”

RER RICHARD POMBO
R-CALIFORNIA

“The most current peer-reviewed science does not support conclusions that the U.S. population is at risk from the trace amounts of mercury found in fish,” notes the report.

“After an exhaustive review of the science surrounding the mercury debate, it is clear that some special-interest groups are crying wolf,” said Pombo in an accompanying news release. “Most strikingly, the conclusions drawn in this paper are not drawn by us, but rather by a vast number of scientific and government studies.”

Mercury in Perspective: Fact and Fiction About the Debate Over Mercury, House Resources Committee Chair Richard Pombo (R-CA) and House Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee Chair Jim Gibbons (R-NV) summarize several studies showing that current levels of environmental mercury pose little or no threat to humans.

“After an exhaustive review of the science surrounding the mercury debate, it is clear that some special-interest groups are crying wolf. ... [T]he conclusions drawn in this paper are not drawn by us, but rather by a vast number of scientific and government studies.”

RER RICHARD POMBO
R-CALIFORNIA

“Most human and animal exposure to environmental mercury occurs through the consumption of fish. Methylmercury enters the food chain through microorganisms eaten by fish and other aquatic life.

U.S. Mercury Levels Falling

The House Resources Committee report also notes:

■ U.S. power plants account for less than 1 percent of global mercury emissions;

■ mercury emissions in the United States have fallen significantly since 1990;

■ mercury levels in ocean fish have remained the same or have fallen slightly since 1990;

■ current scientific literature does not show a direct link between U.S. power plants and mercury in fish;

■ there has been no credible evidence of harm to pregnant women or their unborn children from the consumption of a variety of ocean-going fish; and

■ research has consistently proven the health benefits of regular fish consumption.

New CEI Study Agrees

The House report follows on the heels of the December 14 Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) study released December 15, which concludes “there is no evidence that the levels of methylmercury in the fish Americans consume are cause for any health concern.”

“Agencies and activist groups have issued these unfounded advisories based on tenuous risk portrayals,” said Sandy Szwarc, author of the CEI study.

“In today’s pursuit of absolute assurances of safety,” Szwarc continued, “exceedingly precautionary and arbitrary safety cushions have been set at levels many times higher than those where any actual risk has been detected. But the public is being misled into believing that exposure to mercury levels at or near those extreme precautionary safety thresholds represents actual danger.”

New Jersey Ignoring Science

Passage of the New Jersey automobile recycling bill brought praise from Kevin Mills, Clean Car Campaign director for the environmental activist group Environmental Defense. “New Jerseyans couldn’t have asked for a better gift this Valentine’s Day,” said Mills in a February 14 news release. “This program provides automakers with a cost-effective solution to rectify a dangerous design choice.”

“Governments have seized upon groundless fears and enacted pernicious regulations to address a nonexistent problem,” countered Szwarc. “When politicians usurp science and sound risk assessments, consumers lose.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
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Nuclear Power Is the Safest Energy Source, Studies Show

by Jay Lehr

Today's nuclear power technology, by any and every measure, provides the best safety performance and lowest risk of workplace accidents among all commonly utilized power sources. Nuclear power plants are not at risk from terrorist attacks. They do not offer exponential damage opportunities and they are the most fortified installations in the nation.

It is safe to say neither the general public nor government officials understand many or any of these facts. Their lack of understanding is primarily the result of an extremely successful fear campaign waged by anti-nuclear activists 30 years ago. In addition, the news media has inaccurately reported accidents and mishaps at nuclear power plants.

Our Radioactive World

We live in a radioactive world—this has been true since the beginning of time. Background radiation in the natural environment was much greater in the past than it is today, as all nuclear material decays naturally. The world is less radioactive today than at any time in the past... and man has evolved and prospered through it all.

Each day we are exposed to naturally occurring radiation from rocks in the Earth's crust, outer space, our atmosphere, radon gas, smoking, and even each others' bodies. Every plane flight we take into the upper atmosphere increases our exposure to radiation.

In the end, we appear we will voluntarily accept all of this radiation but will resist any manmade radiation—no matter how harmless—to which we are exposed.

Radiation Sources

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) calculated in 2003 the primary sources of radiation in daily life:

- Radon radiation in average household: 200 millirems
- Natural radiation in the human body: 39 millirems
- Atmospheric radiation from outer space: 31 millirems
- Mammogram: 30 millirems
- Chest x-ray: 10 millirems

I did not list the highest and lowest sources of radiation to which we are regularly exposed. The highest is the 1,400 millirems received by a person undergoing medical tests for gastrointestinal problems. The lowest is the less than one millirem experienced by a person living near a nuclear power plant.

The average U.S. citizen receives 360 millirems per year according to EPA, from a combination of the sources listed above.

Energy Risks

In 1998 a Swiss study looked at 15,914 severe accidents, including 4,290 in the energy industry, between 1969 and 1996. This included the Three Mile Island and Chernobyl. Even including those two highly publicized incidents, the study determined that among conventional energy sources—coal, oil, natural gas and nuclear—nuclear power was by far the safest.

The second safest power source, natural gas, has a fatality rate 10 times higher than nuclear power. The Swiss report, "Comprehensive Assessment of Energy Systems Severe Accidents," published by the Paul Scherrer Institute in 2003, concluded that in the production of a full year of a trillion watts (terawatt-year) of energy—which might require many years to produce, as all of Canada takes 15 years to generate a terawatt-year—fatalities expected from the various potential energy sources are:

- Nuclear: 8 fatalities
- Natural Gas: 85 fatalities
- Coal: 342 fatalities
- Oil: 418 fatalities

My friend and colleague Dr. Bernard Cohen of the University of Pittsburgh pioneered the concept of risk as equated to the risk of premature death of one chance in a million. That risk would decline significantly as one moved further away from a nuclear power plant for five years, there would be an increased risk of premature death from nuclear radiation of one in a million. That risk would decline significantly as one moved further away from the plant.

But Cohen found the very same risk of premature death occurs to the individual who:
- rides 10 miles on a bicycle;
- rides 300 miles in an automobile;
- rides 1,000 miles in an airplane; or
- lives two months in Denver.

Three Mile Myth

Any discussion of nuclear power safety inevitably turns to Three Mile Island, considered the worst—and only—nuclear power failure in the United States. Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM) addressed Three Mile in his outstanding 2004 book, A Brighter Tomorrow: Fulfilling the Promise of Nuclear Energy:... few realize that even though 90 percent of the fuel rods ruptured, the accident was a non-event from a radiation standpoint. The maximum exposure to the nearest member of the public was little more than a third of the [Nuclear Regulatory Commission's] annual limit for the public. And no worker exceeded the commission's current annual limit for occupational exposure."

Domenici also recounts the amazing health record for sailors living on nuclear submarines during the past 50 years. "In the Navy's nuclear submarines, the sailors who live and work within yards of operating reactors receive less whole body radiation while underway than while at home and exposed to natural background radiation."

Safe Technology

Polls show the public accepts far greater risk in their everyday lives, without concern, than the risks they are exposed to with nuclear power. Perhaps some of the remaining unnecessary fears will be assuaged by the next true evolution of reactor design: "pebble bed reactors" that use thousands of ceramic-coated, tennis ball-sized spheres of graphite and uranium.

These reactors are designed so that the chain reaction cannot heat the mass above 1,600 degrees Celsius, at which point the temperature of the mass will fall. The ceramic coat will not melt at temperatures below 2,000 degrees Celsius. Thus no meltdown can occur, making the reactor inherently safe, rather than safe as a result of external safety systems.

Nuclear power plants do not offer an attractive target to terrorists. In 2003, the Electric Power Research Institute performed a simulated air and ground terrorist attack, concluding that no parts of a Boeing 767-400, when crashed into a reactor, would penetrate the containment building or the spent fuel storage pool. As for attack by land, nuclear plants are relatively unattractive targets because of high security and low explosion potential.

While the risk of anything occurring never reaches zero, nuclear safety should not be on any rational person’s list of things to lose sleep over.

Jay Lehr (e3@e3power.com) is science director for The Heartland Institute.
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Important U.S. Climate Program Is Unheralded

By Duane Freese

European greens expressed their displeasure with President George W. Bush during his February visit to Europe, for U.S. unwillingness to support the Kyoto accord, with its greenhouse gas emissions cuts for developed nations. But the Bush administration is taking concrete—if largely unheralded by Europeans and a hostile American media—steps on climate change issues.

Chief among these is the Methane to Markets (M2M) initiative. Upon the Kyoto agreement coming into force for its signatories on February 16, Gregg Easterbrook noted in The New Republic, “The world’s first international anti-global-warming agreement to take force is not the Kyoto treaty. It is a Bush administration initiative—and you have not heard a peep regarding the initiative because the American press corps is pretending it does not exist.”

“[Carbon dioxide], which makes life on this planet possible, is a fundraising focal point for such activist groups as the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, and Greenpeace.”

Methane Cuts More Effective

Easterbrook described the program as follows: “The White House’s July 2004 agreement requires the United States, United Kingdom, India, Ukraine, Mexico, and Italy to reduce global methane emissions by an amount equal to roughly 1 percent of all greenhouse gases released to the atmosphere by human activity.”

Bush’s methane initiative will remove 50 million metric tons by 2015. (Kyoto is not designed to remove any methane from the atmosphere.) According to the Energy Information Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy, that is the equivalent of:

■ Taking 33 million cars off the road for a year;

■ Eliminating 50 coal-fired electricity plants; or

■ Forgoing energy used for providing enough heat to warm 7.2 million households for a year.

The most the Kyoto cuts will accomplish, according to the climate models cited by the treaty’s supporters, is a delay in warming by six years at the beginning of the next century. This short delay will come at a cost of hundreds of billions of dollars in economic losses annually.

Program Is Economically Viable

Meanwhile, M2M will cost the federal government only about $53 million over five years. This is because methane is about 20 to 30 times as potent a greenhouse gas as carbon dioxide (CO2), the main target of the Kyoto accord.

Further, M2M may produce additional economic benefits for developed and developing countries. Plugging methane leaks in natural gas lines means saving product. Capturing it from landfills to help run a local power plant gives local communities that permit landfills an economic reward. Cleaning it from coal mines can reduce explosions.

Greens Committed to CO2

The environmental activist movement, however, has been largely silent regarding M2M. As Daniel Sarewitz and Roger Pielke Jr. wrote in The Atlantic in July 2000, “A central tenet of environmentalism is that less human interference in nature is better than more.” The great symbol of noninterference has become the reduction of CO2 emissions. CO2, which makes life on this planet possible, is a fundraising focal point for such activist groups as the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, and Greenpeace.

As Sarewitz and Pielke argued, “[E]nvironmentalists and scientists, in focusing their own, increasingly congruent interests on carbon-dioxide emissions, have framed the problem of global environmental protection in a way that can offer no realistic prospect of a solution.”

The reason: “The vast majority of developing nations have nothing to gain from emissions reductions for themselves. They gain only from developed nations seeking to meet emissions targets and either transferring their heavier industry to poorer countries that are excluded from Kyoto’s emissions cuts, or getting money directly from developed countries not to develop industry themselves, thereby becoming climate welfare states.”

Accountability, Development

Hence, Kyoto’s unintended consequence may be more interference with the environment and more pollution in developing countries.

The M2M program, by contrast, is part of an alternative strategy that stresses economic accountability and technological development. To date, the Bush administration has provided $700 million in tax credits to promote clean technologies next year, $3 billion in research on new clean technologies, and $200 million to help in the transfer of clean technology to developing countries.

Duane Freese (dfreese@techcentralstation.com) is a columnist for Tech Central Station (http://www.techcentralstation.com), where this article first appeared.
British Actions Lag Behind Kyoto Rhetoric

by Iain Murray and Myron Ebell

A United Kingdom (UK) government watchdog group has reported the government’s plan to mandate the use of renewable energy sources will increase consumer energy prices by 5 percent. According to the February 11 London Times, “The generation of 10 percent of the country’s energy from renewable sources, a central part of the Prime Minister’s plan to put Britain at the forefront of international efforts to tackle climate change, are set to cost the consumer more than £1 billion a year by 2010.”

“The National Audit Office’s report on renewable energy said that the Government was on course to achieve a significant increase in renewable power but that challenges remained if the 10 percent target was to be reached by 2010. Progress had been slow, with only 2.4 percent of energy coming from renewable sources in the past financial year, against a hoped 4.3 percent.”

“Development of renewable energy is being encouraged by the Renewables Obligation, which buys renewable power with a market price closer to £25 per megawatt hour, compared with a market price closer to £25 per megawatt hour. Public support for the renewables industry is expected to average £70 per megawatt hour, and over the World Wide Web, www.scamsandscandals.com

Prime Minister Tony Blair told a panel of MPs on February 7 that he would not countenance a climate-related tax on aircraft fuel, asking them, “How many politicians will vote to end cheap air travel with an election coming up?”

“Prime Minister Tony Blair told a panel of MPs on February 7 that he would not countenance a climate-related tax on aircraft fuel, asking them, ‘How many politicians will vote to end cheap air travel with an election coming up?’”

Moreover, The Journal reported on February 8 the Blair government blocked an attempted by an MP to introduce legislation aimed at encouraging “public facilities like hospitals and schools and private developments to utilize renewable energy heating systems fueled by renewable sources including biomass, solar power, and ground heat. It would have allowed energy suppliers to either invest in their own supplies of renewable heat energy or buy in ‘credits’ from companies that specialize in the technology.”

The Blair government also reacted angrily when the European Commission said it would forbid an increase in the allocations the UK Government had proposed to give to industry for the start of the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. The row caused the delay of UK trading, with the allocation announcement on February 7. Blair told the panel of MPs, “The reason our figure has changed from the estimate is because the facts have changed.”

Actions Clash with Rhetoric

The actions of the British government on global warming continue to be at odds with its rhetoric, particularly that of Chief Scientific Advisor David King, who is more pro-Kyoto—and less politically astute—than Blair.

India, China Not Participating

King has suggested China and India should no longer be exempt from emissions reduction targets. Speaking to a gathering of Indian scientists in Bangalore, he noted, “In the next phase, we need to discuss with China, discuss with India how to (make them) come aboard the process... It would be fair to say the Chinese government is very much aware of this problem and the Indian government is keen to listen to what we have to say.”

This characterization is somewhat at odds with the actions of Chinese and Indian representatives at the December 2004 COP-10 Convention on Climate Change in Buenos Aires, where they strongly resisted calls for mandatory emissions targets for their nations. King’s apparently tenuous grasp of geopolitics is illustrated further by his statement expressing optimism that the United States would become a full party to the Kyoto Protocol: “If you talk to people in the United States, you will find they are keen to get involved.”

Iain Murray (imurray@cei.org) is a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, where he specializes in the debate over climate change and the use and abuse of science in the political process. Myron Ebell (mebell@cei.org) oversees global warming and international environmental work at CEI and chairs the Cooler Heads Coalition, a subgroup of the National Consumers Coalition that focuses on climate change issues.
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Climate Alarmists Playing Shell Game with Data

by Steve McIntyre

Have spent much of the past two years analyzing and reconstructing some of the basic studies used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to support their conclusions about global warming and in turn to promote policies on climate change.

My conclusion is that peer-reviewed publications that Naturewissenschaft & Technik, the National Post, and the Wall Street Journal have recently reported on, is that the major science journals and organizations lag far behind in ensuring the quality of researchers’ data.

In the corporate world, there is simply no question about the importance of providing audit trails, and while they can take many different forms, they all serve the purpose of ensuring the validity of information used for investment decisions.

Flawed “Hockey Stick” Data

The 2001 IPCC report produced findings that have guided investment decisions, which vastly exceed the sums involved in even the largest financial scandals of recent years. Since the IPCC leaned heavily on a novel approach called a “multiproxy climate study” and in particular the “hockey stick graph” of Mann et al. that purported to show extraordinary climate change, this is where I’ve focused my attention. (Editor’s note: See “Nature Admits Widely Cited Global Warming Graph Was Erroneous,” Environment & Climate News, September 2004.)

An audit trail in this case is easily defined: the data in the form used by the authors and the computer scripts used to generate the results. In principle, these can be easily buttoned up and publicly archived.

Yet none of the major multiproxy studies has anything remotely resembling a complete due diligence package, and most have none at all. The author of one of the most quoted studies (Crowley and Lowery, 2000) told me he had misplaced his data. In the case of the Mann et al. (1998, 1999) study, used for the IPCC’s “hockey stick” graph, Mann initially claimed to be unable to remember where the data was located.

In 2004, I was asked by a journal (Climatic Change) to peer review an article. I asked to see the source code and supporting calculations. The editor said no one had ever asked for such things in 28 years of his editing the journal. There is nothing at the journal peer review stage in climate publications that is remotely similar to an audit.

Although the IPCC and similar agencies have many committees and meetings (usually in nice places), they do not carry out any audit or verification activities.

While insiders have long known this, it was recently admitted in written answers by the author of the hockey stick study (Michael Mann) to the U.S. Senate in the fall of 2001. “It is distinctly against the mission of the IPCC to ‘carry out independent programs,’” Mann wrote. Thus, if a paper has passed the cursory journal peer review process, there may not be any subsequent hurdles prior to adoption by the IPCC.

Serious Error in Calculations

Through my own checking, I found that the calculations behind the most famous IPCC graph—the 1,000-year climate hockey stick—contained a serious calculation error that invalidates the results. In this case, the methodology had been inaccurately described in the journal publication.

I also found an influential but unreported alteration to a key data series, where the alteration had been disguised by a (perhaps unintentional) suppression of the start date of the underlying data.

The math involved is not particularly sophisticated: The errors would have been discovered long ago had there been even routine checking.

For all the billions of dollars being spent on the climate change industry, and the thousands of people working full time on this issue, it was nobody’s job to check whether the IPCC’s main piece of evidence was right.

Looking for an outstanding speaker?

Who is Dr. Jay Lehr?

Dr. Jay Lehr is an internationally renowned motivational speaker, scientist, and author. He is considered the world’s leading authority on groundwater hydrology. Dr. Lehr is Science Director for The Heartland Institute, a nonprofit think tank based in Chicago, Illinois, and he’s ready to speak to your group.

Engagements are scheduled on a “first come, first served” basis. Call 312/377-4000 today to schedule Dr. Jay Lehr to keynote your next event!

In his resignation letter, Landsea documented how the IPCC had sanctioned a “misrepresentation” of hurricane research and issued “unfounded pronouncements” to the media that “subverted and compromised” the scientific assessment of the IPCC’s hurricane research. He went on to say “unfounded agenda statements made by the IPCC to the media demonstrated “preconceived agendas” that are “scientifically unsound.”

The text of Landsea’s letter is reproduced below.

An Open Letter to the Community from Chris Landsea

Dear Colleagues,

After some prolonged deliberation, I have decided to withdraw from participating in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns.

With this open letter to the community, I wish to explain the basis for my decision and bring awareness to what I view as a problem in the IPCC process. The IPCC is a group of climate researchers around the world that every few years summarize how climate is changing and how it may be altered in the future due to manmade global warming. I had served both as an author for the Observations chapter and a Reviewer for the 2nd Assessment Report in 1995 and the 3rd Assessment Report in 2001, primarily on the topic of tropical cyclones (hurricanes and typhoons). My work on hurricanes, and tropical cyclones more generally, has been widely cited by the IPCC. For the upcoming AR4, I was asked several weeks ago by the Observations chapter Lead Author Dr. Kevin Trenberth to provide the writeup for Atlantic hurricanes. As I had in the past, I agreed to assist the IPCC in what I thought was to be an important and politically neutral determination of what is happening with our climate.

Shortly before Dr. Trenberth requested that I draft the Atlantic hurricane section for the TAR’s Observations chapter, Dr. Trenberth participated in a press conference organized by scientists at Harvard on the topic “Experts to warn global warming likely to continue spurring more outbreaks of intense hurricane activity” along with other media interviews on the topic. The result of this media interaction was widespread coverage that directly connected the very busy 2004 Atlantic hurricane season as being caused by anthropogenic greenhouse gas warming occurring today.

Listening to and reading transcripts of this press conference and media interviews, it is apparent that Dr. Trenberth was being accurately quoted and summarized in such statements and was not being distortions of his position. These media sessions have potential to result in a widespread perception that global warming has made recent hurricane activity much more severe. It was clear from my participation in the Harvard press conference that had come to the conclusion that global warming was impacting hurricane activity today. To my knowledge, none of the participants in that press conference had performed any research on hurricane variability, nor were they reporting on any new work in the field. All previous and current research in the area of hurricane variability has shown no reliable, long-term trend up in the frequency or intensity of tropical cyclones, either in the Atlantic or any other basin. The IPCC assessments in 1995 and 2001 also concluded that there was no global warming signal found in the hurricane record.

“I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by preconceived agendas and being scientifically unsound.”

Moreover, the evidence is quite strong and supported by the most recent credible studies that any impact in the future from global warming upon hurricanes will likely be quite small. The latest results from the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (Knutson and Tuleya, Journal of Climate, 2004) suggest that by around 2080, hurricanes may have winds and rainfall about 5% more intense than today. It has been proposed that even this tiny change may be an exaggeration as to what may happen by the end of the 21st Century (Michaels, Knappenberger, and Landsea, Journal of Climate, 2005, submitted).

It is certainly true that “individual scientists can do what they wish in their own rights,” as one of the folks in the IPCC leadership suggested. Differing conclusions and robust debates are certainly crucial to progress in climate science. However, this case is not an honest scientific discussion conducted at a meeting of climate researchers. Instead, a scientist with an important role in the IPCC who represented himself as a Lead Author for the IPCC (Dr. Trenberth) has used that position to promulgate to the media and general public his own opinion that the busy 2004 hurricane season was caused by global warming, which is in direct opposition to research written in the field and is counter to conclusions in the TAR.

This becomes problematic when I am asked to provide the draft about observed hurricane activity variations for the AR4 with, ironically, Dr. Trenberth as the Lead Author for this chapter. Because of Dr. Trenberth’s pronouncements, the IPCC process on our assessment of these crucial extreme events in our climate system has been subverted and compromised, its neutrality lost. While no one can “tell” scientists what to say or not say (nor am I suggesting that), the IPCC did select Dr. Trenberth as a Lead Author and entrusted to him to carry out this duty in a non-biased, neutral point of view. When scientists hold press conferences and speak with the media, much care is needed not to reflect poorly upon the IPCC.

It is of more than passing interest to note that Dr. Trenberth, while eager to share his views on global warming and hurricanes with the media, declined to do so at the Climate Variability and Change Conference in January where he made several public presentations. Perhaps he was concerned that such speculation—though worthy in his mind of public pronouncements—would not stand up to the scrutiny of fellow climate scientists. I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by preconceived agendas and being scientifically unsound.”

Sincerely, Chris Landsea
COMMENTARY

U.S. Fighting off Kyoto Restrictions

“...the twentieth century has turned out not to be ‘usual,’ as was claimed. The most accurate measurement of atmospheric temperatures from weather satellites shows little, if any, current warming.”

by S. Fred Singer

The Kyoto Protocol went into effect on February 16, 2005 after seven long years of negotiations. As a victory for European Union diplomacy, it will certainly please international bureaucrats, but it is no cause for celebration. It is ineffective, yet very costly. And it is “scientifically flawed,” to quote Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Impact on Climate Negligible

Even supporters of the protocol concede that if it is carried out without cheating, its goal of cutting emissions of greenhouse gases to 5 percent below the 1990 level by 2012 would reduce the calculated temperature rise in 2050 by a virtually undetectable 0.02 degrees Celsius. That’s two one-hundredths of a degree Celsius.

No wonder Friends of the Earth calls the Kyoto Protocol “woefully inadequate.” Even if the United States and Australia were to ratify and implement the protocol now (though only because the base year was chosen as 1990), but they won’t be by 2012. They will have to meet the same goal but with much higher energy costs. Some are driven by the promise of profits from trading of emission rights, of which Enron was a leading proponent. Others are just after profits: they see emission caps as a way to eliminate competitors. Even some electric utilities support emission restraints, secure in the knowledge they can pass increased costs to ratepayers or satisfy shareholders by showing green credentials.

What’s to be done to overcome this hysteria, before it gets much worse?

When reason and logic fail to convince, the initiative has to come from the top. The President himself must use the bully pulpit and present the facts to the public. His job is made easier by having the facts on his side, plus the ability to generate publicity.

Multi-Front Domestic Battle

Understandably, our European friends are worried about losing their industries, as rising energy costs make them less competitive. Their efforts to pressure the U.S. position are domestic. Congress has its well-known purveyors of global warming fears, especially in the Senate. Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-ME) co-chaired the International Task Force on Climate Change, which has predicted unimaginable catastrophes unless the United States adopts the Kyoto Protocol. Sens. John McCain (R-AZ) and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) are preparing to trot out the latest iteration of their Climate Stewardship bill, which would impose crippling restrictions on the U.S. economy.

Environmental organizations are acting predictably, garnering megabucks from gullible foundations and support from the “amen-chorus” of the New York Times, Washington Post, and even National Geographic and Scientific American. Particularly troublesome is the orientation of the editors of leading scientific journals such as Science and Nature, which seem to be impervious to the growing body of scientific evidence that defines global warming as a non-problem.

While the greenhouse effect is certainly real, its magnitude is nowhere near what alarmists predict. Temperature data suggest a warming of perhaps 0.5 degrees Celsius by the end of this century. Credible experts have assured us that higher levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide coupled with modest temperature increases will actually be beneficial, raising average incomes and standards of living.

Most worrisome is the behavior of some states and municipalities. Eight state attorneys general have filed suit against major utilities for emitting carbon dioxide while supplying the electric power people need. The California Air Resources Board considers carbon dioxide (CO2) a pollutant and is trying to force Detroit to build cars people do not want to buy.

Enron Factor

Finally, many U.S. industries are pushing for caps on CO2 emissions. Some are driven by the promise of profits from trading of emission rights, of which Enron was a leading proponent. Others are just after profits: they see emission caps as a way to eliminate competitors. Even some electric utilities support emission restraints, secure in the knowledge they can pass increased costs to ratepayers or satisfy shareholders by showing green credentials.

Governments may proclaim it, but the public is increasingly dubious. And well they should be. The twentieth century has turned out not to be “unusual,” as was claimed. The most accurate measurement of atmospheric temperatures from weather satellites shows little, if any, current warming.

The rest is mostly hype. Hurricanes are not increasing; sea levels are rising at their usual rate (as they have for thousands of years). Antarctic ice is thickening, and at least half of the world’s glaciers are not shrinking. All the hue and cry is based on theoretical models that cannot even reproduce the recent climate, much less accurately predict future climate.

Enormously Costly Cuts

The cost to participating nations is huge and will be reflected in higher energy prices, which ultimately will result in job losses and other negative effects on their economies. Additional costs will come in the form of emissions monitoring and inspection.

Cheating on a large scale is permitted, however. It is called “emissions trading” or, more properly, buying unused emission rights.

Britain, France, and Germany may be on target now (though only because the base year was chosen as 1990), but they won’t be by 2012. They will have to buy permits from Russia, which has plenty of credits for sale. Russia, after all, successfully demonstrated how to cut emissions—just collapse the economy.

Japan, Italy, Spain, and most of Europe are already not meeting their emission targets. There is no chance they will be in compliance by 2012.

The negative economic effects of the Kyoto Protocol will be made worse by international competition from rapidly growing countries like China and India, which are not about to cut back on energy use.

Unscientific Alarmism

To all these concerns about the Kyoto Protocol, add the lack of science. The claimed consensus on substantial future warming simply does not exist. Governments may proclaim it, but the public is increasingly dubious. And well they should be. The twentieth century has turned out not to be “unusual,” as was claimed. The most accurate measurement of atmospheric temperatures from weather satellites shows little, if any, current warming.

The rest is mostly hype. Hurricanes are not increasing; sea levels are rising at their usual rate (as they have for thousands of years). Antarctic ice is thickening, and at least half of the world’s glaciers are not shrinking. All the hue and cry is based on theoretical models that cannot even reproduce the recent climate, much less accurately predict future climate.

Temperature data suggest a warming of perhaps 0.5 degrees Celsius by the end of this century. Credible experts have assured us that higher levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide coupled with modest temperature increases will actually be beneficial, raising average incomes and standards of living.

Most worrisome is the behavior of some states and municipalities. Eight state attorneys general have filed suit against major utilities for emitting carbon dioxide while supplying the electric power people need. The California Air Resources Board considers carbon dioxide (CO2) a pollutant and is trying to force Detroit to build cars people do not want to buy.

Enron Factor

Finally, many U.S. industries are pushing for caps on CO2 emissions. Some are driven by the promise of profits from trading of emission rights, of which Enron was a leading proponent. Others are just after profits: they see emission caps as a way to eliminate competitors. Even some electric utilities support emission restraints, secure in the knowledge they can pass increased costs to ratepayers or satisfy shareholders by showing green credentials.

What’s to be done to overcome this hysteria, before it gets much worse?

When reason and logic fail to convince, the initiative has to come from the top. The White House has to enter the battle. The president himself must use the bully pulpit and present the facts to the public. His job is made easier by having the facts on his side, plus the ability to generate publicity.

In addition to editorials in the Wall Street Journal and best-selling books such as Michael Crichton’s State of Fear, President George W. Bush will have the support of thousands of scientists and millions of ordinary citizens. They are fed up with global warming hype, and they recognize the threat to our economic well-being from wasting limited resources in fighting non-problems instead of concentrating on real ones. Future generations will thank him for saving us from this madness.

S. Fred Singer (comments@sepp.org) is professor emeritus of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia and president of the Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP) in Arlington, Virginia. He has held several federal positions, including director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service. This article first appeared on the SEPP Web site (http://www.sepp.org).
Science Verifies Crichton’s State of Fear Assertions

Book’s citations pass factual background check

by James M. Taylor

Michael Crichton’s new novel, State of Fear, has created a whirlwind of controversy as global warming alarmists try frantically to discredit the author’s tenacious assault on global warming theory.

Before State of Fear, the left-leaning editorial hierarchy of major national media outlets successfully weeded out the scientific skepticism toward alarmist global warming theory before television and newspaper stories reached the general public. Crichton’s end-run around censorship has created a maelstrom of wrath and fury from alarmists, who realize the millions of citizens reading his novel will likely translate into millions of newly converted skeptics of global warming alarmism.

Crichton gains credibility among previously uninformed readers by citing, either in footnotes or through the dialogue of State of Fear’s main characters, scientific publications that cast significant doubt on the veracity of global warming theory. His readers, therefore, can look up the science themselves if they wish. To fight this, alarmists are disparaging Crichton and the science cited in the novel.

Personal Attacks Proliferate

The science behind Crichton’s book, however, is disparaged more by character assassination than scientific evidence. Crichton snidely conjures up an image of “Crichton leafing through obscure journals and textbooks to find scientific underpinnings for his outlandish premises.” Not once, however, does Curtis dispute with facts or scientific evidence the science presented by Crichton.

Michiko Kakutani of the New York Times made an even more condescending and personal attack on Crichton. In the “ludicrous plot,” according to Kakutani, “of Crichton’s handcuffed novel, the dangers of global warming are nothing but a lot of hype: scare scenarios, promoted by shameless environmentalists eager to use bad science to raise money and draw attention to their cause.”

Referring to State of Fear as a “shril, preposterous right-wing answer” to the box office flop The Day After Tomorrow, Kakutani derides the “footnotes, charts,” and “authorial manifesto” that Crichton includes in the book to provide scientific documentation of his global warming skepticism.

Like Slate’s Curtis, however, Kakutani fails to back up his disparagement of Crichton’s argument with a single scientific fact.

Facts Withstand Scrutiny

Unlike the alarmists, who routinely fail to scientifically document such claims as “the polar ice caps are melting,” “sea levels are rising,” or “hurricanes and other catastrophic weather events are becoming more frequent.” Crichton cites specific scientific studies to back up each indictment of alarmist global warming theory presented in State of Fear.

The credibility of the novel’s underlying argument, therefore, largely depends on the credibility of the science cited in the novel. Conveniently for those seeking in-depth knowledge of global warming science, Crichton’s assertions are easy to verify or disprove.

Some of Crichton’s most scientifically significant assertions are summarized in italics below, along with an analysis of the science.

Much (roughly half) of the 20th century’s approximately 1 degree Celsius warming as measured at ground-based temperature stations occurred prior to 1940, before carbon dioxide (CO2) could have been much of a factor.

This assertion is easy to verify, as Crichton reproduces data published by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Although atmospheric CO2 levels rose during this time period due to increasing global industrialization, global temperatures fell significantly—enough to raise fears that we were entering a new global ice age. Global warming alarmists do not dispute this fact.

CO2 levels cannot be assumed to be linked to global temperatures, as global temperatures fell between 1940 and 1970, even though CO2 levels were rising.

This statement is just as easy to verify, as Crichton once again reproduces data published by NASA. Although atmospheric CO2 levels rose during this time period due to increasing global industrialization, global temperatures fell significantly—enough to raise fears that we were entering a new global ice age. Global warming alarmists do not dispute this fact.

The “overwhelming consensus” of scientists does not support alarmist global warming theory, as professors from MIT, Harvard, Columbia, Duke, Virginia, Colorado, Cal Berkeley, and other prestigious schools as well as the former president of the National Academy of Sciences and several Nobel Prize winners have concluded there is a lack of probative evidence for alarmist global warming theory.

The Kyoto Protocol would have almost no effect on global temperatures, and would forestall little projected warming.

Crichton is right. The October 2003 issue of Nature magazine reports that by 2050, Kyoto will mitigate only 0.02 to 0.15 degrees Celsius of planetary warming. Global warming alarmists freely proclaim Kyoto alone will have little impact on climate and is only a small “first step” along their desired path of energy suppression.

The Heartland Institute offers a feature on its Web site dedicated to following the debate over the science in State of Fear. It collects some of the many reviews, op-eds, and letters that the book has generated and also links to research on environmental issues and the environmental movement. Point your Web browser to http://www.heartland.org and click on the Crichton is Right! graphic.

INTERNET INFO

The Heartland Institute offers a feature on its Web site dedicated to following the debate over the science in State of Fear. It collects some of the many reviews, op-eds, and letters that the book has generated and also links to research on environmental issues and the environmental movement. Point your Web browser to http://www.heartland.org and click on the Crichton is Right! graphic.
Hybrids, Hydrogen Vehicles Struggle to Meet Expectations

by Betty Marton

Despite the promises made on behalf of hybrid electric and hydrogen-powered vehicles, alternative fuel technologies are proving unready to replace gasoline-powered engines. Government agencies across the nation are encountering significant problems in converting their fleets as the vehicles prove to be less fuel-efficient and more costly than promised.

Seattle Area Buses Disappoint

As reported in the December 13 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, expensive new hybrid diesel-electric buses in Kings County, Washington are falling far short of initial promises. To win support for purchasing the buses, county officials claimed the vehicles would use up to 40 percent less fuel than existing ones. However, the New Flyer hybrid articulated buses, which cost about $200,000 more than the 1989 dual mode Breda buses they replaced, have achieved worse mileage than the older buses.

“…what is interesting is that the premium for the ‘magic’ will never be paid back, even under the assumption that historically high diesel prices will continue,” said Tom Tanton, a senior fellow with the Institute for Energy Research. “We’ll see how happy the transit folks are when [diesel fuel] prices return to normal.”

Northeast Fares No Better

Connecticut Transit also operates hybrid buses. Although the agency promoted them as being up to 60 percent more efficient than traditional buses, agency officials told the December 26 New York Times the buses are operating only 10 to 15 percent more efficiently than traditional models.

According to the Times, hybrid buses operated by the New Jersey Transit Authority are also making only minimal fuel efficiency gains. The agency purchased seven buses, spending an extra $600,000 to $800,000 per bus for the hybrid technology, believing they would save 20 to 40 percent on fuel. The actual savings have been at the bottom of that range, New Jersey Transit spokeswoman Penny Bassett Hackett told the Times.

“The small fuel efficiency gains from large hybrid vehicles such as the ones operated by the New Jersey Transit do not yet come close to justifying the huge extra costs involved,” said Iain Murray, a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute and former British government official dealing with transit issues. “And if transit officials are really worried about reducing emissions, they might do better to direct the money towards investments that will attract people out of their cars, such as better parking facilities or lower fares.”

Other agencies have reported larger efficiency gains, though still short of the 40 to 60 percent gains promised in Washington and Connecticut. According to the Times, New York City operates more than 100 buses with hybrid drive trains made by BAE Systems and has reported efficiency gains of 43 to 45 percent. However, the savings around the country appear to be in the range of 10 percent to 20 percent.

Hydrogen Faces Similar Obstacles

Hybrids are seen by many analysts as a short-term technology that will ultimately give way to hydrogen-fueled vehicles. President George W. Bush (R) and California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger (R) have touted hydrogen's potential, but there is a lack of scientific agreement about the future of hydrogen-powered vehicles.

According to scientists attending a December American Geophysical Union conference in San Francisco, hydrogen technology is still plagued by myriad problems, and some experts caution much more research is needed before the nation can commit itself to developing the “hydrogen economy.”

The December 20 San Francisco Chronicle reported the scientists’ concerns included:

- significant hydrogen leakage from cars and hydrogen plants into the atmosphere could set off chemical transformations that generate greenhouse gases and contribute to atmospheric warming.
- although hydrogen also can be extracted from methane, but the extraction process causes carbon dioxide, a major greenhouse gas, to be released in the atmosphere;
- hydrogen is most efficiently extracted by burning fossil fuels, which defeats the purpose of switching to hydrogen fuels.

Hydrogen Vehicles Very Costly

As reported by the Chronicle, MIT-educated physicist Joseph J. Romm, a former U.S. Department of Energy official, said, “I’m supportive of research and development, but we are at least two decades away from (deploying) the vehicles on a mass level.” Romm’s book, The Hype About Hydrogen: Fact and Fiction in the Race to Save the Climate, was published earlier this year by Island Press.

The price tag on hydrogen devices is very high, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars for a single demonstration vehicle, according to Romm.

Although atmospheric scientists are still trying to figure out how hydrogen leakage from cars, fuel stations, delivery trucks, and hydrogen production plants would affect Earth’s atmosphere, it is believed such leaks could change cloud abundance, which might alter local temperatures and climates.

“The widespread use of hydrogen fuel cells ... would cause stratospheric cooling, enhancement of the heterogeneous chemistry that destroys ozone,” scientists from Caltech and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena proposed in the journal Science.

Other scientists argue that even if hydrogen leakage generates a small amount of global warming, that would be a relatively minor problem compared with the advantages of switching from a fossil fuel-based transportation system to a system fueled by hydrogen.

AutomaKers Making Progress

Anthony Eggert, associate director for research in the Hydrogen Pathways program at University of California-Davis, believes automakers are making great progress in reducing costs and increasing reliability and durability of hydrogen powered vehicles, as reported in the January 9 Detroit News.

“GM’s goal,” explained Larry Burns, GM’s vice president of research, in the Detroit News article, “is to design and validate a fuel cell propulsion system by 2010 that is competitive with current internal combustion systems on durability and performance, and that eventually can be built at scale affordably.”

Current generation fuel cell vehicles have a range of between 170 and 250 miles and can accelerate from 0 to 60 mph in 12 to 16 seconds, depending upon whether a battery is used.

Calling fuel cells the “ultimate environmental answer,” Burns said GM will theoretically be able to mass-produce fuel cell vehicles affordably by 2010. However, most of the firm’s competitors, which are also working on the technology, caution it might take longer to reach that goal.

In the nearer future, reported the January 9 New York Times, GM sees a solution in gasoline-electric hybrids, such as its hybrid version of the Chevrolet Silverado and GMC Sierra. A hybrid Sierra gets 19 miles per gallon, compared to the standard version’s 17 miles per gallon. Smaller cars are making somewhat larger mileage gains. Sales of some hybrid vehicles have tripled during the past year, but U.S. new car buyers still choose hybrid vehicles less than 1 percent of the time.

Betty Marton (hamarton@minspring.com) is a freelance writer.
by James Ehlhm and George Wolff

Long the focus of regulators in their efforts to clean up the air, the automobile has become so clean there are now cases where the air coming out of the tailpipe is cleaner than the surrounding air.

“Even though standards did not change much over more than a decade, the shift in focus in the 1980s and 1990s to in-use emissions has been critical to the improved emission performance of the automobile to this day.”

This progress was not made overnight, nor was it made because of a single technology. Instead, it was a result of continuous improvements by the automobile industry, coupled with necessary improvements to automotive fuels. As the air quality in U.S. cities deteriorated due to more vehicles being driven more miles, it became clear automobile emissions had to be controlled. The sources of automobile emissions were identified, HC's came from three sources: exhaust, evaporative, and crank-case emissions, while CO and NOx came solely from exhaust emissions.

The first control device, implemented in 1961 in California and 1963 nationwide, was the positive crankcase ventilation system. This simple system recycled HC's from the crankcase to the intake manifold so they could be burned in the engine rather than letting them be vented to the atmosphere. The first exhaust or tailpipe standards, for HC's and CO, took effect in 1966 in California and 1968 at the federal level. Table 1 identifies tailpipe emission standards over time, systems in-use and alerted the driver to malfunctions via a dashboard light. States also initiated inspection/maintenance (I/M) programs. The effectiveness of I/M programs has been a topic of considerable debate, as there have been ongoing questions about the accuracy of the testing and effectiveness of the repairs.

1970s: The Catalytic Converter

Three-way catalytic converters were installed on 1975 vehicles and were referred to as oxidation catalyst by because they oxidized the HC's and CO to carbon dioxide (CO2) and water vapor.

1980s: In-Use Performance

As Table 1 shows, federal tailpipe emission standards were made substantially more stringent in 1981. These standards were very challenging.

Three-way catalytic converters were developed to control all HC's, CO, and NOx simultaneously. For these catalytic converters to operate properly, the air-fuel ratio had to be closely monitored. By the introduction of far more sophisticated diagnostic systems, the focus on in-use emissions continued with the introduction of far more sophisticated second-generations systems. The system allows for more than 100 different diagnostics for a typical vehicle, any of which could be chosen. A malfunction is detected, informing the operator the vehicle needs to be taken in for service.

Tighter Standards in California

California adopted cleaner low-sulfur gasoline requirements as an integral part of its LEV program. A unique element of the California LEV program is its zero-emission vehicle (ZEV) mandate. As originally adopted, the ZEV mandate required 10 percent of all cars and certain light-duty trucks sold in the state to be ZEVs.

The ZEV mandate was different from all other emission standards in that it attempted to force the mass production of a specific technology: battery electric vehicles. However, battery electric vehicle technology never became competitive in the marketplace, primarily due to the high cost and limited energy storage capacity of the batteries, which limited how far a vehicle could travel before the battery needed to be recharged, a process that took several hours.

As a result, the ZEV mandate has been delayed and modified several times and has been unsuccessful compared to the advances made in response to the performance-based emission standards.

2000s: Eliminating the Remainder

While the technology advancements of the 1990s brought the emission performance of new vehicles to levels once thought impossible, the requirements adopted in this decade are basically about eliminating the little that is left.

Two major programs, the federal Tier 2 standards and the California LEV II standard, are in force. The California LEV II program is its zero-emission vehicle (ZEV) mandate. As originally adopted, the ZEV mandate required 10 percent of all cars and certain light-duty trucks sold in the state to be ZEVs.

The ZEV mandate was different from all other emission standards in that it attempted to force the mass production of a specific technology: battery electric vehicles. However, battery electric vehicle technology never became competitive in the marketplace, primarily due to the high cost and limited energy storage capacity of the batteries, which limited how far a vehicle could travel before the battery needed to be recharged, a process that took several hours.

As a result, the ZEV mandate has been delayed and modified several times and has been unsuccessful compared to the advances made in response to the performance-based emission standards.

1960s: The First Controls

The initial focus was on emissions of carbon monoxide (CO) from all vehicles and emissions of black smoke from diesels. With the demonstration in the 1950s that Los Angeles smog could be generated by irradiation of hydrocarbons (HC's) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) in sunlight, they were added to the list of emissions to be controlled. The 1970 Clean Air Act identified CO, NOx, HC's, and total suspended particulates among the air pollutants called “criteria pollutants”—ones that required National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)—and charged the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with the establishment of vehicle emission standards.

The automobile industry realized such emission standards could be met only by using new technologies, and one of those technologies was the catalytic converter for exhaust gas clean up.

Table 1. U.S. light-duty vehicle emission standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Year</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>% Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-control</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Projected emissions inventory for California (annual average emissions in t/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reactive Organic Gases</th>
<th>NOx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2222</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Passenger Cars</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) as of 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>9 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>1.0 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC's</td>
<td>9 ppm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRESS continued at right**
dards, are reducing allowed emissions to near-zero levels not only for passenger cars but also for light-duty trucks (such as SUVs, pickups, and vans) by requiring that these vehicles meet passenger car standards.

Cleaner low-sulfur gasoline will be required on the federal level by the middle of the decade and will result in immediate reductions throughout the in-use fleet while enabling the advanced emission controls needed for the Tier 2 standards. The federal Tier 2 and California LEV II programs will provide large emission reductions as older vehicles are retired from the on-road fleet and replaced by these clean new vehicles.

Automakers will continue to make improvements to the emission performance of their gasoline engines. They also will continue to develop hydrogen-fueled fuel-cell vehicles, which have zero tailpipe emissions. While this technology shows considerable promise, its introduction, in terms of timing and volume, is highly uncertain at this time.

“The 1970s also saw the emergence of the catalytic converter, probably the most important vehicle emissions control device ever implemented.”

The Future: Near-Zero Emissions

To say vehicle emission controls have come a long way in the past 30 to 40 years would be an understatement. Today’s new vehicles have near-zero emissions and employ technology that will keep them that way throughout their on-road life.

To achieve the full benefit of today’s new vehicles throughout U.S. cities will take time, as cleaner vehicles must replace the older, higher-emitting vehicles in the in-use fleet. A projection of this progress over time is shown in Table 2 for California (a similar trend occurs nationally).

On-road reactive organic gas emissions from passenger cars are projected to decrease from 2,257 tons per day (t/day) in 1980 to 104 t/day in 2020, a 95 percent reduction. On-road NOx emissions from passenger cars are projected to decrease from 1,561 (t/day) in 1980 to 81 t/day in 2020, a 94 percent reduction.

As Table 2 also shows, the reductions from passenger cars are far more dramatic than the reductions from other pollution sources. There is little doubt emissions will fall even further in the future as the auto industry continues down the road toward zero.

James Ehlmann (@gm) is manager of vehicle emissions and George Wolff is principal scientist for General Motors Public Policy Center in Detroit, Michigan. A longer version of this article initially appeared in Environmental Protection Magazine, a publication of the Air & Waste Management Association. Reprinted with permission.

Environmental Red Tape Stalling Natural Gas Recovery

Energy Department documents more than 30 regulatory impediments

by James M. Taylor

More than 30 environmental policy and regulatory impediments are stalling domestic natural gas production, according to the Department of Energy (DOE) Energy Information Agency (EIA).

If the status quo is allowed to continue, EIA observes in its December 2004 report on Environmental Policy and Regulatory Constraints to Natural Gas Production, future shortages and price shocks will adversely affect the U.S. economy.

Conflicting Policies Cited

According to EIA, U.S. annual natural gas consumption will increase from 23 trillion cubic feet (TCF) in 2000 to 35 TCF in 2025. The new energy strategy will affect the price of natural gas, which will impact the US economy.

Recent studies have examined limitations to accessing natural gas, particularly in the Rocky Mountain region, but even after the gas is accessed, numerous additional environmental policy and regulatory constraints can affect production and delivery to consumers.
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by Michael Fumento
Perhaps I shouldn’t have been surprised at my reception January 25 at a Lakewood, Ohio hearing on whether to ban smoking in restaurants and bars. Such events tend to bring out the penny-ante dictators. After all, when customers can readily find smoke-free facilities and nobody’s forced to take a job, such bans are inherently authoritarian.

But these people went beyond the standard bullies with a noble-sounding cause.

Stacking the Deck
The nine-member commission appointed to advise the city council on the ban originally arranged to have six witnesses testify. One would expect a balanced panel with three witnesses for the ban and three witnesses against, right? Try six for and zero against. Then they relented and deigned to allow one witness on the other side — until they discovered it was me.

Specifically, those behind the national jihad against so-called “passive smoking” insisted I not be allowed to speak. One email labeled me a “shock jock” — an interesting metaphor considering I’ve never even guest-hosted a radio show.

Hours before my flight, I got word the panel had, under the threat of civil disobedience from the Small Business Coalition of Cleveland, again relented. I would be allowed to speak if I went last. By then, of course, the media and bored audience members would be gone. My time was also cut by a third at the last minute, but I rather saw that coming.

Just the Facts
Did I shock them? I hope so. Somehow the multitude of studies I discussed had been “overlooked” by the throng of witnesses before me.

I informed the panel that the study that began the crusade, published in 1992 by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), had, despite EPA’s insistence, found no statistically significant link to lung cancer. If EPA’s researchers had used the normal standard for statistical significance—a measure of the probability that the outcome resulted from sheer chance—they would have found no relationship.

Since the football fell short, they used a more lax standard to move the goalposts closer.

Strong Evidence Against
I told them EPA also found a mere 17 percent increased risk, yet the National Cancer Institute has said even a 100 percent increase is “considered small” and is “usually difficult to interpret. Such increases may be due to chance, statistical bias, or the effect of confounding fac-

tors that are sometimes not evident.” (The exception is with very large studies, but EPA’s was not.)

I noted that the other “authoritative” study linking passive smoke to lung cancer, commissioned by the World Health Organization, actually showed a statistically significant reduced risk for children of smokers and no increase for spouses and coworkers of smokers. For spouses and coworkers of smokers, it found neither increased nor decreased risk.

And I told them that the largest of the passive smoking studies (35,000 participants) and longest (39 years) found no “causal relationship between exposure to environmental tobacco smoke (passive smoking) and tobacco-related mortality.”

Fantastic Claim
I was going to tell them that smoking-ban crusaders had attempted to link to passive smoking virtually every disease known, “with the possible exception of herpes, hangnails, and hemorrhoids.” But lo! One of the previous witnesses was a pediatrician who claimed passive smoking caused herpes.

Fancy that, a virus spread by smoke.

I addressed specifically the health of workers. Such independent bodies as the Oak Ridge National Laboratory have found that in facilities where smoking tables are segregated (which is true of virtually all that do allow smoking), passive smoke “concentrations in the non-smoking section of the restaurant in question were statistically different from those measured in similar facilities where smoking is prohibited.”

Another Oak Ridge study of waiters, waitresses, and bartenders in the Knoxville, Tennessee area found a large range of exposure, with nothing detected at the bottom end. But even at the top end the levels indicated were “considerably lower than Occupational Safety and [Health] Administration workplace standards.”

Propaganda, Not Science
It has long been clear that “passive smoking” is not a scientific term but a propaganda one. A 1975 New England Journal of Medicine study found that even back then, when smoking obscured your face, the smoke puffed into your face was ubiquitous in restaurants and bars, the concentration was equal to merely 4/1000 of a cigarette per hour.

And while obviously you can inhale smoke from others’ cigarettes, we also know “the dose makes the poison.” We are constantly bombarded by carcinogens such as ultraviolet radiation and estrogen, but in such small amounts the body’s defense systems ward them off.

This explains why, despite what we’re so often told, studies of health risks of passive smoke keep coming up negative.

Hidden Agendas
Anti-smoking activists, however, continue to ignore the facts, because to admit them would destroy their agenda entirely. Having made all the progress they could in getting people to stop smoking by telling them, “Your smoking will kill you,” they have changed tack to get others to force them to stop, by telling nonsmokers, “Other people’s smoking will kill you.” (Or at least give you herpes.)

Former Surgeon General David Satcher essentially admitted as much at a Washington, DC hearing when he said a ban on workplace smoking would be “effective in creating a new social norm that discourages people from smoking.”

Smoking—real smoking—is both vile and deadly. I fully sympathize with those who want to see it go the way of the mastodon. But they lose me when they slip on the jackboots and fudge the science.

So now you know why there was so much fuss and feathers over my impending testimony. It wasn’t the Fumento they were afraid of — it was the facts.

Michael Fumento (fumento@pobox.com) is an author, journalist, and attorney specializing in science and health issues. He is a science columnist for Scripps-Howard and a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute in Washington, DC.

INTERNET INFO
Support for the statements Fumento makes in this essay is available online at the following sites:


National Cancer Institute, http://www.nci.nih.gov


“[T]he largest of the passive smoking studies (35,000 participants) and longest (39 years) found no ‘causal relationship between exposure to environmental tobacco smoke (passive smoking) and tobacco-related mortality.’”
Lead Solder Scare Campaign Threatens Computer Prices, Performance

by James M. Taylor

Recognizing the essential role of computers in today’s Information Age, government officials from California to Pennsylvania are calling for more widespread availability of affordable computers for adults and schoolchildren alike. San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom and Philadelphia Mayor John Street, for example, have recently voiced their support for free computer and Internet access for their citizens.

At the same time, environmental extremist groups are waging a scare campaign that threatens to erode computer production and drive up prices well beyond the means of many Americans.

Soldering Essential, Under Fire
At the heart of the scare campaign is lead-based soldering (pronounced “soldering”). Soldering is the process of heating a lead-tin alloy to its melting point, which then forms a pliable metal paste that bonds essential computer circuitry components together. The lead in the lead-tin alloy is essential to soldering performance. While it is possible to solder with other metals, lead carries crucial and unique advantages over the alternatives. Lead-tin alloy melts at the relatively low temperature of 183 degrees Celsius. Other metal alloys must reach at least 206 degrees to melt. Soldering at the higher temperatures can damage computer circuitry components.

Lead also prevents tin particles from forming beard-like whiskers that cause short-circuiting and damage to other circuitry components, and it has the advantage of being abundant and far less expensive than alternative metals such as copper and silver.

False Fears Spreading
Activist groups, however, have mounted a scare campaign to ban lead in solder material. They note that lead is toxic to humans, and as consumers buy newer computers and discard their old ones, more lead is entering landfills. As computers with lead solder accumulate in landfills, they argue, it becomes more likely that lead will contaminate groundwater and endanger human health.

Experts say that argument is flawed.

- **Lead solder is an insignificant source of lead.** According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), lead solder represents less than 1 percent of U.S. lead use and lead disposal in landfills.
- **Computers are not increasingly entering U.S. landfills.** The National Safety Council reports most computer users keep their obsolete computers, sell them to used computer dealers, or trade them in for a more expensive model.
- **Lead is a stable metal.** According to the Electronic Industry Alliance’s Environment Consumer Education Initiative, lead rarely leaves its computer shell even after entering a landfill.
- **Modern landfill liners and other landfill technologies make it unlikely lead would leak out of a landfill into groundwater.** Landfills are built today with thick, puncture-resistant liners that keep waste from coming into contact with soil and groundwater.

Stipulates that a panel of independent scientists will utilize the best available technology to develop forward-looking clean-air regulations, and EPA will then clarify exactly how clean air rules will apply to livestock farmers.

Should Resolve Ongoing Disputes
Ongoing disputes between EPA and live-stock farmers motivated the agreement. EPA had been pursuing enforcement actions against a number of livestock farmers for alleged violations of the Clean Air Act; the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act; and the Environment Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act. However, farmers asserted, and EPA eventually agreed, that sufficient data are not available to establish compliance thresholds for livestock operations.

Explained Terry Fleck, executive vice president for the Indiana Pork Advocacy Coalition, as reported January 21 by the Brownfield Network, “About three years ago EPA and some states started trying to apply the nation’s air quality regulations to livestock and poultry farms without any type of scientific research as to a livestock farm’s impact on air quality. The pork industry told the EPA, you can’t do this to farmers when farmers had no idea their farms could come under air quality regulations.”

“EPA officials in both the Clinton and Bush administrations and scientists of the National Academy of Sciences agreed that sound scientific data was missing to enforce the current air laws,” added Dave Roper, chairman of the Environment Committee of the National Pork Producers Council (NPPC).

“Many believe that federal and state air regulators currently lack the information needed to correctly interpret current laws for animal production,” continued Roper. “Climate, animal numbers and age, and farm management are all key variables that affect emissions. Until science interprets these factors, livestock producers are at a loss to know if the laws apply to their farms.”

Deal Ensures Cleaner Air
Individual livestock farmers may choose whether or not to join the agreement. Farmers choosing to join will be immune from enforcement actions regarding past alleged violations. In return, they will pay moderate civil penalties (with the amount determined by the size of the livestock farm), fund the independent study into air emissions, make facilities open to government monitoring, and abide by future EPA regulations resulting from the upcoming scientific study. All farmers who join will have to pay the penalties, even if they have never before been found to have released any pollution; the “civil penalty” will be the equivalent of a “consent agreement joining fee.”

Farmers choosing not to join the agreement will have to pay the agreement’s civil penalties, but still may be open to EPA enforcement actions and still must comply with any future EPA regulations.

This agreement is a huge step forward,” said Thomas V. Skinner, EPA’s acting assistant administrator for enforcement and compliance assurance, in a January 21 news release. “It will allow us to reach the largest number of AFOLs [animal feeding operations] in the shortest period of time and ensure that they comply with applicable clean air requirements.”

“The purpose of the agreement,” EPA’s news release stated, “is to ensure that AFOLs comply with applicable environmental requirements and to gather scientific data the Agency needs to make informed regulatory and policy determinations. The agreement will establish an industry-funded emissions monitoring program that will help provide this information, leading to better tools to help the farm industry, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and EPA determine the compliance status of feed operations.”

Farmers’ Groups Urge Participation
Fleck strongly urged farmers to join the agreement. He explained, “When a farmer signs this agreement with EPA he is giving himself protection from any unknown past air quality violations. However, after the two-year study is completed, farms found to emit more than the thresholds will have to comply with the laws in the future, but past emissions are excused.”

Roper agreed. “This has been a long, exhaustive, and costly endeavor that NPPC has led on behalf of America’s pork producers for the past three years. I urge all pork producers to seriously consider signing the consent agreement.”

Will Preempt State Legislation
The agreement carries significant importance for states contemplating their own emissions standards. In Iowa, for example, activist groups are trying to convince state legislators that federal regulations are not strict enough on livestock farmers.

The upcoming independent study and resultant federal rules will likely satisfy legislators who doubt that federal rules safeguard human health and the environment. A patchwork of competing state laws would make compliance difficult for livestock farmers and would likely raise consumer costs.

“National restrictions on air emissions will lower air emissions from livestock and poultry farms across the country,” said NPPC President Keith Berry, a pork producer from Greensboro, Indiana.

James Hoare (jhoare@mcgivneyandkluger.com) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
"Uninterrupted Gloom and Doom"

a review of *State of the World 2005*

Y ou will not want to buy *State of the World 2005* unless you are worried that you have an overly optimistic personality and believe you need a bit of gloom and doom to bring you down. Or perhaps you are a statistics junkie and like plenty of numbers, regardless of whether they are accurate or relevant.

In the hands of the uninformed, this book can lead only to depression—which of course has long been the purpose of the Worldwatch Institute.

Kremlin Model

The book hits the ground running with a hollow, almost laughable foreword by that great environmentalist leader, Mikhail Gorbachev. If you have not noticed, the fall of the Iron Curtain offered a bevy of new blood to the environmental movement in the form of people previously engaged in the support of communism.

Gorbachev’s foreword contains the following paragraph, which can only bring followers of his Kremlin career to hysterics:

“I believe that today the world faces three interrelated challenges: the challenge of security, including the risks associated with weapons of mass destruction and terrorism; the challenge of poverty and underdevelopment; and the challenge of environmental sustainability.”

Attacks on Iraq War

A great deal of the book’s attention is focused on America’s alleged belligerence, attacking the war in Iraq at every turn, as if this had anything to do with the environment. The book also tells us the United States has only itself to blame for becoming a target of international terrorism, describing terrorism as the roots of extremist violence are not going to disappear as long as the protagonists who tend to be politically despicable, unreliable brethren.

“Rather than striking a blow against terrorism, the occupation of Iraq has accelerated the radicalization of an Islamic world already seething over events in the occupied Palestinian Territories.”

Errors Needing Correction

Refreshing, however, the authors every so often include some hearteningly accurate material. A case in point is their complete reversal from previous haranguing over the world’s “exploding” population to an admission that most of the world has population growth under control.

They also present some reasonably accurate statistics on disease in the Third World… but then appear to blame much of it on “[the widespread and often indiscriminate use of antibiotics and other anti-bacterial agents… creating families of drug-resistant microbes.” Apparently, the authors never heard of malaria’s worldwide resurgence, causing the deaths of literally millions of people, after environmental activist groups successfully eliminated the use of the man-made pesticide known as DDT.

Even the left-leaning *New York Times* is calling for the return of DDT, yet groups like the Worldwatch Institute would rather ignore and deny that particular Third World holocaust.

Similarly, the Worldwatch authors give any serious reader pause when they state that the United States ranks 28th among nations with a life expectancy of 69.3 years. We in fact passed 70 decades ago and now sit atop the world at 77 years of age. (See [http://my.webmd.com/content/article/101/106141.htm?x=1727_0000_5024_hv_03](http://my.webmd.com/content/article/101/106141.htm?x=1727_0000_5024_hv_03)).

Railing Against Fossil Fuels

“You will not want to buy *State of the World 2005* unless you are worried that you have an overly optimistic personality and believe you need a bit of gloom and doom to bring you down.”

Food As WMD

The authors even go so far as to ask the question, “can food be a weapon of mass destruction?” by claiming that our livestock is becoming increasingly disease-prone and that the reason there is no evidence of this is that we cannot tell because we have too many animals to monitor. They follow this with the threat of widespread foot and mouth disease, disregarding the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s successful prevention of that disease for decades as a result of effective food and farm policies.

One of the clear intentions of *State of the World 2005* is to eliminate successful agriculture in this country as we know it. We have the healthiest, safest, and least-expensive food supply on the planet. We have tripled yields everywhere over the past 40 years, leaving the bulk of our arable land for forests, parks, nature trails, and human amenities.

The book is uninterrupted gloom and doom, sprinkled with occasionally accurate facts. It is a glass almost always half empty.

But best of all, it is a clear insight into the thinking of those who oppose much of human progress and all of capitalism while supporting most of the failed endeavors of socialism’s 70 year experiment in Mr. Gorbachev’s native land.

Dr. Jay Lehr (e3@e3power.com) is science director for the Heartland Institute.
New York Times Endorses DDT

A January 8, 2005 article, written by New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof, reported the growing scientific consensus that DDT is environmentally safe and an irreplaceable anti-malaria weapon.

“The U.S. and other rich countries are siding with the mosquitoes against the world’s poor by opposing the use of DDT,” wrote Kristof.

“The poor countries that were able to keep malaria in check tend to be the same countries now join us in a worldwide campaign to support the use of DDT in combating malaria and other infectious diseases that have destroyed so many lives in so many developing countries?”

Paul Driessen, senior policy advisor Congress of Racial Equality

“South Africa was right to use DDT,” said WWF spokesperson Richard Liroff. “If the alternatives to DDT aren’t working, as they weren’t in South Africa, geez, you’ve got to use it. In South Africa it prevented tens of thousands of malaria cases and saved lots of lives.”

Greenpeace spokesperson Rick Hind agreed. “If there’s nothing else and it’s going to save lives, we’re all for it. Nobody’s dogmatic about it.”

Ban Killed Millions

“It might be easy for some to dismiss the past 43 years of eco-hysteria over DDT with a simple ‘nevermind,’” asserted Steve Milloy, an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute, “except for the blood of millions of people dripping from the hands of the WWF, Greenpeace, Rachel Carson, Environmental Defense Fund, and other junk science-fueled opponents of DDT.”

“All I can say is: It’s about time,” Paul Driessen, senior policy advisor for the Congress of Racial Equality and author of Eco-Imperialism: Green Power — Black Death, said. “Better late than never. But why did so many people have to die over the past three decades, because of the near-global de facto DDT ban, which these groups promoted so incessantly? Will these two organizations now join us in a worldwide campaign to support the use of DDT in combating malaria and other infectious diseases that have destroyed so many lives in so many developing countries?”

“So why do the U.N. and donor agencies, including the U.S. Agency for International Development, generally avoid financing DDT programs?” Kristof asked. “The main obstacle seems to be bureaucratic caution and inertia. President Bush should cut through that and lead an effort to fight malaria using all necessary tools, including DDT.”

James Hoare (jhoare@mcgivneyandkluger.com) is managing attorney at the Syracuse, New York, office of McGivney, Kluger & Gannon.
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