Chicago Falls Short of Touted 2001 Renewable Fuels Pledge

After pledging in 2001 that his city government would run on 20 percent renewable power by 2006, the end of the year showed Chicago Mayor Richard Daley (D) could not make good on his commitment to run the city on the more expensive fuel sources.

As the Chicago Tribune reported on November 20, 2006, “Chicago’s energy mix isn’t so green. Nearly all of the megawatts powering City Hall and other government buildings are still coming from nuclear and coal plants. ... The city hasn’t bought any green energy since 2004.”

Daley’s pledge inspired an avalanche of accolades, including feature stories in such publications as the Washington Post, Time, and Christian Science Monitor. In 2002, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency named Chicago its Partner of the Year for green power. Daley was invited to speak to Robert Redford and a conference of mayors at the actor’s Sundance Resort in Utah.

The mayor pleased environmental activist groups by pledging to lead by example.
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ESLA Listing

Not Needed for Polar Bears

By H. Sterling Burnett

Despite healthy polar bear populations upwards of 20,000 bears worldwide, U.S. Secretary of the Interior Dirk Kempthorne announced on December 27 the Bush administration’s plan to list the polar bear as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. Kempthorne’s announcement begins a 12-month period of public comment and scientific review.

Ag Interests Challenge New EPA Soot Rules

By John Dale Dunn M.D., J.D.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) new rule requiring a 50 percent reduction in fine particulate matter allowable over a 24-hour period subjects farmers, cattlemen, and businessmen to inappropriately strict new standards, according to petitions filed.
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Climate AlARMist QuITS BrITISH Government

By H. Sterling Burnett

Sir Nicholas Stern, author of a controversial October 2006 report alleging global warming will wreak havoc on the global economy, on December 11 resigned his position as second permanent secretary in the British treasury department after the government essentially ignored his call for drastic action.

Sought Action

Upon its release, the Stern report on projected economic costs of climate change caused a political uproar and media frenzy.

Sponsored by British Chancellor Gordon Brown, who is favored to succeed Tony Blair as the next British prime minister, the report garnered great media attention because it purported to show the future harm from human-induced global warming would be much greater than any previous study had predicted. Stern’s report said the harm would be as much as 20 percent of world gross domestic product each year.

By contrast, the report estimated the costs to reduce future warming significantly would be less than 1 percent of present and future world gross domestic product, lower than almost every previous estimate.

Citing Stern’s conclusions, environmental activist groups called for even deeper cuts in greenhouse gas emissions than required by the Kyoto Protocol and renewed calls for the United States to join the international treaty.

“Sir Nicholas Stern, author of a controversial October 2006 report alleging global warming will wreak havoc on the global economy, on December 11 resigned his position as second permanent secretary in the British treasury department …”

Economists Refuted Report

Because the report’s findings were so radically at odds with previous economic analyses, it received a great deal of attention and criticism from economists.

Award-winning economists such as Robert O. Mendelsohn and William Nordhaus of Yale University and Sir Partha Dasgupta of Cambridge University pointed out the report assumed a 60 percent higher growth rate in global population than expected by international demographers; assumed income growth rates would be less than half the present rate; and used inconsistent and arguably absurd discount rates that substantially underestimated the costs of cutting carbon emissions while simultaneously using a higher discount rate when calculating the benefits of immediate action.

Economists rejected Stern’s estimates of the economic costs associated with climate change caused a political uproar and media frenzy.
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Africans Urge Congress to Fulfill DDT Promise to Fight Malaria

**Africa Fighting Malaria,** a public policy organization dedicated to educating people about the scourge of malaria, submitted a letter on January 22 to U.S. Sens. Robert C. Byrd (D-WV) and Thad Cochran (R-MS), chairman and ranking member, respectively, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, requesting the approval of proposed 2007 funding for bilateral and multilateral malaria control programs for Africa, including the President’s Malaria Initiative and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria. The letter was endorsed by more than 50 public policy groups.

**Dear Chairman Byrd and Ranking Member Cochran:**

We fully understand that you face significant challenges in finalizing the FY 2007 appropriations process and setting budget priorities for the year ahead. Nonetheless, we hope very much that you will consider increased funding for bilateral and multilateral malaria control programs as a priority, and strongly encourage you to do so.

Malaria kills over a million people each year and hinders economic, cognitive, and social development. It is the single biggest killer of African children, yet more resources and attention are devoted to fighting the disease now than ever before. We urge you to support the Senate’s funding level of $234 million for bilateral malaria programs, which includes $135 million for the President’s Malaria Initiative (PMI) in 2007.

In 2006, the PMI launched efforts in Angola, Tanzania, and Uganda to successfully scale up malaria control measures. In Angola, an indoor residual spraying program that began in December 2005 had provided protection for 555,000 people by the end of March 2006. In Uganda, the PMI procured over 290,000 pediatric doses of Artemisinin-based combination treatment drugs for free distribution as part of Uganda’s home-based management of fever program in the IDP camps in northern Uganda.

In Tanzania, beginning in mid-December 2005, the PMI distributed 130,000 long-lasting bed-nets, more than doubling the coverage rates of pregnant women and children on Zanzibar and Pemba Island. The number of confirmed malaria cases on Pemba Island dropped 87 percent from January to September 2006 to 1,570—down from 12,531 over the same period [in 2005], according to local health reports.

In total, these activities protected an estimated 6 million people from malaria. With $135 million in FY2007, the PMI will be able to protect an additional 30 million people in these three countries and four new ones: Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, and Senegal.

President Bush and the First Lady recently hosted a White House Summit on Malaria to galvanize public-private partnerships, grassroots and community efforts for this initiative. Various global public health leaders, including Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Dr. Margaret Chan, new head of the World Health Organization, Melinda Gates of the Gates Foundation, Paul Wolfowitz, head of the World Bank, several African Health Ministers, and numerous celebrities participated and committed their support to the PMI. A new network called Malaria No More was created specifically to build on the momentum generated by this event and the PMI’s success in 2006.

As a result, the U.S. political commitment to fighting malaria is tremendous and unprecedented. It is critical at this stage that the financial commitment is equally tremendous. The PMI must receive the full requested funding of $135 million for FY2007 to sustain and build upon these efforts in the recipient countries.

Success will be measured by the extent to which recipient countries can sustain the programs our resources and expertise are helping to build. This will not be possible without the ongoing commitment of both the House and Senate to work on a bipartisan basis to provide full funding for goals that are ambitious, but also vitally important and wholly achievable.

Malaria is a preventable and curable disease.

Further, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria is a critically important partner to the U.S. in efforts to control and eradicate malaria. The Global Fund currently provides about a third of all resources for malaria control globally, and works side-by-side with the PMI, USAID and the CDC to provide effective malaria control measures to recipient countries.

In all your deliberations on FY2007 appropriations, we urge you to maintain the Senate level of $600 million for the Global Fund. Combined with an additional $100 million in the Labor-HHS bill, the total U.S. contribution to the Global Fund would be $700 million in FY 2007.

In sum, we hope that as you consider the final FY 2007 appropriations for Foreign Operations, you will succeed in defending the Senate’s funding level of $234 million for bilateral malaria programs, including the PMI, and $700 million in total for the Global Fund. Working together, the U.S. and the Global Fund can help save countless lives of those most at risk from this deadly, yet preventable, disease.

Sincerely,

Africa Fighting Malaria

**Tell Us What You Think!**

Write to me at: James M. Taylor Managing Editor Environment & Climate News

The Heartland Institute 19 South LaSalle Street #903 Chicago, Illinois 60603

Or drop me an email: taylor@heartland.org

---

**DDT Did Not Harm Eagles**

**By Jay Lehr, Ph.D.**

While it is wonderful that the bald eagle will be taken off the Endangered Species list, many media reports repeated the fiction that the ban on DDT use in the U.S. was a major factor in the species' recovery.

There is no scientific evidence that DDT had any negative impact on our national bird. To the contrary, DDT’s elimination of disease-causing vermin helped virtually all bird populations, which is well documented by the National Audubon Society.

A brief history of the eagle population makes this clear. In 1941, before any DDT was used, 197 bald eagles were counted. In 1960, after 15 years of heavy DDT use, the count had risen to 891. The prominent, late entomologist, Dr. J. Gordon Edwards, recorded more specific aspects in his last authoritative treatise on the subject, “Effects of DDT in Surface Water on Bird Abundance and Reproduction,” featured in the Surface Water volume of the *Water Encyclopedia* (Wiley Interscience, 2004), a scientific anthology that I had the pleasure to edit.

“The important argument for the proper lifesaving use of DDT should not be weakened by erroneous reports about eagles.”

The World Health Organization and others now recognize the need to bring back DDT in order to reduce deaths from malaria. The important argument for the proper lifesaving use of DDT should not be weakened by erroneous reports about eagles.

Jay Lehr, Ph.D. (lehr@heartland.org) is science director of The Heartland Institute.
Maine Meets Federal Ozone Standards for the First Time

By James M. Taylor

For the first time since the state began monitoring ground-level ozone in the 1970s, the entire state of Maine is now officially meeting federal ambient air quality standards.

Ongoing Clean Air Trend

“Maine is an example of the ongoing decline in ground-level ozone and pollution in general throughout the nation,” said Joel Schwartz, a visiting fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. “Environmental activist groups have been alleging the Bush administration is rolling back the Clean Air Act, but unrelenting improvements in air quality in Maine, New England, and the country as a whole show just the opposite to be true,” Schwartz said.

Seemingly Impossible Task

Jim Brooks, head of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection’s Bureau of Air Quality, told the December 12 Bangor Daily News that back in the 1980s he thought he would never see the day when the state could meet federal attainment standards.

“I’m very pleased. This is a milestone,” Brooks said.

Maine officials attributed the clean air gains to a wide range of programs implemented at the federal, state, and local levels, including programs implemented in upwind states.

“While Maine is now meeting the federal ozone standard, there remains room for air quality improvement,” Littell added. “We need to continue working with EPA and upwind states to further reduce emissions of ozone precursors and other pollutants including mercury from power plants. As emission control programs and technology advance, we should be prepared to follow suit and adopt new controls that effectively reduce these air pollutants.”

James M. Taylor (@taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.

Vegetable Producers Sued for Air Pollution

Activists claim dust raised by farming poses health risk

By John Dale Dunn, M.D., J.D.

Environmental activist groups in California filed a lawsuit December 27 in the U.S. Court of Appeals in San Francisco claiming the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency should declare the San Joaquin Valley in nonattainment with federal particulate matter (PM) guidelines.

The lawsuit makes good on threats by the activist group Earthjustice to challenge air quality throughout the San Joaquin Valley region.

Never Pure Enough

Although the San Joaquin Valley is far and away the nation’s largest supplier of healthy fruits and vegetables, all of that farming creates dust, and the activists have begun to target farmers as air polluters.

An article in the October 22 Sacramento Bee chronicled Earthjustice’s complaints. The activist group claims it possesses data that show unhealthy air existed on a few days around Thanksgiving in 2005 in the San Joaquin Valley at Bakersfield and Corcoran. The group does not specify the days or give the number of days of alleged noncompliance.

Science Rebuffs Activists’ Claims

Earthjustice claims small particles in the air creep into people’s lungs and cause disease. “Rural Latino communities are still choking on dust because the Air District isn’t doing enough to protect us,” stated Rey Leon of the Latino Issues Forum on the Earthjustice Web site.

Medical research on the effects of air pollution, however, does not support environmental activists’ claims that air pollution in America is killing anyone. A comprehensive 19-year study of air pollution in California, published in 2005 in the journal Inhalation Toxicology, found no effect on mortality from air pollution in 25 California counties, including Fresno.

Individuals living in the two highest air pollution counties, Kern and Riverside, had no decrease in life expectancy.

“The San Joaquin Valley has had declining PM 10 values for years,” noted Joel Schwartz, an air quality policy expert and visiting fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. “Even so, it is somewhat irrelevant because the valley is still in violation of PM 2.5 standards, so the valley will still be subject to the same regulations as it would have if it had not attained PM 10 standards.”

Nevertheless, Schwartz explained, “Studies show agricultural dust, because it is so coarse and heavy, is filtered out of the air very efficiently before it reaches urban and residential areas.

“Lawsuits like this are more about publicity and trying to get courts to set regulatory policy,” Schwartz said. “There is no real merit to this lawsuit other than public relations goals and ulterior motives.”

John Dale Dunn, M.D., J.D. (@jddmjd @web-access.net), an inactive attorney, teaches emergency medicine at Fort Hood, Texas and is a member of the Science and Policy Advisory Board of the American Council on Science and Health.
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Lawsuit Seeks to Prolong 40-Year Delay on Maryland Highway

Proposed road ‘steamrolled through the approval process,’ opponents claim

By James M. Taylor

Forty-plus years of delays in building a vital highway connector between I-270 and I-95 in Prince George’s and Montgomery Counties in Maryland should be extended because government officials failed to sufficiently assess more environment-friendly alternatives, four environmental activist groups alleged in a December 20 lawsuit. Activists Want More Study

The activist groups—Environmental Defense, the Sierra Club, Audubon Naturalist Society, and Maryland Native Plant Society—assert government officials improperly failed to consider such “reasonable alternatives” as building mass transit and improving local roads as an alternative to the highway connector. The activists also claimed the connector would result in noise levels that would unacceptably disrupt open lands.

“From the beginning, the ICC (Intercounty Connector) study failed to consider alternatives that could better solve congestion. This violates federal laws requiring a fair look at other ways to solve problems,” Neal Fitzpatrick, executive director of the Audubon Naturalist Society, said in a press statement. “When you cut through the political rhetoric offered by state officials, the ICC is a poor performer. It does little to relieve congestion and does not justify the massive community and environmental damage it causes.”

Washington Post Says Build It

“The officials in Maryland understand that the planned intercounty connector, possibly history’s most studied road, has been examined and assessed ad nauseam and approved,” countered the December 21 Washington Post, rarely an opponent of environmental activist groups. “The Post noted that prior to the lawsuit the Montgomery County Planning Board was the only government agency holding up road construction. ‘Maybe the board members are also awaiting a bolt of lightning or some other heavenly sign before they give the go-ahead for the road, which would connect two vital corridors in the Maryland suburbs,’ the Post chided.

“Most officials in Maryland understand that the planned intercounty connector, possibly history’s most studied road, has been examined and assessed ad nauseam and approved.”

WASHINGTON POST

Highway Would Cut Pollution

Dispensing with the assertion that the proposed highway connector would add pollution to the region, economist and land policy expert Randall O’Toole of the Thoreau Institute said, “Anything that relieves congestion reduces pollution. So the argument that the highway connector will increase pollution is just a red herring.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.

Soot

Continued from page 1

December 18 with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Farmers and cattlemen, in particular, argued the rule will unjustifiably impose unprecedented regulations on dust kicked up by centuries-old agricultural practices.

The first real action required under the new rule was air monitoring activities beginning January 1, 2007. The rule was finalized on September 28, 2006 and took effect immediately.

Previous Rules Also Controversial

In the spring of 2006 EPA proposed new and more stringent National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). That action was taken just a decade after significant air standards changes in 1996, which many observers at the time considered unnecessary. The 1996 standards caused much disagreement inside and outside the Clinton administration and were criticized as too aggressive, not based on good health effects science, and too expensive. EPA Administrator Carol Browner nevertheless implemented them on an emergency basis, after a shorter-than-usual time period for comments and debate.

New Rules Unprecedented

The comment period for the 2006 proposed NAAQS began in May 2006 with arguments for and against tighter standards. Advocates inside and outside EPA argued the controversial 1996 standards, which are still in the process of being implemented, were not strict enough. Many of those advocates not only support the current effort to tighten the standards but also argue EPA’s 2006 rule has not gone far enough.

Opponents of the new standards say the research on air quality health effects used to support the 1996 and 2006 standards amounts to junk science that violates basic rules of epidemiology and toxicology. They point out EPA cannot link current particulate matter standards to any mortalities, let alone the thousands of deaths EPA is claiming it will prevent with its new standard.

Farmers and cattlemen are particularly troubled by EPA’s new standard. To attain the new standards, states will likely have to impose unprecedented regulations on traditional agricultural practices. In particular, states are likely to target dust kicked up by plowing, planting, fertilizing, and feeding practices.

“When you deal with agriculture, you deal with dust,” Tamara Thies, director of environmental issues for the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association, told the December 18 Greenwire.

Farmers Feeling Pressure

The American Farm Bureau, National Pork Producers Council, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and National Association of Manufacturers have joined the cattlemen in challenging the new standards.

David Warner, a spokesman for the National Pork Producers Council, said EPA has violated a consent decree with the Thoreau Institute said, “Anything that relieves congestion reduces pollution. So the argument that the highway connector will increase pollution is just a red herring.”

Karen Batra, speaking on behalf of the Cattlemen’s Association and the Beef Industry, was not swayed by arguments for stricter regulation. The cattlemen “believe that the health effects studies relied on by EPA were not reliable science and do not justify another economic burden on stressed farmers and ranchers,” Batra said.

John Dule Dunn, M.D., J.D. (jdd@web-access.net) teaches emergency medicine at Fort Hood, Texas and is a member of the Science and Policy Advisory Board of the American Council on Science and Health.

I believe in freedom. What do YOU believe in?

Colorful, high-quality, extra durable bumper stickers look great on file cabinets, doors, windows, and folders as well as cars. A great present for friends, coworkers, relatives, and neighbors. Impress your friends! Irritate your enemies! Place your order today!

$1.49 each $37.50 for 50
$9.99 for 10 $59.99 for 100

To order, visit www.heartland.org or call The Heartland Institute at 312.377.4000. Or, send a check or money order to The Heartland Institute 19 Sooth LaSalle Street #803 Chicago, IL 60603.
EPA Should Help States Required to Clean Up Foreign Pollution

Chamber petitions EPA to implement existing federal law

By William L. Kovacs

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce on December 13 petitioned the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to implement a mechanism protecting states and local authorities and other stakeholders from suffering regulatory and economic burdens due to impacts on local air quality conditions arising from intrusive foreign emissions. These include ozone and particulate matter originating in Asia and other places that ultimately come across the U.S. border.

Georgia Example

Air emissions emanating from outside the United States can cause states and counties to violate Clean Air Act (CAA) air quality attainment standards. What’s more, the scientific literature clearly demonstrates that in many instances, states or counties would be able to comply with attainment standards but for emissions originating from outside the nation’s borders. Walker County, Georgia Commissioner Bebe Heiskell recently testified to Congress, “Walker County’s non-attainment status is almost exclusively due to outside influences on our air quality—including up to 60 percent natural particulate matter, transported from Alaska, Canada, and amazingly Africa, which is completely out of our control.”

Heiskell also observed, “Many industries begin a site location search using EPA’s Internet list of counties in non-attainment. Those counties never make the list of prospective sites [for business development].”

Thus the impact of foreign emissions poses problems for business and industry stakeholders in localities affected by such emissions.

Burden on States

Recognizing the situation, Congress stated in Section 179B of the 1990 Clean Air Amendments that U.S. states and businesses should not be penalized if emissions emanating from outside the United States are the “but for” cause of non-attainment of air quality standards.

Unfortunately, notwithstanding that clear statutory language and the agency’s own understanding of congressional intent, EPA has failed to provide a reliable, feasible, and generally applicable mechanism for states to address and discount the impact of foreign emissions.

Instead, EPA guidance in this area is very limited, deficient, and complex. As a result, in striving to meet EPA’s air quality attainment goals, state and local air quality managers are burdened with having to do something not only about emissions generated locally but also about intrusive foreign emissions emanating from distant sources around the globe which they have no control.

The Chamber petition asks EPA simply to do what the law requires.

“Need for Predictability, Consistency”

Making the problem worse is that EPA determinations concerning “but for” exclusions are not only made after the fact, but are also made on a case-by-case basis. In addition, EPA advises air quality managers to deal with the regional EPA authorities instead of the central headquarters, although each EPA regional authority may have its own way of evaluating data and information.

“The law, however, is clear. It requires EPA to make allowances for foreign emissions in determining air quality compliance. And in interpreting and implementing the law, EPA must be clear about what can be done to address the issue.”

EPA’s own understanding of congressional intent, EPA has failed to provide a reliable, feasible, and generally applicable mechanism for states to address and discount the impact of foreign emissions.

Assumption of Guilt

Help from the federal agency has not been forthcoming. EPA has stated it has no position about how to address the problem. Essentially, EPA has said to state and local air quality managers: Convince us that some of the emissions seen at air quality monitors in your area are in fact emissions emanating from outside the United States, or we won’t be sympathetic to your problems in the event of noncompliance issues.

Compounding the problem, EPA has failed to clearly advise state and local air quality managers how to go about determining which emissions are coming from around the world and which are not. Instead, EPA is leaving it up to the air quality managers to figure out what to do.

EPA won’t even tell state and local air quality managers which models or other tools to use or how to ensure the data and information they collect or produce is valid. All EPA is willing to do is look at what the state and local authorities have found out about the problem—after they have spent time, money, and labor collecting the data.

The world’s economy is growing—and with it, the amount of foreign emissions coming into the United States. Without action by EPA, states will be required increasingly to clean up other people’s messes.

The Chamber petition asks EPA simply to do what the law requires.

William L. Kovacs (pr@uschamber.com) is vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Environment, Technology, and Regulatory Affairs Division.

INTERNET INFO

Media Hype on Climate Change Is Nothing New: Inhofe

Alarmism over climate change is unsupported by the weight of scientific evidence, and proposals by environmental activists to impose drastic actions are unwarranted, Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK), chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, stated on the Senate floor on September 26, 2006.

In his address, Inhofe summarized the state of climate change science, drawing upon the latest scientific research.

Reproduced below is the third installment in an ongoing series presenting Inhofe's address, edited for length. Environment & Climate News will publish subsequent parts of the address in upcoming issues.

Press alternates between warming, cooling scares
French President Jacques Chirac provided the key clue as to why so many in the international community still revere the Kyoto Protocol. In 2000 he said Kyoto represents “the first component of an authentic global governance.”

Furthermore, if your goal is to limit CO2 emissions, the only effective way to go about it is the use of cleaner, more efficient technologies that will meet the energy demands of the future. CO2 emissions, the only effective way to go about it is the use of cleaner, more efficient technologies that will meet the energy demands of the century and beyond.

The Bush administration and my [Senate] Environment and Public Works Committee have been engaged in these efforts as we work to expand nuclear power and promote the Asia-Pacific Partnership. This partnership stresses the sharing of new technology among member nations, including three of the world's top ten emitters—China, India, and South Korea—all of whom are exempt from Kyoto.

Media Advocacy Flip-Flops
Many in the media, as I noted earlier, have taken it upon themselves to drop all pretense of balance on global warming and instead become committed advocates for the issue. Here is a quote from Newsweek magazine:

“There are ominous signs that the Earth’s weather patterns have begun to change dramatically and that these changes may portend a drastic decline in food production with serious political implications for just about every nation on Earth.”


Here is a quote from Time magazine:

“As they review the bizarre and unpredictable weather pattern of the past several years, a growing number of scientists are beginning to suspect that many seemingly contradictory meteorological fluctuations are actually part of a global climactic upheaval.”

They weren’t referring to global warming; they were warning of a coming ice age.

Let me repeat, all three of those quotes were published in the 1970s and warned of a coming ice age.

“Many in the media ... have taken it upon themselves to drop all pretense of balance on global warming and instead become committed advocates for the issue.”

Global Warming in 1939
In addition to global cooling fears, Time magazine has also reported on global warming. Here is an example:

“Those who claim that winters were harder when they were boys are quite right—weathermen have no doubt that the world at least for the time being is growing warmer.”

Before you think this is just another example of the media promoting Vice President Gore’s movie, you need to know that the quote I just read you from Time magazine was not a recent quote; it was from January 2, 1939. Yes, in 1939.

Nine years before Vice President Gore was born and over three decades before Time magazine began hyping a coming ice age, and almost five decades before they returned to hyping global warming,

Time magazine in 1951 pointed to receding permafrost in Russia as proof that the planet was warming.

In 1952, the New York Times noted that the “trump card” of global warming “has been the melting glaciers.”

Frozen with Fear
There are many more examples of the media and scientists flip-flopping between warming and cooling scares.

Here is a headline from the New York Times reporting on fears of an approaching ice age: “Geologists Think the World May be Frozen Up Again.”

That sentence appeared over 100 years ago in the February 24, 1895 edition of the New York Times.

Let me repeat. 1895, not 1995. A front-page article in the October 7, 1912 New York Times, just a few months after the Titanic struck an iceberg and sank, declared that a prominent professor “warns us of an encroaching ice age.”

The very same day in 1912, the Los Angeles Times ran an article warning that the “human race will have to fight for its existence against cold.”

An August 10, 1923 Washington Post article declared: “Ice Age Coming Here.”

Different Tack
By the 1930s, the media took a break from reporting on the coming ice age and instead switched gears to promoting global warming:

“America in Longest Warm Spell Since 1776; Temperature Line Records 25-Year Rise” stated an article in the New York Times on March 27, 1933. The media of yesteryear was also not above injecting large amounts of fear and alarmism into their climate articles.

An August 14, 1934 front-page article in the Chicago Tribune declared: “Scientist Says Arctic Ice Will Wipe Out Canada.”

The article quoted a Yale University professor who predicted large parts of Europe and Asia would be “wiped out” and Switzerland would be “entirely obliterated.”

A December 29, 1974 New York Times article on global cooling reported that climatologists were promoting yet another round of eco-doom.

After more than a century of denying global warming and instead switched gears to promoting global warming:

“America in Longest Warm Spell Since 1776; Temperature Line Records 25-Year Rise” stated an article in the New York Times on March 27, 1933. The media of yesteryear was also not above injecting large amounts of fear and alarmism into their climate articles.

The article also warned that unless government officials reacted to the coming catastrophe, “mass deaths by starvation and probably in anarchy and violence” would result. In 1975, the New York Times reported, “A major cooling [was] widely considered to be inevitable.”

Familiar Alarmism
These past predictions of doom have a familiar ring, don’t they? They sound strikingly similar to our modern media promotion:[our] former vice president’s brand of climate alarmism.

“Ice Age Coming Here.”

The article also warned that unless government officials reacted to the coming catastrophe, “mass deaths by starvation and probably in anarchy and violence” would result. In 1975, the New York Times reported, “A major cooling [was] widely considered to be inevitable.”
By Michael Coulter

Scientist Norman Borlaug received the nation’s highest civilian honor—the Congressional Gold Medal—on December 6, 2006, making him one of only 300 or so people who have received the medal since it was first given to George Washington in 1776.

Technologies to Defeat Hunger

Borlaug is widely regarded as the “Father of the Green Revolution” and was lauded by Congress for developing technologies that dramatically increased food production, particularly in Third World nations.

Those technologies include the use of pesticides to fend off crop-destroying insects, nitrogen fertilizer to increase plant growth and food yields, irrigation projects to expand crop acreage, and high-yield seeds created to absorb additional nitrogen from the soil.

“In December 6 news release, Rep. Tom Lathan (R-IA) referred to Borlaug as “an American superhero,” noting, “Dr. Borlaug’s work and leadership gave the world’s poorest people access to food, ensuring that children who would have been victims of malnutrition could thrive.”

Sen. Tom Harkin (D-IA), in a separate December 6 news release, said, “It is fitting that we honor this man who has done so much to alleviate hunger and human suffering, improve the quality of life surrounding the globe, and promote understanding of peace among all of the world’s people.”

Spreading the Green Revolution

In 1944 Borlaug began working for a research project in Mexico aiming to increase wheat production. The project was a joint effort of the Mexican Ministry of Agriculture and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Borlaug continued with that project until 1960. It was during his time in Mexico that he “made his breakthrough achievement in developing a strain of wheat that could exponentially increase yields while actively resisting disease.”

During the 1960s and 1970s, Borlaug worked in a variety of capacities to improve food production. From 1960 to 1963 he worked with the Inter-American Food Crop Program, and from 1964 to 1982 he worked with the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center, based in Mexico.

During that time he also was a consultant to the United Nations’ Food and Agriculture Organization in North Africa and Asia. He also served as a consultant to many governments in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

The Congressional Award cited in particular his work in Mexico, Pakistan, India, and the Middle East.

“Dr. Borlaug’s work and leadership gave the world’s poorest people access to food, ensuring that children who would have been victims of malnutrition could thrive.”

TOM LATHAN
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE - IOWA

Continuing the Green Revolution

Now in his early nineties, Borlaug has continued his education at Minnesota, earning a master’s degree and Ph.D. in plant pathology.

Borlaug put his education to work as a microbiologist for the DuPont company from 1942 to 1944.

Dr. Norman E. Borlaug (right), winner of the 1970 Nobel Peace Prize and often referred to as the “Father of the Green Revolution,” received the Congressional Gold Medal on December 6, 2006. He is shown here with Dr. Roger Beachy, president of the Donald Danforth Plant Science Centers, in February 2006, when he received the Danforth Award for Plant Science in recognition of his life-long commitment to increasing global agricultural production through plant science. During a career spanning more than four decades, Borlaug has received hundreds of science awards and 50 honorary doctorate degrees.

Numerous Prestigious Awards

Borlaug has been honored hundreds of times during the past 40 years for helping to usher in the Green Revolution. His most famous recognition was the Nobel Peace Prize, awarded to him in 1970.

He has received 50 honorary doctorates from leading colleges and universities around the world. Agricultural organizations, such as the Bangladesh Botanical Society and American Society of Agronomy, and science organizations, such as the American Chemical Society and National Academy of Sciences, have given him many awards. He is a member or honorary member of many national academies of science.

Farm Background

Borlaug was born March 25, 1914 in Cresco, Iowa and was raised on a family farm.

He worked for the U.S. Forest Service from 1935 to 1938, and during that time earned a bachelor’s degree in forestry from the University of Minnesota. He continued his education at Minnesota, earning a master’s degree and Ph.D. in plant pathology.

Michael Coulter (mlcoulter@gcc.edu) teaches political science at Grove City College.
By Patrick J. Michaels

What’s behind the shameless demagoguery and character assassination being heaped on climate change “deniers”? What’s behind the chilling calls for “Nuremberg trials” for dissenting scientists? Why has the Green rhetoric escalated to lynch-mob proportions?

“History is repetitious. Most of the people being shouted down aren’t even guilty as charged. Almost every scientist I know will tell you that the planet is warmer than it was a few decades ago, and that the burning of fossil fuel has contributed to the warming of recent decades.

“The Guardian”

British writer George Monbiot is even more severe. “[E]very time someone dies as a result of floods in Bangladesh, an airline executive should be dragged out of his office and drowned,” he was quoted in The Guardian as saying, on December 5, 2006.

Agreement on Facts

History is repetitious. Most of the people being shouted down aren’t even guilty as charged. Almost every scientist I know will tell you that the planet is warmer than it was a few decades ago, and that the burning of fossil fuel has contributed to the warming of recent decades.

What Explains the Increasing Fury of Global Warming Alarmists?

It’s easy to show that the warming of the last three decades presages a very modest warming for the technologically foreseeable future, and that no policy will do anything to alter the warming trajectory we are on enough to measure its effect in a lifetime.

“Billions of taxpayer dollars have been spent developing a host of computer models to study how climate changes as carbon dioxide concentrations increase. Different models produce different rates of warming. But in ensemble, the models have an interesting behavior: They indicate that indeed it has been constant since 1976. And once human warming is established by increasing greenhouse gases, the warming tends to take place at a constant rate.

“As there is a “wisdom of crowds,” there is also a “wisdom of models.” It’s been known for years that a collection of weather forecasting models tends to do better over time than any individual model. The same should apply to climate models, and to their collective behavior, which is a constant-rate warming.

“Modest Warming

So all one has to do is establish a greenhouse warming, and then demonstrate that indeed it has been constant since it started in the mid-1970s (which it has been, at 0.18 degrees Centigrade per decade), and you know the rate of future warming.

Unless, of course, all that modeling work is just dead wrong. And that’s the truth that has people so exercised.

In fact, the merging of observed and modeled warming forces the conclusion that twenty-first century warming will be near the low end of a much larger range (from 1.4 to 5.8 degrees Centigrade per decade) projected by the United Nations in its 2001 compendium on climate change.

Simple Adaptation

Then there’s the problem of what to do about this warming. In fact, we have been doing something all along: adapting to it. Consider what’s going on in North American cities. They warm up, with or without global warming, thanks to all their concrete and blacktop. As cities have warmed in recent decades, heat-related mortality has dropped significantly. Why? Because heat waves became common, and people learned how to live with them.

“Futile ‘Solutions’

Nor will such technology exist for the foreseeable future. Sure, governments can “encourage” us to buy hybrid cars. But the beaters we trade in simply move down the economic chain. Net emissions actually rise.

There also isn’t any viable legal instrument that will significantly alter the rate of warming. The Kyoto Protocol, which is pretty much moribund, would reduce surface warming by 0.07 degrees Centigrade every 50 years, an amount too small to measure.

Kyoto failed because, by and large, no nation could meet its modest emission reduction targets.

That’s what’s being denied by those who call everyone they disagree with “deniers.”

Real Deniers

Here are the hard facts: Unless you stipulate that the behavior of all those climate models is wrong, you are forced to conclude that future warming will be modest and there really isn’t anything you can do about it.

Anyone who refuses to acknowledge this is in denial—which, of course, explains the frustration and hyperbole of the mob, now calling for assault and murder.

Where, incidentally, is the outrage?
Economists See No Reason for Climate Change Alarm: Survey

By Robert Whaples

What long-term impact is global climate change likely to have on the economy? To answer this question (and a slew of others), I polled Ph.D. economists, randomly selected from the ranks of the American Economic Association.

Like almost everyone else, economists must, essentially, take on faith predictions and calculations by scientists about the impact of greenhouse gases on the environment. They realize such predictions are based on complicated models and tentative scenarios, informed by self-interest.

But they have been trained to understand what makes the economy hum and to think through how people will respond to changing conditions of all kinds.

“What long-term impact is global climate change likely to have on the economy? To answer this question ... I polled Ph.D. economists, randomly selected from the ranks of the American Economic Association.”

Variety of Choices
Specifically, I asked this challenging question:

“In comparison to a world in which greenhouse gas (GHG) levels were stable, rising levels of greenhouse gases by the end of the twenty-first century will cause GDP per capita in the U.S. to be (a) more than 10 percent lower, (b) about 5 to 10 percent lower, (c) about 1 to 5 percent lower, (d) less than 1 percent lower or higher, (e) about 1 to 5 percent higher, or (f) more than 5 percent higher.” (Remember that GDP—gross domestic product—equals the value of all final goods and services produced in the economy or equivalently the level of aggregate income.)

A couple of these choices may seem odd to the lay person, since few media accounts hold out the prospect that any global warming and other climate changes could be beneficial to our standard of living.

However, some economists credit this possibility—pointing to the fertilization effect of higher carbon dioxide levels on plant growth and the amenity value of warmer weather, for example.

Definite Lack of Alarm
The results show most economists are not alarmed by the likelihood of continued carbon dioxide emissions.

The Great Depression of 1929 to 1933 caused inflation-adjusted GDP to fall a numbing 27 percent. Few economists think rising GHGs will have anywhere near this impact—only one in eight predict GDP will fall by more than 10 percent.

Almost twice as many believe rising greenhouse gas levels will cause the economy to grow.

The most popular response is that rising greenhouse gas levels will have virtually no impact on income per person (less than 1 percent lower or higher). The vast majority (73.2 percent) predict the impact will be less than 5 percent one way or the other.

Minimal Expected Effect
Here are the complete responses:

(a) more than 10 percent lower = 12.5%;
(b) about 5 to 10 percent lower = 7.1%;
(c) about 1 to 5 percent lower = 21.4%;
(d) less than 1 percent lower or higher = 35.7%;
(e) about 1 to 5 percent higher = 16.1%;
(f) more than 5 percent higher = 7.1%.

Assuming that “more than 10” = 15, “more than 5” = 10, and taking the midpoint of the other intervals, this averages to -1.86 percent. Since the end of World War II, inflation-adjusted GDP has risen by about 2 percent per year on average.

Thus, the collective wisdom of these economists is that greenhouse gas emissions will shave about one year of economic growth off the economy over the next century.

Flexible Adaptation
Why do economists generally conclude the economic impact of climate change is likely to be small, not large? The growing literature on this topic suggests most parts of the economy are not very vulnerable to climate change. Just as importantly, parts of the economy that might be negatively impacted are pretty flexible and adaptable to change.

If climate does change, crops can be modified, different crops can be planted, and crops can be planted in different places, for example. If sea levels rise, we have the ability and resources to build protective structures or, in a worst-case scenario, simply move to higher ground.

Thus, while potential climate changes might be devastating to parts of the environment, most economists don’t think it will affect our economic standard of living much, one way or the other.

Recent history has shown economists that the primary cause of economic growth is technological improvement. Climate change cannot stanch the global torrent of new discoveries, processes, and products.

“The Great Depression of 1929 to 1933 caused inflation-adjusted GDP to fall a numbing 27 percent. Few economists think rising GHGs will have anywhere near this impact—only one in eight predict GDP will fall by more than 10 percent.”

Human ingenuity is the ultimate resource ... and as far as most economists are concerned, rising greenhouse gas levels cannot imperil this.

Robert Whaples (whaples@wfu.edu) is chair of the Department of Economics at Wake Forest University. This article was first published on the Tech Central Station Web site (http://www.techcentralstation.com) and draws on his article, “Do Economists Agree on Anything? Yes,” in The Economists’ Voice 3 (9), November 2006. Reprinted with permission.
Global Satellite Temperatures

DECEMBER 2006

The global average temperature (top) for December was 0.31°C above normal. The Northern Hemisphere's temperature (middle) was 0.49°C above normal. The Southern Hemisphere's temperature (third) was 0.11°C above normal.

Global Satellite Temperatures

IS THIS GLOBAL WARMING?

Each month, Environment & Climate News updates the global averaged satellite measurements of the Earth's temperature. These numbers are important because they are real—not projections, forecasts, or guesses. Global satellite measurements are made from a series of orbiting platforms that sense the average temperature in various atmospheric layers. Here, we present the lowest level, which climate models say should be warming. The satellite measurements are considered accurate to within 0.01°C. The data used to create these graphs can be found on the Internet at http://vortex.nsstc.uah.edu/public/msu/t2lt/tltglhmam_5.2.

GLOBAL AVERAGE

NORTHERN HEMISPHERE

SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE

219,000 years of Temperature Variation


Careful Review of Science Refutes Global Warming Myths

Review of Unstopable Global Warming Every 1500 Years
By S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery
Rowman & Littlefield, 2006
260 pages, $24.95, ISBN 0742551172

With their new book, Unstopable Global Warming Every 1500 Years, S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery skewer all the misinformation that has been used for so long in an attempt to convince society that mankind is the root cause of all global climate change.

The book is truly amazing! It meticulously supports, with hundreds of detailed, published references, the clear facts and conclusions that the Earth's climate has been traveling a well-defined rollercoaster path of temperature change for at least 900,000 years.

Everyone reading this review should buy two copies of the book, keeping one in plain view at their home or office while sending one to a friend or government official who may be called upon to make a decision regarding CO2 emissions into our atmosphere.

An Inconvenient Antidote

In almost a point-by-point refutation of Al Gore’s unsupportable rant that “the debate is over; man is warming the Earth,” Singer and Avery explain technically but lucidly why nearly every cherry-picked fact in Gore’s movie “An Inconvenient Truth” is contradicted by science, which weighs heavily in favor of a very different truth: Man is in fact all but irrelevant to global climate, as the sun and its accompanying solar system rule.

Anthropogenic (human-caused) global warming has been the scrouge du jour of the collectivist environmental movement, socialist countries, and academic money launderers for nearly a decade now. Unlike the past Y2K scare, ozone elimination, and avian flu, efforts to combat global warming will have long-term, serious, negative impacts on the citizens of the world, whose quality of life, especially in the poorest nations, will be disastrously worsened.

If we gave up high-yield farming, as many global warming alarmists desire, we would need to clear all the world’s forests to sustain our current food demands, and thus eliminate about half of the world’s wildlife.

“S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery skewer all the misinformation that has been used for so long in an attempt to convince society that mankind is the root cause of all global climate change.”

Singer and Avery explain how the ratio of two isotopes of oxygen allows us to date the age in which air bubbles were trapped in ice, and that with almost a million years of ice cores we can readily tell that periodic warming of the Earth has occurred persistently almost every 1,500 years.

That obviously does not square with efforts to get us to reduce our use of cars, air conditioners, and fertilizer in order to reduce carbon in our atmosphere. Technological advances have increased our life expectancy by 30 years during the past century, but now we are being asked to give much of it up and return to organic farming, which was able to support only 1.5 billion people 100 years ago.

This brings up a key question: Do environmental zealots really care about the environment, or do they simply hate life, especially in the poorest nations, thus eliminating efforts to get us to reduce our use of cars, air conditioners, and fertilizer in order to reduce carbon in our atmosphere. Technological advances have increased our life expectancy by 30 years during the past century, but now we are being asked to give much of it up and return to organic farming, which was able to support only 1.5 billion people 100 years ago.

The book is truly amazing! It meticulously supports, with hundreds of detailed, published references, the clear facts and conclusions that the Earth's climate has been traveling a well-defined rollercoaster path of temperature change for at least 900,000 years.

Everyone reading this review should buy two copies of the book, keeping one in plain view at their home or office while sending one to a friend or government official who may be called upon to make a decision regarding CO2 emissions into our atmosphere.

An Inconvenient Antidote

In almost a point-by-point refutation of Al Gore’s unsupportable rant that “the debate is over; man is warming the Earth,” Singer and Avery explain technically but lucidly why nearly every cherry-picked fact in Gore’s movie “An Inconvenient Truth” is contradicted by science, which weighs heavily in favor of a very different truth: Man is in fact all but irrelevant to global climate, as the sun and its accompanying solar system rule.

Anthropogenic (human-caused) global warming has been the scrouge du jour of the collectivist environmental movement, socialist countries, and academic money launderers for nearly a decade now. Unlike the past Y2K scare, ozone elimination, and avian flu, efforts to combat global warming will have long-term, serious, negative impacts on the citizens of the world, whose quality of life, especially in the poorest nations, will be disastrously worsened.

It will not be possible to read Unstopable Global Warming without being convinced a sham is being perpetrated on society. Even a 30-minute perusal of the text will impress the average unbrainwashed person that despite Gore’s beautiful pictures of heaving ice flows in both his movie and book, man is not the culprit behind climate change. Singer and Avery’s well-chosen book title alone should give the thinking person pause.

Data in Ice Cores

In the opening chapter, “Is Humanity Losing the Global Warming Debate?” Singer and Avery document the exhaus-
tive data search they performed to confirm conclusively the existence of a 1,500-year warming cycle. They grappled with the 100,000-year elliptical cycle of the Earth’s orbit, the 41,000-year axial tilt cycle of the Earth, and the 25,000-year precessing or wobble cycle.

In addition to those cycles, they thoroughly document the most influential cycle of all: the 1,500-year solar cycle that drives most of the Earth’s climate cycle.

The authors shatter the greenhouse gas theory, making it clear humanity’s modest addition to the atmosphere’s small amount of carbon dioxide does not add up to a significant alteration in temperature.

In obliterating the Kyoto Protocol as a construct to change anything, the authors uncover a suppressed report from the federal government of Canada, which concluded that country’s expenditure of $500 million to reduce greenhouse gases was “largely wasted, producing neither a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions nor the development of new, cleaner technologies.”

Scaremongering Exposed
With merciless precision and incontrovertible scientific proof, Singer and Avery show mankind need not fear there will be sea level surges, devastating floods, the mass extinction of species, famine, drought, barren soil, more frequent and fierce storms, death by warming, and then an eventual sharp turn to killer cold.

“The GCMs are three-dimensional models that have sent temperatures much higher and much lower than today’s temperatures. Scaremongering Exposed

Ulterior Motives Unmasked
Singer and Avery reveal the best imaginable view of global warming alarmists’ true objectives when they explain what the Greens want is “to end or severely restrict the use of fossil fuels.”

“Human food production today depends far more on farming technology than on modest climate changes,” the authors note. “We are no more doomed to famine by the Modern Warming than we are doomed to malaria in the era of pesticides and window screens. In fact, the food abundance the world has increasingly enjoyed since the eighteenth century is primarily due to scientific and technological advances.”

Dramatic Weather Events
Along the same lines, Singer and Avery look at history and confirm that the frequency and intensity of hurricanes, droughts, thunderstorms, hail, and tornadoes have not increased in recent years.

They point out, for example, that John Cherry, type of weather at Huntsville, in testimony before Congress, “noted that the most significant droughts in the Southwestern United States occurred more than four hundred years ago, before 1600. He stated that before 1850, America’s Great Plains were called ‘the Great American Desert,’ and experts at the time said the region couldn’t be farmed. Weather just seems unusual and dangerous these days, said Cherry, because of the increased media coverage of major storms.”

Computer Models Flaws
The authors explain a subject few of us really understand—the global warming computer models that are used to scare the public on a daily basis. They are properly called Global Circulation Models, or GCMs, and they are the megastars of today’s climate and environmental research. Unstoppable Global Warming is worth owning if just for chapter 11, which explains the limitations of GCMs quite clearly for folks without a deep scientific background.

Here is a sample:

“The GCMs are three-dimensional computer models that attempt to pull together and project into the future all major causes of climate change—jet streams in the upper atmosphere; deep ocean currents; solar radiation reflected back to space by ice sheets and glaciers; changes in vegetation; naturally changing greenhouse gas levels; eddies in the ocean that transfer heat laterally; number, type, and altitude of clouds in the skies; variations in radiant energy coming from the sun; plus hundreds of other factors.”

“Singer and Avery explain technically but lucidly why nearly every cherry-picked fact in Gore’s movie ‘An Inconvenient Truth’ is contradicted by science ...”

Warming Benefits the Biosphere
In addition to disassembling the absurd scenarios of the anti-human zealots, the authors calmly present the logistical lessons from history that provide so much cause for optimism. A case in point:

“Human food production historically has prospered during global warmings. ... Warming climates provide more of the things plants love: sunlight, rainfall, and longer growing seasons. During warmings there are less of the things plants hate: late spring frosts and early fall frosts that shorten the growing seasons, and hail storms that destroy fields of crops,” Singer and Avery observe.

“Human food production today depends far more on farming technology than on modest climate changes,” the authors note. “We are no more doomed to famine by the Modern Warming than we are doomed to malaria in the era of pesticides and window screens. In fact, the food abundance the world has increasingly enjoyed since the eighteenth century is primarily due to scientific and technological advances.”

“Human food production today depends far more on farming technology than on modest climate changes,” the authors note. “We are no more doomed to famine by the Modern Warming than we are doomed to malaria in the era of pesticides and window screens. In fact, the food abundance the world has increasingly enjoyed since the eighteenth century is primarily due to scientific and technological advances.”
Polar Bears

Continued from page 1

Global Warming Blamed

While acknowledging polar bear populations are not currently in decline, Kempthorne stated in a news release, “we are concerned that the polar bears’ habitat may literally be melting.” If the bear is listed as threatened, it will be the first time a species was placed on the Endangered Species list based on the threat of global warming.

Greenpeace and the Natural Resources Defense Council had previously sued the Bush administration, attempting to force it to list the species at threatened.

Environmental activist groups have offered anecdotal evidence that four polar bears drowned while swimming in Alaska’s Beaufort Sea, and that three polar bears attacked and ate other polar bears, allegedly due to hunger.

In addition, environmentalists contend human activities are causing global warming and that such warming will melt most of the ice at the North Pole within 50 years. If that happens, they argue, polar bears will be unable to hunt seals, their preferred prey, without the polar ice.

Populations Are Growing

Environmental activists have presented only one academic study that shows any negative effect of warming temperatures on polar bears. That study examined only one population of polar bears, in Canada’s Western Hudson Bay, and linked the early breakup of ice in the bay to a 21 percent decline in the polar bear population.

Other, more comprehensive research suggests the plight of that one population does not reflect the polar bear population trend as a whole.

Since the 1970s, while much of the world was warming, polar bear numbers increased dramatically, from roughly 5,000 to 25,000 bears, a higher polar bear population than has existed at any time in the twentieth century. Scientists believe polar bears thrived in the past in temperatures even warmer than at present—during the medieval warm period 1,000 years ago and during the Holocene Climate Optimum between 5,000 and 9,000 years ago.

Thrive During Warm Times

Polar bears have thrived during warmer climates because they are omnivores, like their cousins the brown and black bears. Though polar bear eat eats seals more than any other food source, research shows they have a varied diet. When other foods are available—including fish, kelp, caribou, ducks, sea birds, musk ox, and walrus carcasses—they take advantage of it.

Dr. Mitchell Taylor, a biologist with Nunavut Territorial government in Canada, pointed out in testimony to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that modern warming may be beneficial to bears since it creates better habitat for seals and would dramatically increase growth of blueberries, upon which bears gorge themselves when available.

Taylor explained Alaska’s polar bear population is stable and recent research shows the polar bear population in Canada alone has increased 25 percent from 12,000 to 15,000 during the last decade, with 11 of Canada’s 13 polar bear populations stable or increasing in number. Where polar bear weight and numbers are declining, Taylor thinks the cause is too many bears competing for food, not Arctic warming.

“Despite healthy polar bear populations that are sustaining upwards of 20,000 bears worldwide, the Bush administration’s plan to list the polar bear as threatened under the Endangered Species Act,”

Climate scientist David Legates said shrinking Arctic sea ice may be a temporary, local phenomenon not linked to global warming, especially as the polar ice sheets in Greenland and Antarctica are not in decline.

“Russian coastal-station records of both the extent of sea ice and the thickness of fast ice (ice fixed to the shoreline or seafloor) extending back 125 years show significant variability over 60- to 80-year periods,” said Legates.

Enviro Group Refutes Alarmism

The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) has written on the threats allegedly posed to polar bears from global warming. According to the WWF, there are approximately 22,000 polar bears in 20 distinct populations worldwide. Only two bear populations—accounting for about 16.4 percent of the total number of bears—are decreasing, and they are in areas where air temperatures have actually fallen, such as the Baffin Bay region.

By contrast, another two populations—about 13.6 percent of the total number—are growing, and they live in areas where air temperatures have risen, near the Bering Strait and the Chukchi Sea.

As for the rest, 10 populations representing about 45.4 percent of the total number of bears are stable, and the status of the remaining six populations is unknown.

Ulterior Motives

Many analysts see the proposal to list the polar bear as threatened as not so much about the welfare of the bears themselves but as an effort to force the Bush administration to adopt regulations to limit greenhouse gas emissions.

Steven Milloy, publisher of JunkScience.com and an adjunct scholar with the National Center for Policy Analysis, said the media attention at the Kempthorne news conference did not revolve around whether the bears were actually at risk, but rather whether the announcement meant “the Bush administration was caving on global warming.”

Milloy noted, “If the administration admits that the bear is dying due to climate change, it may be forced to start energy rationing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in order to comply with the Endangered Species Act. This is what the environmentalists filing the lawsuit had in mind all along.”

H. Sterling Burnett (sterling.burnett@ncpa.org) is a senior fellow with the National Center for Policy Analysis.

Is the Pursuit of Energy Independence an Illusion?

For more than 30 years, America has heard repeated calls for energy independence. The George C. Marshall Institute has released a report which explains why the rhetoric and illusion of energy independence is inconsistent with economic, technical and political realities.

The Illusion of U.S. Energy Independence: An Assessment of the Current State of Energy Use examines current energy independence proposals that focus on drastically reducing oil use. Since oil is primarily for transportation, these proposals would limit mobility and ration energy use. Even with efficiency gains from current technology improvements, these efforts would have a disproportionate impact on groups that can least afford the increased costs, such as the poor and the elderly.

“A more secure energy future must be built on objective realities,” the report concludes. “Illusions breed frustration and waste resources.”


The George C. Marshall Institute, a non-profit research group founded in 1984, is dedicated to fostering and preserving the integrity of science in the policy process. The Institute conducts technical assessments of scientific developments with a major impact on public policy and communicates the results of its analyses to the press, Congress and the public (www.marshall.org).
Is Oil the Root of All Evil?

Review by Thomas Tanton

Mark Twain popularized the statement, “There are three kinds of lies: lies, damn lies, and statistics.” Lives per Gallon does an excellent job of proving that thesis. It is a book written for conspiracy theorists and paranoid pessimists who look for confirmation of their worldview.

Blaming Oil for Everything

When word got out that Terry Tamminen, California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger’s (R) friend and advisor, was writing a book encouraging state and local governments to lodge nuisance lawsuits against oil companies for degrading the environment, rational thinkers became nervous. Here was a senior official close to the Republican governor with a controversial friend and advisor, was writing a book.

Progress Ignored

Tamminen essentially ignores our nation’s ever-improving air quality, mentioning it in only a single sentence in the book. But what makes air quality improvements so extraordinary, dynamic, and deserving of more space in Tamminen’s book is that the improvements occurred along with increasing motor vehicle use, energy use, and economic growth.

For example, during the 1980-2005 time period—when automobile miles driven each year nearly doubled (93 percent) and national energy use similarly expanded—every measure of air pollution improved by 20 to 40 percent. Tamminen ignores that while placing blame for increased childhood asthma on petroleum-caused air pollution, Tamminen echoes claims by regulators and activists that low-level air pollution kills thousands of people each year, but the research evidence shows this claim is implausible. While the incidence of asthma has nearly doubled in the past 25 years, air pollution cannot be the cause, since air pollution of all kinds declined at the same time. Emergency room visits and hospitalizations for asthma are lowest during July and August, when ozone levels are at their highest.

Technological Advances

While single-mindedly attempting to blame petroleum for virtually every scourge that afflicts the planet, Lives per Gallon similarly loses touch with reality regarding the solutions posed. While every “alternative” has its environmental and economic costs, they are promoted by Tamminen with the same level of zeal as petroleum is denigrated. "Lives per Gallon ... is a book written for conspiracy theorists and paranoid pessimists who look for confirmation of their worldview.”

Overall, Lives per Gallon provides numerous isolated examples of bad situations and tries to connect each and every one of them to the world oil market. The tenuous nature of that connection is never made in an integrated fashion, but is a hodgepodge of factoids. This is like trying to explain the Amazonian rainforest by showing a few pictures of individual trees standing alone.

Oh, and that breathing mask that came with the book? At first, I thought it was supposed to represent some evidence Tamminen might have of declining air quality ... but it’s actually a statement on the quality of the book.

Thomas Tanton (ttanton@fastkat.com) is vice president for the Institute for Energy Research.

Lives per Gallon
By Terry Tamminen
Is Oil the Root of All Evil?

210 pages, $24.95, ISBN 1597261017 (comes with breathing mask)

---
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"Path-breaking ... A must read for everyone interested in how the Constitution is supposed to protect individual liberties.” — Randy Barnett
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Alar: The Great Apple Scare

By Jay Lehr and Sam Aldrich

This article is the ninth in a continuing series excerpted from the book Smoke or Steam: A Guide to Environmental, Regulatory, and Food Safety Concerns, by Samuel Aldrich, excerpted and abridged by Jay Lehr.

Against a background of a skull and crossbones, overlaid on a red apple, the late Ed Bradley appearing on CBS TV’s “60 Minutes” on February 26, 1989 said:

“The most potent cancer-causing agent in our food supply is a substance sprayed on apples to keep them on the trees longer and make them look better. That’s the conclusion of a number of scientific experts, and who is most at risk? Children who may someday develop cancer.”

Almost overnight the Alar story seemed to be everywhere: Phil Donahue, the Today Show, Women’s Day, CNN, The MacNeil/Lehrer Report, the Washington Post, the New York Times, etc. Actress Meryl Streep announced on TV the formation of Mothers and Others for Pesticide Action and make them look better. That’s the conclusion of a number of scientific experts, and who is most at risk? Children who may someday develop cancer.”

Almost overnight the Alar story seemed to be everywhere: Phil Donahue, the Today Show, Women’s Day, CNN, The MacNeil/Lehrer Report, the Washington Post, the New York Times, etc. Actress Meryl Streep announced on TV the formation of Mothers and Others for Pesticide Action, and cast needless doubt on the safety of Alar, especially for children, and asked EPA to declare Alar an “imminent hazard,” which would have allowed banning it at once.

The NRDC claimed to have scientific evidence showing Alar might cause cancer. The alleged evidence, however, was never published where it could be reviewed by qualified scientists.

EPA set up a “special review” panel—rejection of the NRDC results just three weeks before the 60 Minutes program.

The Scientific Advisory Panel for EPA concluded NRDC’s “evidence” was flawed and rejected it because it did not conform to standards of research and review established by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In April 1989, Science magazine condemned the NRDC report.

CBS Ignored Evidence

Alar had in fact been eliminated in baby food three years earlier by Gerber, Heinz, and Beech Nut, and other companies eliminated the use of Alar in other products soon afterwards—because of unfavorable publicity, not because of any safety hazard.

Despite this, according to Reed Irvine of Accuracy in Media, the NRDC arranged with CBS to air its report, “Intolerable Risk: Pesticides in our Children’s Food,” on 60 Minutes.

In the book Fear of Food (Free Enterprise Press, 1990), Andrea Arfsten characterized NRDC’s Alar scare as “a deliberately misleading environmentalist fund-raising campaign.”

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on the border of hysteria called the U.S. suffered substantial financial loss, and South Koreans were denied a healthful food, all because of a false scare. The NRDC claimed to have scientific evidence showing Alar might cause cancer. The alleged evidence, however, was never published where it could be reviewed by qualified scientists.

NRDC’s Alar scare, few recognize the malevolent intentions of the groups involved. Thus, similar unjustified scare campaigns are likely to be repeated.
Lead Paint

Continued from page 1

ities from using public nuisance laws to force companies that once manufactured lead-based paint to pay for paint removal and replacement in older buildings. The legislation also caps non-economic damages for private citizens seeking damages from paint companies.

The federal government outlawed the use of lead in paint in 1978, citing health concerns related to the ingestion or inhalation of lead paint chips. The paint industry had on its own initiative taken lead out of paint in 1955, responding to similar concerns. Companies such as Sherwin Williams stopped using lead-based paint as far back as the 1930s.

“The issue is upkeep and maintenance by landlords, not companies or successors of companies that haven’t manufactured lead paint in more than 40 years.”

Two Legal Avenues

Nevertheless, owners and occupants of older buildings across the nation have attempted to sue paint companies for removal and replacement costs related to lead paint and have also sought non-economic damages.

The Ohio Consumer Sales Practices Act (CSPA), which allows consumers to receive three times their economic and non-economic damages if they show they were harmed by deceptive or unfair trade practices, currently is the law under which plaintiffs most frequently sue paint companies. Plaintiffs’ attorneys have argued in court, with mixed success, that paint companies were aware of health concerns related to lead-based paint before they stopped using it, and that companies should currently be held liable for paint work done more than 50 years ago.

Additionally, various cities and towns have attempted to use public nuisance laws to force paint companies to remove and replace lead-based paint and pay for public information campaigns.

Legislation Limits Liability

In response to recent lawsuits, the Ohio legislature in December 2006 approved Senate Bill 117, which would prohibit local governments or private entities from using public nuisance laws to force prior manufacturers of lead paint to pay for paint removal.

The bill also would put a $5,000 cap on non-economic damages plaintiffs could obtain against lead paint manufacturers under the CSPA.

Approved, Then Vetoed

Generally supportive of S.B. 117 but believing the cap on CSPA non-economic damages should be higher, Taft decided not to sign the bill but to let it become law without his signature. Taft calculated that his 10-day window to veto the bill ended on Friday, January 5, his last day in office.

On the afternoon of January 5, Taft sent the bill to his secretary of state to sign. Outgoing Secretary of State J. Kenneth Blackwell (R) signed the bill, and Taft assumed it had become law.

“Incoming Ohio Gov. Ted Strickland (D) has sparked a potential constitutional showdown by vetoing a lead paint bill outgoing Gov. Bob Taft (R) thought he had already approved.”

On Monday, January 8, however, Strickland had his incoming secretary of state, Jennifer Brunner, return the bill to him, and he promptly vetoed it.

Strickland justified his action by asserting that Sundays should not be counted in the 10-day period to veto legislation. Strickland also argued the actions taken by Taft and Blackwell did not have the effect of officially turning the bill into law.

Legal Action Threatened

In response to Strickland’s veto, House Speaker Jon Husted (R-Kettering) and Senate President Bill Harris (R-Ashland), both Republicans, have accepted the offer of incoming Attorney General Marc Dann, a Democrat who plans to support Strickland’s veto, to appoint an independent counsel to assist the legislature in determining whether and how to challenge the veto.

“From our conversations with the governor’s office, they believed that he [Taft] took an action,” explained Senate Chief of Staff Matt Schuler. “It was a choice he made to allow it to become law without his signature. He sent it to the secretary of state, and Ken Blackwell signed it.”

Local Backlash

Many in Ohio see Strickland’s move as an unfair attempt to score political points by punishing paint companies.

“The issue is upkeep and maintenance by landlords, not companies or successors of companies that haven’t manufactured lead paint in more than 40 years,” noted a house editorial in the January 11 Coshocton [Ohio] Tribune. “Cities’ suing paint companies make[s] about as much sense as suing Jim Beam for making the bourbon found in the blood of the drunken driver who caused an accident.”

The editorial added, “Cities can better spend their time and resources by cracking down on landlords who are negligent when they let their properties deteriorate and endanger residents. Paint companies have no control over the actions of non-responsive landlords.”

“Senate Bill 117 … would prohibit local governments or private entities from using public nuisance laws to force prior manufacturers of lead paint to pay for lead paint removal.”

No Health Danger

“No even the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency expresses much alarm about risks of childhood exposure from the mere presence of intact lead paint,” said Maureen Martin, senior fellow for legal affairs at The Heartland Institute.

“There are relatively simple and inexpensive methods available to homeowners and landlords to keep lead paint intact or to fix it if it deteriorates,” Martin noted. “So unless there is reason to suspect deteriorated lead-based paint is present in Akron houses and apartments, such inspections might not even be legal. They certainly are not necessary.”

James M. Taylor (Taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
GM Introduces High-Performance Electric Concept Car

By James M. Taylor

Placing itself in strong position to take advantage of the post-gasoline automobile age that it believes is just around the corner, General Motors has unveiled a high-performance electric car that it anticipates will be ready for production within two or three years.

Most Trips on Battery

Company officials unveiled the Chevy Volt sports sedan, featuring a rechargeable plug-in battery and the ability to run on ethanol blends up to E-85, at the January Detroit Auto Show.

Unlike current hybrids that run primarily on gasoline but utilize battery power whenever feasible, the Volt will run for its first 40 miles of each drive exclusively on battery power, and will then use gasoline or ethanol blends to recharge the battery on the fly.

When unveiling the Volt, GM cited research showing 78 percent of U.S. commuters drive 40 miles or less to and from work, enabling them to make a gasoline-free commute.

“If you lived within 30 miles from work—60 miles round trip—and charged your vehicle every night when you came home or during the day at work, you would get 150 miles per gallon,” GM Chairman Robert Lutz said in a January 17 news release. “More than half of all Americans live within 20 miles of where they work: a 40-mile round trip. In that case, you might never burn a drop of gas in the life of the car.”

Can Use Alternate Fuels

Another innovative feature of the Volt is its compatibility with various fuel sources. Its internal combustion engine will be able to run on gasoline or up to 85 percent ethanol blends. It is also designed to convert easily to biodiesel or hydrogen fuel and when those fuel sources become commercially viable.

GM anticipates a day in the not-too-distant future when the Volt will run completely free of gasoline, regardless of the length of a given trip.

Not wanting to produce a mere concept car or one that cannot meet the needs of a typical American family, GM designed the Volt to seat four or five passengers. It can accelerate from zero to 60 mph in 8.5 seconds.

“One of the key things is its nimbleness,” Lutz said. “It’s a small electric car, but it’s a high-performance electric car.”

Battery Tech Last Obstacle

The initial production schedule for the Volt will be ready for production within two or three years.

“General Motors has unveiled a high-performance electric car that it anticipates will be ready for production within two or three years.”

City Balked at Bill

Bill Abolt, commissioner of Chicago’s Department of the Environment, promised in 2002 that his city government would buy 50 megawatts of renewable power by 2006, the end of the year showed Chicago Mayor Richard Daley (D) could not fulfill his pledge …

City Balked at Bill

Bill Abolt, commissioner of Chicago’s Department of the Environment, promised in 2002 that the city would meet its 20 percent commitment by the end of 2006.

Abolt said in an interview with Conscious Choice, “Some of it will come from burning methane that comes off landfills. The majority will come from new wind, solar, biomass, and small scale hydro-electric generation. The biggest challenge is getting the wind online, but already ComEd has agreed to have 50 megawatts under construction this year with a commitment to sell us this wind power by the beginning of 2003.”

According to the Tribune, as recently as 2003 methane from landfills provided 10 percent of the electricity used by the city government. But the contract with ComEd to buy that energy expired in 2004, and the city did not renew it.

And when presented with the advance bill for new wind power, the city balked.

“The deal we were expecting from Chicago and the deal they offered didn’t match,” Gabriel Alonzo, spokesman for wind power producer Gamesa Corporation, told Tribune reporter Michael Hawthorne. The deal with Gamesa was to have established a commercial wind farm in Mendota Hills, about two hours west of Chicago.

Other Cities to Follow

“The lack of actual development of renewables in Chicago points once again to the disconnect between political promises and the realities of the market,” observed Tom Tanton, vice president of the Institute for Energy Research. “With most cities and other governmental agencies confined by budgetary limits, Chicago’s example of broken promises is likely to be repeated in other cities whose leaders make feel-good, but economically suicidal, renewable power pledges.”

“There is no reason for Chicago or any other city to purchase more expensive and less reliable renewable energy when these cities need power at reasonable prices,” Tanton added.

City officials did not return phone calls seeking comment.

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Michael Crichton’s book, *State of Fear* (Harper Collins, 2004, $27.95), is a surprising book. Tucked inside a lively and entertaining tale of a philanthropist, a scientist, a lawyer, and two remarkable women who travel around the world trying to foil the plots of evil-doers is a detailed expose of the flawed science and exaggerations at the base of the global warming scare. It is also a devastating critique of mainstream environmentalism today and an eloquent call for change.

Like Crichton’s previous block-busters, *The Andromeda Strain* and *Jurassic Park*, this book blends science and fiction in ways that teach as well as entertain readers. Crichton, who earned an M.D. from Harvard University and has written several nonfiction books, backs up his claims with footnotes, an appendix, and an annotated bibliography. Clearly, he wants the science in his book to be taken seriously.

Which raises the question: How much of the science in *State of Fear* is accurate, and how much is fiction?

The answer: **Michael Crichton is right!** His synthesis of the science on climate change is extremely accurate and the experts he cites are real. The Heartland Institute has been participating in the debate over climate change for more than a decade, and we have worked with many of the experts listed in the book’s bibliography. You can find more information at The Heartland Institute’s Web site, www.heartland.org, by clicking on the Crichton is Right button.

**Are you an elected official looking for innovative ideas?**

Join nearly 500 elected officials who have already joined The Heartland Institute’s Board of Legislative Advisors.

“The Heartland Institute is a treasure trove of timely information. They do a great job of getting information to you with their broad array of publications.”

**Cindy Noe, State Representative, Indiana**