By James Hoare

The United States is making more significant progress than Europe in cutting both greenhouse gas intensity and gross emissions, Kurt Volker, a European affairs analyst with the U.S. government, told German economic leaders in a February 12 speech in Berlin.

Volker, the U.S. principal deputy assistant secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs, noted greenhouse gas emissions in both regions are in decline, but that the U.S. is cutting its emissions faster. Volker credited the Bush administration’s Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) and the Kyoto Protocol for its Senate ratification in 2001. The U.S. is set to withdraw from the protocol on January 3, 2007, after the Democrats regain control of Congress in November.

The United States is meeting its Kyoto targets, but “Europe’s Kyoto targets are off the mark,” Volker said. “With the United States cutting its emissions faster, and the European Union failing to meet its targets, the United States will soon have the lowest carbon emissions in the world.”

Volker also told the economic leaders that the United States has made significant progress in reducing its oil consumption.

He noted that greenhouse gas emissions in the United States have declined 14% since 2000, while those in Europe have declined only 10%. He also noted that since the Kyoto Protocol came into effect in 2005, the United States has reduced its emissions by 2.4%, while those in the European Union have fallen by only 1.3%

Volker’s remarks in Berlin were part of a larger speech to German business leaders in which he also noted that the United States will become more competitive in the global marketplace if it continues to pursue its energy policies and if other countries do the same.
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Local Budgets Reel Under Arsenic Mandates

By James Hoare

The citizens of Middlefield, Ohio are being hammered by a staggering cost of $7,400 per household after water testing showed the community is very slightly above new, stringent federal standards regarding arsenic in water.

A flurry of late January news stories

By Michael Coulter

On February 2, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) released the Summary for Policymakers of its Fourth Assessment, even though the full report won’t be released for three months. The summary claims there is an increasing likelihood that humans are causing a warming of the climate, but it also predicts less global warming than was forecast by previous IPCC reports.

The U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, chaired by Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA), held a series of hearings on climate change in January and February. The U.S. House Science and Technology Committee, chaired by Rep. Bart Gordon (D-TN), conducted a full committee hearing on climate change on February 8, specifically addressing the release of the IPCC summary.

“Congress is holding hearings on a theory which has no evidence to support it, and ignoring the evidence that mostly all of the recent warming is part of a natural cycle that is not dangerous and is unstoppable,” said Dennis Avery, director of the Center for Global Food Issues and a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute.
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Uganda Will Use DDT to Fight Malaria

By Bonner R. Cohen

Concerned about the rising number of deaths of mosquito-borne malaria is inflicting on its citizens, the government of Uganda has approved the use of the pesticide DDT to combat the deadly disease.

Activists Rebuffed

The decision, handed down in January, marks the end of a protracted conflict that pitted public health officials, who overwhelmingly favor the use of DDT, against environmental activists and corporate agricultural exporters, who oppose it.

Frustrated by the inability of other measures to stem the dreaded disease, which kills an estimated 100,000 Ugandans each year, officials at the country’s National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) will permit DDT to be sprayed in residences, where the chemical’s unique properties irritate, repel, and poison mosquitoes while doing no harm to humans or animals.

Uganda’s decision is contingent on approval from international authorities such as the World Health Organization (WHO), the secretariat of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), and the Rotterdam Convention.

DDT Historically Successful

DDT was last used in Uganda 46 years ago by WHO. It successfully controlled the spread of malaria in Kamungu province in the western region of the country. Uganda was one of many malaria-prone countries where the use of DDT brought the killer disease to the brink of eradication.

With the help of DDT, the global malaria death rate—which had been 1,740 deaths per million in 1930—dropped more than 70 percent, to 480 per million in 1950.

Since Uganda stopped using DDT, however, malaria has ravaged the country. Government officials have decided to rebuff environmental activists and once again use it to combat malaria.

False Concerns Doom Africans

Niger Innis, spokesman for the U.S. branch of the Congress of Racial Equality, said, “Environmentalists always claim to be stakeholders. But every day that they succeed in delaying the use of DDT and other insecticides, another 3,000 to 5,000 people die from malaria. Those victims and the half billion who get this disease every year, who lie in bed shaking with convulsions, who can’t work or go to school, who end up with permanent brain damage from malaria—they are the real stakeholders. It’s their views that count.”

“Concerned about the rising number of deaths of mosquito-borne malaria is inflicting on its citizens, the government of Uganda has approved the use of the pesticide DDT to combat the deadly disease.”

Additional, regularly updated information on global climate change is available at climatesearch.com

© 2007 The Heartland Institute. Nothing in this issue of Environment & Climate News should be construed as reflecting the views of The Heartland Institute, nor as an attempt to aid or hinder the passage of any legislation.
Controversial EPA Proposal May Increase Ozone Pollution

By James M. Taylor

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is considering new rules for diesel truck engine manufacturers that may actually increase ozone levels in many cities.

EPA may require implementation of a specific technology to reduce emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NOx). Some experts say that technology may be too complicated and expensive to use.

Costly Technology

In a “guidance document” on meeting federal rules for 2010 diesel truck emissions, EPA seems prepared to require truck manufacturers to install a separate chamber in truck engines to carry a chemical called urea. When sprayed at proper ratios into a truck’s exhaust gases as they leave the engine, urea converts NOx into nitrogen.

The urea-based technology envisioned by EPA would drive up engine prices, as new designs will be required to provide room for urea chambers and allow for the precise ratio spraying of urea into engine exhaust. The new technology also would drive up operating costs for truckers, who would need to periodically refill the chambers and maintain the system in good working order.

Spokespersons for truck and engine manufacturers say continuing improvements in emissions control technologies will lead to better ways to reduce NOx emissions in the near future. EPA’s guidance document could lock the industry into one technology path that is complex, costly, and unlikely to be sustainable. That would also have the unfortunate effect of delaying better solutions.

Kill Switches

As part of the urea technology, EPA’s guidance favors a mandatory kill switch that would shut off and disable the engine if the urea chamber were to run out of the chemical. The prospect of truck engines suddenly turning off on busy freeways has raised truckers’ concerns over safety as well as manufacturers’ concerns about legal liability.

Urea freezes when temperatures fall below 11 degrees, so truckers may be stranded on remote highways—through no fault of their own—if the kill switch kicks in during cold winter nights. Urea thawing devices are currently on the drawing board, but even if they could be successfully implemented they would further drive up costs.

Another problem is assigning responsibility for providing adequate supplies of urea to truckers on the road. If the onboard urea runs out, can the driver get to—or find open—a service station or dealership to fill up with urea? EPA seems to be suggesting that engine and truck manufacturers should take responsibility for creating a national urea distribution system, something the industry says it cannot and should not have to do.

The organization of the service station industry—a combination of independent distributors, chains, and company-owned stores—makes it unlikely that an effort led by truck manufacturers to create a supply chain for urea would be either successful or expedient.

Ozone Already Declining

EPA’s proposal might make sense, despite all of these concerns, if the nation were facing a crisis of rising ozone levels. However, just the opposite is the case. Since the mid-1970s, the number of days during which ozone levels exceeded federal standards has declined by 80 to 95 percent (depending on whether one is measuring based on the new eight-hour standard or the old one-hour standard). NOx emissions from coal-fired power plants have declined roughly 60 percent since 1998. More NOx reductions from coal-fired power plants will be required under future clean air requirements.

There is growing evidence that further NOx reductions could actually slow current progress toward reducing ozone, or even cause ozone levels to increase. Ground-level ozone forms during summer months when NOx and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) react with oxygen on warm, sunny days. Researchers have shown that NOx emissions drop as much as 50 to 60 percent on weekends (due to much lower amounts of diesel vehicle traffic), but ozone levels stay the same in some cities, such as Atlanta and Cincinnati, or even spike upwards in some cities, such as Los Angeles and San Diego.

Joel Schwartz, a clean air expert with the American Enterprise Institute, notes that NOx reductions reduce ozone levels only when there is a preexisting high ratio of VOC relative to NOx in the atmosphere. At low VOC-to-NOx ratios—which is the situation in most of the U.S.—reducing NOx actually increases ozone formation.

“Over the past few decades, American metropolitan areas have been moving further into the VOC-limited regime,” Schwartz observes, explaining the higher ozone levels on weekends.

“It’s ironic, isn’t it?” observes Schwartz. “All this controversy over a requirement—very low-NOx diesel trucks—that will actually slow progress on or even worsen ozone in populated areas.”

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

Wisconsin

Continued from page 1

residents more than $1 billion, or more than $500 per household, according to state officials.

Radical Emissions Cuts Required

CAIR requires states to submit to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulatory plans designed to reduce power plant nitrogen oxide emissions by 61 percent and sulfur dioxide emissions 57 percent by 2015. The 7-0 vote by the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board affirms proposed regulations submitted by the state Department of Natural Resources.

The new regulations allow power plants that have difficulty meeting their required emission cuts to purchase emission credits from power plants that cut emissions more than required by the new regulations. This cap-and-trade approach is designed to reduce the economic costs of meeting the new standards.

“The Wisconsin Natural Resources Board has unani-
mously approved [clean air] regulations that will ... cost the state’s residents more than $1 billion, or more than $500 per household.”

Environmental activist groups had called for more stringent reductions than those required under CAIR. They also sought to eliminate emissions trading, arguing that each and every power plant should make the 61 percent and 57 percent emissions reductions, regardless of the relative costs.

No Health Benefits

Joel Schwartz, a visiting fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, said CAIR is unnecessary and overly costly. Still more stringent requirements would do more harm than good, he said.

“EPA claims CAIR will prevent thousands of premature deaths and hospital admissions each year by reducing particulate air pollution. But the particulates from power plants are in the form of ammonium sulfate and ammonium nitrate, which are non-toxic even at levels many times greater than ever occur in the air we breathe,” Schwartz explained.

“CAIR could be funny if it wasn’t so tragic,” Schwartz observed. “The Bush administration implemented CAIR in order to look pro-environment, and in the process helped environmentalists promote fake power plant pollution health scores.”

Added Schwartz, “Environmentalists and the New York Times continue to pillory President Bush anyway, claiming he has gutted the Clean Air Act and increased power plant pollution. In the end, CAIR will impose tens of billions of dollars in costs on the American people, and all they’ll have to show for it are higher electricity bills.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Bush Executive Order Aims to Reign in Excessive Regulation

By James M. Taylor

An executive order signed by President George W. Bush on January 18 will make it more difficult for federal agencies to issue policy guidances that critics have described as back-door attempts to impose regulations. Executive Order 13422 requires federal agencies to submit any proposed new policy guidance to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA), a branch of the White House’s Office of Management and Budget. Under the new rule, federal agencies will be required to demonstrate a market failure in justifying any new policy guidance. The executive order also requires agencies to provide an up-front projection of compliance costs. Unlike regulatory guidelines, policy guidances do not require any public notice or public input.

Before a federal agency can issue a regulatory guidance, which is afforded substantial deference in federal courts, it must provide public notice of the proposed regulation, offer citizens the right to submit comments on the proposed regulation, and then take citizen comments into account in making a final decision.

“An Executive Order signed by President George W. Bush on January 18 will make it more difficult for federal agencies to issue policy ‘guidances’ that critics have described as back-door attempts to impose regulations.”

Bullying Businesses

Federal agencies frequently issue guidelines to explain how they will interpret unclear provisions of laws and regulations. Businesses welcome agenda-free policy guidances that provide advance notice of how federal agencies will interpret murky legal language. However, agencies such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and Environmental Protection Agency have been criticized for issuing a multitude of policy guidances designed to bully businesses into abiding by overly restrictive interpretations of laws and regulations.

Regulatory Abuse

The executive order is “another avenue for special interests to slow down and prevent agencies from protecting the public,” Rep. Brad Miller (D-NC), chair of the House Committee on Science and Technology, said in a February 13 news release.

“Guidance documents are abused by federal regulatory agencies that use them as a substitute for regulations, often over years and even decades,” countered Maureen Martin, senior fellow for legal affairs at The Heartland Institute. “When this happens, the constitutional rights of regulated entities are violated because they do not receive notice, nor do they have the right to comment on the guidance. The guidance thus becomes law by agency stealth,” Martin said.

“Executive Order 13422 is a good start, but it falls short of the radical regulatory reforms that are needed,” Martin added. “Essentially, the order adds a layer of bureaucratic review for guidance documents. One promising aspect of EO 13422, however, is that the White House’s Office of Management and Budget will be reviewing proposed agency guidance documents to determine if they are ‘consistent with applicable law.’ We can hope this review would invalidate at the outset any specious guidance rules.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Heartland President Debunks Global Warming Myths

By Joseph L. Bast

Joseph Bast, president of The Heartland Institute, gave a summary of the current state of global warming science in a February 7 presentation to the Nebraska Farm Bureau. Bast demonstrated the current global warming scare is like prior environmental scares that were soundly debunked once sufficient scientific data were gathered on the issues.

Although global warming is a scientifically controversial topic, Bast notes, scientists agree the warming to date has been modest and that natural variability may well explain some or all of it. Premature attempts to “do something now” will cause more harm than good, particularly to American farmers, he notes.

Alarmist News Coverage

Everywhere you look, there are headlines about the coming global warming crisis. The latest news hook was a report from the United Nations claiming, “most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations.”

Most of the so-called “news” stories about this report didn’t explain that what was released wasn’t a new “study” that increases our knowledge of global warming, but just a political document written by U.N. bureaucrats—not real scientists—and edited behind closed doors, not subject to peer review, and that it was just an executive summary of one part of a three-part study that won’t even be released for another three months.

Obviously, this is not how real science is conducted or released.

Same Tune, Different Lyrics

The media, nevertheless, love reporting unsupported scare scenarios. Last April, the cover of Time magazine declared, “Be worried, be very worried.” Amid lots of scary pictures of deserts, floods, and hurricanes, it said, “Global warming is already disrupting the biological world, pushing many species to the brink of extinction and turning others into runaway pests. But the worst is yet to come.”

But should we trust Time magazine? On July 24, 1974, Time published an article titled “Another Ice Age?” that read, “…the atmosphere has been growing gradually cooler for the past three decades. The trend shows no indication of reversing. Climatological Cassandras are becoming increasingly apprehensive, for the weather aberrations they are studying may be the harbinger of another ice age.”

It’s not just Time magazine that’s unreliable on global warming. The popular press features possible crises on their front pages all the time, because bad news sells and they are in the business of selling copies of their publications and generating ad revenue, not reporting the truth about complicated subjects. As they say in the business, “if it bleeds, it leads.”

These are the same guys who told us Alar, saccharin, Red Dye #2, dioxin, a hole in the ozone layer, electric power lines, and cell phones were all causing cancer epidemics, and that Y2K would shut down the nation’s electric grid and banks.

Repeatedly Proven Wrong

They were wrong on every one of these issues. Cancer rates in the United States for the non-elderly population have been falling since 1970, and more recently for the total population including the elderly, and more recently still, even the absolute number of cancer deaths is now falling.

Somehow, the false predictions always appear in banner headlines on page 1, but the retractions appear on page 37, next to ads for septic tank pumps.

The major media will wake up eventually, and in 2010 or 2020 they will once again be trying to sell newspapers and magazines by predicting global warming crises. The latest news hook was a story from the United Nations claiming, “Be worried, be very worried.”

Scientific Disagreement

The most important thing to understand about global warming is that there is a lot of disagreement in the scientific community about what’s going on. An international survey of climate scientists conducted in 2003 by German environmental scientists Dennis Bray and Hans von Storch uncovered many interesting results. Specifically, most scientists don’t believe climate science is too unsettled to form a basis for public policy.

An even more recent survey, conducted in 2006, of members of the National Registry of Environmental Professionals, uncovered similar results.

Fully 34 percent of environmental scientists and practitioners disagree that global warming is a serious problem facing the planet. Moreover, 41 percent disagree that the planet’s recent warmth “can be, in large part, attributed to human activity.” An overwhelming 71 percent disagree that recent hurricane activity is significantly attributable to human activity. Fully 47 percent disagree that international agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol provide a solid framework for combating global climate change.

Warming Beneficial Overall

Despite all this disagreement, there is consensus on a few points, but these points lead to a conclusion very different from what the media claims. There is consensus that there has been a modest warming of about 1 degree Fahrenheit in the last century. During that time, human civilization, food production, and wildlife have flourished. Whatever harms this warming may have caused were overwhelmed by the benefits.

There is consensus that natural variability could explain some, all, or none of this warming. We don’t know because temperatures historically have sometimes increased without rising levels of CO2 and temperatures historically have sometimes not increased during periods when CO2 levels were rising. We know that variation in solar energy, clouds, and ocean currents all play bigger roles in affecting climate than does CO2.

There is consensus, generally unreported by the media, that if warming continues at its past rate, the results will be beneficial, for the weather aberrations they are predicting already occur naturally. Warmer weather is good for human health—it’s why most people move south rather than north when they retire, and why morbidity and mortality rates are lower in warmer climates—and for wildlife and plant life, too.

And because most of the warming occurs at night, during the winter, and at higher latitudes, it means longer growing seasons and less stress on plants and all types of wildlife.

Robert Mendelsohn, a distinguished professor at Yale University, estimates a 2.5° Celsius warming by the year 2060—which is more than what even most alarmists predict—would generate a net benefit of $8.4 billion a year for the United States.

“These are the same guys who told us Alar, saccharin, Red Dye #2, dioxin, a hole in the ozone layer, electric power lines, and cell phones were all causing cancer epidemics, and that Y2K would shut down the nation’s electric grid and banks.”

Computer Models Unreliable

There is consensus, finally, that the computer models relied on by the global warming alarmists are unreliable.

Most of the models assume a rate of population growth that is twice what demographic experts forecast, and they assume global per capita CO2 rates will double by 2060, even though that rate was flat—no increase at all—between 1970 and 1999.

Change these dubious assumptions, and the predicted warming trend disappears.

All of which is to say that global warming is likely to be a much smaller deal than the media and some politicians have been making it out to be.

Legislation Threatens

But this doesn’t mean legislation won’t be passed or schemes cooked up in the
name of “doing something about global warming” that would have a very big effect on consumers, taxpayers, and farmers and ranchers.

Nebraska and approximately 30 other states have already passed legislation in the name of “doing something” about global warming, and the federal government is spending billions of dollars a year in taxpayer dollars on it already.

High Costs, Little Return
The fatal flaw of all these schemes is their cost. They would require spending hundreds of billions of dollars a year—trillion-dollar deficits during the coming decades—to reduce emissions by amounts too small to have a measurable effect on global temperatures. For example, the best estimate of the cost of the Kyoto Protocol, which would have required the United States to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 7 percent below 1990 levels by 2010, is $375 billion in lost gross domestic product every year.

Kyoto would destroy 2.4 million U.S. jobs—jobs in manufacturing and agriculture—that would go to China, India, and the other 177 of the world’s 210 countries that aren’t subject to the Kyoto Protocol, or to the majority of European countries that have signed the Kyoto Protocol but already are failing to stay inside its caps.

The 179 countries that are not bound by the terms of the Kyoto Protocol account for 76 percent of the world’s CO2 emissions and 90 percent of the world’s population.

Implementation of the Kyoto Protocol would cost the average household in the United States about $3,400 a year in lost income and higher prices for consumer goods. Please think about that: $3,400 a year, about $300 a month, for a reduction in temperatures almost too small to measure.

To have any impact on the global climate, emission reductions would have to be global—not just by a few developed countries—and they would have to be steep, about 70 percent to 80 percent of current emissions. This isn’t just economically impossible, it’s technologically impossible as well. Why take “a first step” (as many climate alarmists call the Kyoto Protocol) if the necessary next steps are impossible?

Agriculture Would Suffer
Farmers and ranchers have a stake in the global warming debate. Through low-till or no-till farming, they might be able to sequester more carbon in the soil and maybe get paid to do so through carbon trading or a government program. Farmers could actually benefit from the global warming scare, even if it is phony and likely to hurt everyone else.

Or not.

A few years ago, I conducted research on the effects of global warming legislation on America’s farm community. I was lucky to work with some real experts, including Dr. Jay Lehr, Heartland’s science director, and editorial editor of McGraw-Hill’s Standard Handbook on Environmental Science, Health, and Technology and the new six-volume Water Encyclopedia; Dennis and Alex Avery, an economist and a biologist, respectively, with the Hudson Institute’s Center for Global Food Issues; and James L. Johnston, an agricultural economist recently retired from Amoco.

Together we produced two studies: “State Greenhouse Gas Programs: An Economic and Scientific Analysis” (February 2003) and “Greenhouse Gas Control: Implications for Agriculture” (August 2003). These studies arrived at three conclusions of particular interest to farmers and ranchers:

Permit Costs Overwhelm Credits
First, farmers are likely to end up paying more for emission permits than they would like to earn selling credits for sequestering carbon in their soil and crops. The reason is that farmers emit much more in greenhouse gases than they now sequester or can reasonably expect to sequester in the future.

According to EPA, agricultural soils in the United States in 2001 sequestered 15.2 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, compared to total agricultural emissions of 226 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (coming primarily from methane from livestock and nitrous oxide from fertilizer application).

If farmers want to be paid to store carbon, they had better expect to be charged for emitting carbon.

Higher Cost of Production
Second, higher prices for fossil fuels would more than offset whatever amounts farmers are paid to sequester carbon. Caps on emissions, raising energy taxes, or a combination of the two would have the effect of raising energy prices.

Most economists believe a tax equivalent to $0.50 a gallon on gasoline would be required to achieve the Kyoto Protocol’s goal of cutting U.S. emissions to 7 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2010. My colleagues and I estimated the impact of such a tax on the cost of agricultural inputs—fuels and electricity, pesticides and other chemicals, fertilizer, and customer operations and hauling—and then calculated the per-acre increased cost to farmers.

For wheat it came to $16 per acre; for soybeans, $19 per acre; for corn, $45 per acre; and for cotton, $64 per acre.

This means while the government is paying the farmer a dollar or two per acre to sequester carbon, the businesses that sell them electricity, diesel fuel, heating oil, and fertilizer and that haul the products to market will be taking even more money out of farmers’ other pocket at the rate of between $16 and $64 per acre.

“The 179 countries that are not bound by the terms of the Kyoto Protocol account for 76 percent of the world’s CO2 emissions and 90 percent of the world’s population.”

Sequestration Ineffective
Third and finally, we found carbon sequestration can play only a small role in responding to the possible problem of climate change. Farmers in the United States currently capture no more than 1 percent of total annual U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. We would have to increase carbon sequestration by 100 percent just to sequester 2 percent of total emissions, or by 1,000 percent to sequester 10 percent of total emissions.

Do you think we can do that? From 1990 to 2001, carbon sequestration in agricultural soils rose by only 14 percent.

The real promise for carbon sequestration lies in forestry and in developing countries. According to EPA, U.S. forests sequestered 759 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent in 2001, 50 times as much as agricultural soils. An acre of forest can have 30 times the biomass of an acre of marginal farmland.

The only really good idea for fighting global warming with sequestration is subsidizing the end of deforestation and planting more trees in Third World countries. Deforestation in Third World countries currently accounts for emissions equal to three-fourths of the entire emission reduction called for by the Kyoto Protocol. If we could stop it, we’d be three-quarters of the way home without reducing our own emissions by a single metric ton.

There is no reason to get on the global warming bandwagon. The science just isn’t there, and it grows less convincing by the week. Farmers are likely to pay more than they stand to earn from selling carbon credits. And to the extent that sequestration has a role to play in combating the possible problem of global warming, the best place to do it isn’t in the United States but in developing countries, and not in planting corn, wheat, or soybeans, but in planting trees.

Many States Devastated by Frigid Weather

By John Dale Dunn

In a time when the national media trumpets any brief heat wave or unusually warm local weather as "proof" of global warming, the winter of 2006-2007 offered quite a counterpunch of remarkable cold weather events.

Calif. Citrus Crop Destroyed
In California's San Joaquin Valley, several consecutive nights of below-freezing temperatures in mid-January devastated the state's $1 billion citrus crop.

Agriculture officials estimated three-fourths of the citrus crop had been destroyed, along with much of the valley's other fruits and vegetables, such as lucrative avocado and strawberry crops.

California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger (R) estimated a total loss of $1 billion from the prolonged cold weather and applied to the federal government for emergency monetary relief to help deal with the economic disaster. Schwarzenegger's appeal for disaster relief was particularly ironic given the governor's high-profile criticism of the Bush administration for not devoting enough economic resources to fight global warming. Schwarzenegger has repeatedly alleged that rising temperatures induced by human activities will cause his state severe economic harm.

Emergency Aid Irony
California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger (R) estimated a total loss of $1 billion from the prolonged cold weather and applied to the federal government for emergency monetary relief to help deal with the economic disaster.

Schwarzenegger's appeal for disaster relief was particularly ironic given the governor's high-profile criticism of the Bush administration for not devoting enough economic resources to fight global warming. Schwarzenegger has repeatedly alleged that rising temperatures induced by human activities will cause his state severe economic harm.

Snow in Los Angeles and Arizona
The cold weather provided striking images for residents throughout the state. The most improbable scene was snowfall burying palm trees in the resort community of Malibu.

Even Los Angeles reported snowfall on January 17, marking the first snowfall at Los Angeles International Airport in 45 years. Improbable snowfall was not limited to California. The usually hot and dry desert community of Tucson, Arizona, just north of the Mexican border, received an inch and a half of snow on January 21. Downtown Phoenix was also blanketed with rare snowfall.

PETA Ignores Freezing Cattle
In Colorado, ranchers scrambled to save more than 300,000 cows and steers in a region where even cold-tested residents were amazed at the winter's fury. Gov. Bill Owens (R) was particularly outraged when the leftist advocacy group People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) refused a request for emergency assistance to help save cattle that were literally freezing to death in blizzard conditions and 15-foot-high snowdrifts.

The state asked PETA for help airlifting food to cattle and rescuing those freezing in snowdrifts, but the advocacy group refused.

"You're going to save them, and then in six months they're going to be killed and end up on someone else's plate," argued PETA spokeswoman Reannon Peterson in a radio interview.

"What a bunch of losers," respond-

In a time when the national media trumpets any brief heat wave or unusually warm local weather as 'proof' of global warming, the winter of 2006-2007 offered quite a counterpunch of remarkable cold weather events."

Record Snow in Alaska
Anchorage, Alaska also suffered from abnormally cold and snowy weather this past winter. The city received record snowfall in December and had received a record 74 inches of snow by January.

The city could not keep up with the cost of trucking snow away, resulting in two-lane streets reduced to one lane. Anchorage exhausted its snow removal funds and was $2 million in deficit for snow response by mid-January. Large vehicles such as fire trucks could not go anywhere, and hoses were frozen.

Ironic Cancellations
In Washington, DC, Congressional hearings to investigate global warming were cancelled when an ice storm and frigid conditions shut down the nation's capital.

On the same day, Maryville University in suburban St. Louis announced it was canceling a presentation of Al Gore's An Inconvenient Truth global warming documentary because of unusually cold and snowy conditions.

Dr. John Dale Dunn (jddmdj@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.

Europe

Continued from page 1

gas emissions per unit of gross domestic product declined by 7.5 percent in the United States from 2000 to 2004, the most recent period for which reliable data have been assembled. The European Union reduced its greenhouse gas intensity by only 4.5 percent in the same time span, Volker reported.

"How did the United States achieve this lower emissions intensity ratio?" Volker asked. "By working very hard to bring cleaner technology into the marketplace. Through a combination of targeted market decisions, incentives, voluntary partnerships, and mandates, the [Bush] administration's policies have helped speed the deployment of cleaner technology."

EU Total Emissions Up
Just as importantly, Volker noted, while overall U.S. greenhouse gas emissions grew by 1.3 percent from 2000 to 2004, emissions despite the impressive reduction in greenhouse gas intensity.

Investing in Technology
The U.S. strategy of investing in new technology and encouraging private enterprise to take the lead in reducing emissions is producing better results than the European command-and-control strategy of passing mandatory caps but failing to encourage market solutions, Volker noted.

"We are investing heavily in clean technology and instituting policies to help it become cost-competitive," said Volker. "From Fiscal Year 2001 to the end of Fiscal Year 2006, the U.S. government devoted more than $29 billion to climate science, technology, international assistance, and incentive programs."

"The hard data show that Kyoto is a paper tiger," noted Sterling Burnett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis. "You have got words on paper and they are not worth a thing if the actions don't correspond. U.S. businesses are succeeding where European bureaucracies are failing."

"The United States is making more significant progress than Europe in cutting both greenhouse gas intensity and gross emissions ..."

"Since the negotiation of the Kyoto Protocol the U.S. has outperformed Kyoto's major parties in terms of CO2 emissions," said Chris Horner, senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute. "The disparity is even more exaggerated over the past five years for which data are available, 2000 to 2004.

Horner added, "any claim that it is the U.S.'s turn to do what the rest of the world is purportedly doing can only be a call to abandon our position as a world leader in favor of a failed scheme."

James Hoare (ljahoare@aol.com) is an attorney practicing in Rochester, New York.
School District Rejects Gore Film
Board requires presentation of “credible, legitimate opposing view” on warming

By James M. Taylor

A l Gore’s 2006 film An Inconvenient Truth cannot be shown in Federal Way, Washington schools unless “credible, legitimate” opposing views are also presented, the district’s school board decided on January 9.

The school board emphasized that a preexisting policy requires teachers to provide balance when presenting controversial issues.

Ensuring Balance
School board member David Larson told the January 11 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, “the principal reason for that is to make sure that the public schools are not used for indoctrination.”

Gore’s movie, while vigorously applauded by global warming alarmists, has been criticized for a selective and frequently inaccurate presentation of the science regarding global warming.

“Gore’s film is a colorfully illustrated lawyer’s brief—one-sided advocacy for climate alarmism and energy rationing.”

MARLO LEWIS
SENIOR FELLOW
COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE

Loaded with Inaccuracies
Science, however, calls into question numerous misleading and inaccurate assertions presented in the film.

“Gore’s film is a colorfully illustrated lawyer’s brief—one-sided advocacy for climate alarmism and energy rationing,” said Marlo Lewis, a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

The only facts and arguments Gore presents are those that support his scare ‘em green agenda, and he often distorts even the evidence he cites.

“Gore’s film is not balanced, and Federal Way has ample reason to insist that teachers fairly present the other side or not show the film at all,” Lewis added.

Producer Outraged
Laurie David, a co-producer of the film, expressed outrage that teachers are required to bring balance to the discussion if they choose to show the Gore film.

“I am shocked that a school district would come to this decision,” David said in a news release. “There is no opposing view to science, which is fact, and the facts are clear that global warming is here, now.”

“Gore’s film is a colorfully illustrated lawyer’s brief— one-sided advocacy for climate alarmism and energy rationing.”

MARLO LEWIS
SENIOR FELLOW
COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE

Loaded with Inaccuracies
Science, however, calls into question numerous misleading and inaccurate assertions presented in the film.

“Gore claims glaciers in the Himalayan Mountains are rapidly melting, threatening the water supplies of hundreds of millions of people. However, just months before Gore’s movie was released, Insurance Digest reported Himalayan Mountain glaciers are as big as ever.”

Rife with False Claims
Also false is Gore’s claim that declining rainfall (allegedly caused by global warming) is leading to a dramatic southern expansion of the Sahara Desert. The New Scientist reported as recently as 2002, “Africa’s deserts are in ‘spectacular’ retreat,” with vegetation reclaiming large expanses of barren land across the entire southern edge of the Sahara.

While showing an animated map of the planet purporting to depict ocean currents responding to a 5° F rise in temperatures, Gore claimed a 5° increase is “on the low end of the projections.” In fact, a 5° rise in temperatures would be on the high end of projections offered by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Gore claims the Antarctic polar ice cap is melting and that this is a “canary in the coalmine” demonstrating dramatic global warming. Antarctica has been cooling for many decades, and its ice cap is expanding, not shrinking.

Lewis noted, “Gore warns that half the Greenland Ice Sheet could break up and slide into the sea, raising sea levels by 10 feet. Yet the current rate of ice mass loss on Greenland translates into about one inch of sea level rise per century.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
State Climatologists Attacked for Global Warming Doubts

By H. Sterling Burnett

Several state climatologists—researchers officially charged with gathering, analyzing, and disseminating climate and weather information for the states—are being pressured by global warming alarmists to silence or change their skeptical views on global warming alarmism.

Pressure has reached the point of threatened job reprisals, including removal from their positions, for state climatologists who continue to cast doubt on global warming.

“Several state climatologists ... are being pressured by global warming alarmists to silence or change their skeptical views on global warming alarmism.”

Governor Intervenes

Oregon Gov. Ted Kulongoski (D), for example, has confirmed he wants to take the title of state climatologist away from Oregon State University’s George Taylor—a two-time president of the American Association of State Climatologists. Taylor, offensive, according to Kulongoski, is in asserting that most of the small global warming we have seen in recent decades is the result of natural climate variation.

Kulongoski fears Taylor’s scientific opinion undermines the state’s stated goal of preventing global warming by reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

State Sen. Brad Avakian (D-Beaverton), a Kulongoski ally, is sponsoring a bill to give the governor the power to appoint the state climatologist. The state legislature created the position in 1991 as part of a state climate office at Oregon State University. To avoid political interference with the process, the legislature delegated the appointment of the office to Oregon State University.

The university appointed Taylor to the position when it was first created, and he has held the position since 1991. Avakian’s bill would change that.

Ignoring Science, Governor

In Delaware, State Climatologist David Legates is under fire for joining several other authors in a friend-of-the-court brief against the State of Delaware’s legal efforts to regulate greenhouse gas emissions. Legates has argued there is a great deal of uncertainty concerning the extent to which human activities are driving the recent warming cycle.

As a result of scientific doubts he has expressed regarding global warming alarmism, the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control is seeking to remove Legates from office, even though the University of Delaware currently evaluates state climatologist candidates and makes appointment decisions based on scientific rather than political factors.

In an effort to end the controversy, Delaware Gov. Ruth Ann Minner (D) sent a letter to Legates stating that while his views on warming don’t represent the position of the executive branch, the governor appreciates his ongoing work and that of the state climate office.

Despite Minner’s stated support, Legates said the Department of Natural Resources is still attempting to have him removed.

Virginia Gov Pressures Prof

The disturbing developments in Oregon and Delaware follow on the heels of similar intimidation in Virginia.

In late 2006 Virginia Gov. Tim Kaine (D) began an investigation of Virginia State Climatologist and University of Virginia Prof. Dr. Patrick Michaels. Michaels is a past president of the American Association of State Climatologists and is widely cited as one of the most publicly visible skeptics of the view that human actions are likely to cause a climate catastrophe.

Michaels believes human actions, primarily fossil fuel use, are contributing somewhat to the present warming, but he has argued that future warming will be modest and is unlikely to result in serious harm to humans or the environment.

Michaels’ scientific conclusions have raised the ire of environmental activists, prompting Kaine to investigate ways to remove him from his position as state climatologist. When it became clear that Michaels worked for the University of Virginia and not the governor, Kaine's office sent a letter to Michaels asking him to make it clear that when he speaks or writes about climate change he is speaking for himself and not for the state.

“Those who want to muzzle scientists should be ashamed of themselves. The scientific process should be about being able to explore unpopular ideas, not conforming scientific views to match a particular governor’s point of view.”

DAN SIMMONS
DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCES TASK FORCE
AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL

Scientists Concerned

Colorado State Climatologist Roger Pielke summarized on his Web log the fear these recent developments have raised in the scientific community.

Calling the attempts to remove Taylor

CONTINUED on right

Congress, Media Distort Censorship Issue

By H. Sterling Burnett

In an ironic twist to the ongoing persecution of state climatologists who doubt global warming alarmism, the U.S. House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on January 30 held hearings at which the Democratic leadership and environmental activists assailed the Bush administration for purported interference with and attempted suppression of scientists whose views were not considered in line with the administration’s climate change policy.

Testimony from two activist organizations that have been regular critics of the Bush administration—the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) and the Government Accountability Project (GAP)—was prominently featured in the hearings.

Dubious Survey

The UCS presented findings from a survey of more than 1,600 government scientists at seven federal agencies. Seventeen percent—279 government scientists—responded to the survey.

Of those who responded, roughly 40 percent indicated they felt pressured to eliminate references to global warming from their work or had had their work edited in ways that changed its meaning.

Committee chairman Henry A. Waxman (D-California) argued at the hearing that the evidence indicated the Bush administration had attempted to “mislead the public by injecting doubt into the science of global warming.” Waxman called the alleged actions an attempt to manipulate climate change policy.

“[T]he Democratic leadership ... assailed the Bush administration for purported interference with and attempted suppression of scientists whose views were not considered in line with the administration’s climate change policy.”

“orchestrated campaign to mislead the public about climate change.”

With no Bush administration officials invited to participate, no one at the hearing raised the point that those scientists who responded to the survey were a self-selecting group. The one independent scientist who was allowed to testify argued that scientists are more likely to join or cooperate with groups that agree with their point of view, so the survey results released by the UCS should come as no surprise.

Biased Coverage

The Associated Press, along with most major newspapers, including USA Today, the New York Times, Washington Post, Chicago Tribune, and Los Angeles Times, covered the hearings, publishing numerous editorials condemning the administration’s alleged attempts at censoring or suppressing climate research.

Very few newspapers have covered the explicit attempts at censorship of state climatologists and attempts by global warming alarmists to remove them from their offices.

— H. Sterling Burnett
and Legates “unprecedented,” Pielke wrote, “These are very chilling develop-ments and should be resisted and objected to by anyone who values the free expression of scientific views. ... The use of governors to stifle alternative scientific views is what governments have done in the past to suppress free speech. “The move to remove them from their positions because they do not espouse a particular viewpoint on climate change reeks negatively of a federal government enacting policy and the process should be resisted and objected to by society at large.” Pielke continued. “Regardless of your perspective on the role of humans in the climate system, their attempt to remove them from their positions because they do not espouse a particular viewpoint on climate change reeks negatively of a federal government enacting policy and the process should be resisted and objected to by society at large.”

Support Offered

Dan Simmons, director of the Natural Resources Task Force at the American Legislative Exchange Council, condemned efforts by global warming alarmists to squelch debate raised by state climatologists. In an interview for this article, Simmons said, “In January, global warming alarmists charged that the Bush administration is muzzling scientists, and yet they failed to complain that at the state level alarmists are muzzling scientists with whom they disagree. This politicization of science must stop.”

Simmons added, “Those who want to muzzle scientists should be ashamed of themselves. The scientific process should be about being able to explore unpopular ideas, not conforming scientific views to match a particular governor’s point of view.”

Also lending support for the continued independence of state climatologists is U.S. Sen. James Inhofe (R) of Oklahoma, ranking member and former chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.

Responding to the ongoing assault on state climatologists, Inhofe stated, “Suppressing scientific debate by threatening state climatologist positions, calling for Nuremberg-style trials and decertification of skeptics, are all signs of a growing desperation by the global warming alarmists. Climate skeptics continue to be vindicated as more and more scientists and policymakers realize the inconvenient truth that global warming alarmism is unsustainable.”

Senator Calls for National Low-Carbon Fuel Standards

By James M. Taylor

Appearing in Long Beach, California with fellow Republican maverick Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger (R-CA), Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) on February 21 called for a mandatory 10 percent reduction in carbon emissions from automobiles.

“The plan would force U.S. consumers to purchase more expensive ethanol fuel and hybrid vehicles until new technologies become technologically and economically feasible.”

Following California

The proposed federal mandate emulates Schwarzenegger’s plan to mandate a 10 percent cut in automotive carbon emissions—one of numerous actions the governor has taken to please environmental activists in his state.

Schwarzenegger has defined free-market environmentalist principles by expanding state regulation, spending $2.9 billion to subsidize a rooftop solar power plan, expanding state control of scenic lands, opposing offshore natural resource recovery, subsidizing unproven hydrogen transportation fuel, and committing the state to Kyoto-style carbon reduction mandates.

“I know that Senator McCain sees the value of bringing to Washington the same kind of programs that we have put into place right here in California,” Schwarzenegger told reporters at the joint news conference in Long Beach.

“We share common philosophy and goals for this country,” McCain agreed.

‘Great for Our Economy’

McCain said requiring a 10 percent cut in the carbon intensity of automotive transportation “is great for our economy and our taxpayers because the low carbon fuel standard will more than triple the size of our renewable fuels market in California and put more than 7 million alternative fuel or hybrid vehicles on the road by 2020 without any new government spending.”

Tom Tanton, senior fellow with the Institute for Energy Research, disagreed.

“There are many good reasons why petroleum has such a large market share—price, convenience, and performance driven in large measure by its quality per BTU,” Tanton said. “The alternatives required by McCain’s plan would be less efficient, more expensive, and have a very negligible effect on climate. Moreover, increasing use of alternative fuels such as ethanol has already driven up food prices, and would do so even more under McCain’s plan.

“Though research and development in new energy technologies must be encouraged, government should not try to engineer the results, nor select individual market sectors for solutions,” Tanton added.

Better Options Available

Jerry Taylor, senior fellow and director of natural resource studies at the Cato Institute, noted that even if global warming were a legitimate concern, the McCain plan is an inefficient way to address it.

“If we decide that government must act to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the most efficient way to go about this is to impose a simple tax on greenhouse gas emissions. Market actors will then decide how best to reduce greenhouse gas emissions or ambient greenhouse gas concentrations,” Taylor said.

“Reducing carbon emissions from automobiles might be one way we might reduce carbon emissions, but there are other possibilities,” Taylor noted. “Perhaps nuclear power is a more cost-effective means of reducing carbon. Perhaps sequestering carbon from coal-fired power plants makes more economic sense. Maybe conservation and energy efficiency hold more economic promise than investing in expensive alternative fuels. Or maybe geo-engineering is more cost-effective than emissions controls altogether.

“The point is that Sen. McCain presumes to know exactly how we can most efficiently reduce greenhouse gas emissions,” said Taylor. “Market actors, however, are in a better position to sort out alternative emission control plans than a politician. Regardless, most economists who specialize in the economics of climate change agree that the costs associated with embracing McCain’s preferences with regard to renewable energy are greater than the benefits they might deliver.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland. org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
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.
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The global average temperature (top) for January was 0.53°C above normal. The Northern Hemisphere’s temperature (middle) was 0.63°C above normal. The Southern Hemisphere’s temperature (third) was 0.44°C below normal.

Weather Channel Host Shows Climate Alarmists’ Ugly Side

By John Dale Dunn

Heidi Cullen, a Weather Channel meteorologist who hosts the station’s alarmist weekly program The Climate Code, created a media stir on January 18 by calling on the American Meteorological Society (AMS) to decertify meteorologists who disagree with her alarmist global warming views.

Politically Correct Warming

On her Weather Channel Web log, Cullen stated, “If a meteorologist can’t speak to the fundamental science of climate change, then maybe the AMS shouldn’t give them a Seal of Approval.”

Added Cullen, “It’s like allowing a meteorologist to go on-air and say that hurricanes rotate clockwise and tsunamis are caused by the weather. It’s not a political statement ... it’s just an incorrect statement.”

Nuremberg Trials

Cullen’s aggressive remarks continued a recent trend of global warming alarmists seeking vengeance on scientists who disagree with their theories. In 2006 Dave Roberts, prominently featured in the December 17, 2006 episode of Cullen’s The Climate Code, called for Nuremberg-style trials to convict and execute global warming skeptics.

Similarly, university-appointed state climatologists in Delaware, Oregon, and Virginia have been threatened with dismissal from their positions because they have raised questions about suspect global warming assertions. (See story, page 10.)

Scientific Method Ignored

Sterling Burnett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis, noted the irony of scientists calling for draconian reprisals against skeptics of global warming alarmism.

“The entire scientific method is built upon the enormous value of skepticism,” Burnett concurred. “Scientists and policy analysts seeking to profit economically from their position on global warming have a very easy choice to make. All the big money from government grants, non-government organizations, and foundation gifts is dependent upon the perpetuation of global warming fears,” Burnett observed.

Dr. John Dale Dunn (jddmdjd@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.

INTERNET INFO

Evangelical Group Denies Backing Global Warming Agenda

By Bonner R. Cohen

On January 17 a small group of high-profile environmental activists and evangelicals announced an alliance against greenhouse gas emissions, but spokesmen for leading religious organizations quickly countered that the individuals do not speak for any evangelical organization.

At a news conference in Washington, DC that day, a group of environmental activists with the United Nations-affiliated Center for Health and the Global Environment and a group of evangelicals affiliated with the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) launched what they called “an unprecedented joint effort to protect the global environment and advance policies that address some of the most pressing threats to our planet, including global warming, habitat destruction, pollution, and species extinctions.”

“On January 17 a small group of high-profile environmental activists and evangelicals announced an alliance against greenhouse gas emissions ...”

NAE’s Position Unchanged

The NAE, which has more than 40,000 affiliated churches in 60 denominations, has not officially weighed in on the topic since January 26, 2005, when the organization’s board issued a statement refusing to embrace a particular view on environmental policy, particularly as it relates to global warming.

That statement, “For the Health of the Nation,” says in part, “Recognizing the ongoing debate regarding the causes and origins of global warming, and understanding the lack of consensus among the evangelical community on this issue, the NAE Executive Committee, while affirming our love for the Creator and His creation, directs the NAE staff to stand by and not exceed in any fashion our approved and adopted statements concerning the environment contained within the Evangelical Call to Civic Responsibility.”

“Calls to NAE seeking to ascertain whether its official position had changed were not returned by press time.”

Dr. Calvin Beisner, national spokesman for the Interfaith Stewardship Alliance (ISA), a coalition of scientists and religious leaders committed to responsible environmental stewardship, said in a January 17 press statement, “If Rich Cizik wrote or was aware of and permitted the release of the media advisory claiming that today’s effort was ‘spearheaded by the National Association of Evangelicals,’ he has overstepped the board in last year’s statement.”

Activists Continuing Pressure

The release of the “Urgent Call” and Beisner’s public dressing down of Cizik for the latter’s refusal to comply with the NAE’s guidelines on global warming are but the latest skirmish in an ongoing conflict within the evangelical community.

That conflict has seen environmental activists, working through surrogates within the evangelical community, attempt to make inroads into the predominantly socially conservative evangelical movement.

Some of the efforts have been ham handed, to say the least. In late 2002, for example, the Evangelical Environmental Network (EEN) launched a high-profile anti-SUV campaign asking, “What Would Jesus Drive?” Headed by the Rev. James Ball, EEN is a subsidiary of the Rev. Ronald J. Sider’s Evangelicals for Social Responsibility.

Ball, Sider, and Cizik have tried to meld the notion of “Creation care” to environmental policy, particularly as it relates to global warming.

Teaming with Radicals

As the global warming debate has unfolded within the evangelical community, nagging questions about the ultimate agenda of Ball, Sider, Cizik, and their allies have persisted.

For his “What Would Jesus Drive?” campaign, Ball’s organization availed itself of the services of the decidedly left-leaning Washington public relations firm Fenton Communications, whose clients have included the communist governments of Angola and Nicaragua, Greenpeace, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Rainforest Action Network, Environmental Working Group, and George Soros’s Open Society Institute.

“Personally, I am skeptical that humans are largely to blame for our recent moderate warming, and I am very skeptical that any future warming is likely to be catastrophic. I am still more skeptical that asserted solutions such as the Kyoto Protocol will effectively address the topic or be worth all the economic costs necessary for their implementation,” added Richards.

Bonner R. Cohen (broohen@ix.netcom.com) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research in Washington, D.C. and author of The Green Wave: Environmentalism and its Consequences, published by the Capital Research Center.
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In a speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate, delivered on September 26, 2006, Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK) summarized the state of climate science, drawing upon the latest scientific research. Reproduced below is the fourth 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.

**Deceptions About Greenland**

Has [the] embarrassing 100-year documented legacy of coverage on what turned out to be trendy climate science theories made the media more skeptical of today’s sensational promoters of global warming?

You be the judge.

On February 19th [2006], CBS News’s 60 Minutes produced a segment on the North Pole. The segment was a completely one-sided report, alleging rapid and unprecedented melting at the polar cap. It even featured correspondent Scott Pelley claiming that the ice in Greenland was melting so fast, that he barely got off an iceberg before it collapsed into the water.

60 Minutes failed to inform its viewers of a 2005 study by a scientist named Ola Johannessen and his colleagues showing that the interior of Greenland is gaining ice and mass and that according to scientists, the Arctic was warmer in the 1930s than today.

**Blasted Bias Ignored**

On March 19th of [last] year 60 Minutes profiled NASA scientist and alarmist James Hansen, who was once again making allegations of being censored by the Bush administration. In this segment, objectivity and balance were again tossed aside in favor of a one-sided, glowing profile of Hansen.

The 60 Minutes segment made no mention of Hansen’s partisan ties to former Democrat Vice President Al Gore or Hansen’s receiving of a grant of a quarter of a million dollars from the left-wing Heinz Foundation run by Teresa Heinz Kerry. There was also no mention of Hansen’s subsequent endorsement of her husband John Kerry for president in 2004.

**Skeptics Slandered**

Many in the media dwell on any industry support given to so-called climate skeptics, but the same media completely fail to note Hansen’s huge grant from the left-wing Heinz Foundation.

The foundation’s money originated from the Heinz family ketchup fortune. So it appears that the media makes a distinction between oil money and ketchup money.

60 Minutes also did not inform viewers that Hansen appeared to concede in a 2003 issue of *Science* that the use of “extreme scenarios” [ones not based on scientific facts] to dramatize climate change “may have been appropriate at one time” to drive the public’s attention to the issue.

Why would 60 Minutes ignore the basic tenets of journalism, which call for objectivity and balance in sourcing, and do such one-sided segments? The answer was provided by correspondent Scott Pelley. Pelley told the CBS News Web site that he justified excluding scientists skeptical of global warming alarmism from his segments because he considers skeptics to be the equivalent of “Holocaust deniers.”

**Reporter Writing Fantasy**


So here we have a very prominent environmental reporter for the *New York Times* who is promoting aspects of global warming alarmism in a book aimed at children.

**Time’s Yellow Journalism**

In April of [last] year, *Time* magazine devoted an entire issue to global warming alarmism titled “Be Worried, Be Very Worried.”

This is the same *Time* magazine which first warned of a coming ice age in the 1920s before switching to warning about global warming in the 1930s before switching yet again to promoting the 1970s coming ice age scare.

The April 3, 2006 global warming special report of *Time* magazine was a prime example of the media’s shortcomings, as the magazine cited partisan left-wing environmental groups with a vested financial interest in hyping alarmism.

Headlines blared:
- “More and More Land Is Being Devastated by Drought”
- “Earth at the Tipping Point”
- “The Climate Is Crashing.”

**Cause for Concern**

*Time* magazine did not make the slightest attempt to balance its reporting with any views of scientists skeptical of this alleged climate apocalypse.

I don’t have journalism training, but I dare say calling a bunch of environmental groups with an obvious fundraising agenda and asking them to make wild speculations on how bad global warming might become is nothing more than advocacy for their left-wing causes. It is a violation of basic journalistic standards.

To his credit, *New York Times* reporter Revkin saw fit to criticize *Time* magazine for its embarrassing coverage of climate science.

So in the end, *Time’s* cover story titled “Be Worried, Be Very Worried,” appears to have been apt. The American people should be worried—very worried—of such shoddy journalism.
Pennsylvania Implements Severe New Mercury Regulations

By Michael Coulter

Pennsylvania’s state agency responsible for publishing newly enacted regulations ended a two-month showdown with Gov. Ed Rendell (D) on February 10 by publishing strict mercury reduction rules supported by the governor.

The final hurdle to implementation was acquiescence by two leaders, Sens. Mary Jo White (R-Venango) and Raphael Musto (D-Luzerne) of the Environmental Resources and Energy Committee. Under Pennsylvania law, a proposed regulation can be rejected by the legislature if a committee passes a resolution opposing the regulation and then both chambers agree with the resolution.

White and Musto, who have long opposed the proposed mercury standards as being extremely burdensome for little if any environment and health benefits, announced in a February 7 letter that they would not use provisions under the Regulatory Review Act to prevent the implementation of the new mercury regulation.

After the February 7 announcement, the Legislative Reference Bureau agreed to publish the new regulation.

$1.7 Billion ‘for Nothing’

“We are going to spend $1.7 billion [in order to comply with the regulation] for nothing,” said Gene Barr, vice president of political and regulatory affairs for the Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry. “There are no discernible health benefits for the Pennsylvania rule over the federal rule. “No scientific journal has ever found a single person with an unsafe level of mercury from eating fish,” added Barr.

Barr questioned the wisdom of having stricter regulations in Pennsylvania when mercury emissions from plants in Ohio will simply drift across the border and settle in Pennsylvania. “The air that is in Pennsylvania today is the air that was in Ohio yesterday,” said Barr.

Barr also criticized the cap-and-trade approach that establishes an industry-wide limit allowing plants that reduce emissions by more than 70 percent to sell credits to others that have a more difficult time meeting emissions.

“John Hanger, president of PennFuture, said, “We’re pleased we started this process in 2004, and now two years later there’s a strong regulation,” said Hanger.

Hanger said mercury is a “powerful neurotoxin” and said, “It wouldn’t surprise me if someday we learn that there is no safe level of mercury.”

Steven Milloy, publisher of the environmental science Web site junkscience.com, countered, “There is no evidence that the levels of mercury in the environment are harmful. Most mercury, in fact, is naturally produced.

“Mercury is only harmful in what essentially amount to poisoning cases—isolated incidents like in Minamata Bay, Japan in the 1950s and Iraq in the 1970s,” Milloy explained. “No one is exposed on a typical basis to anywhere close to the levels of mercury as in those two tragic incidents.”

Michael Coulter (mncoulter@gce.edu) teaches political science at Grove City College.

Purposeless Regulation

For communities such as Middlefield, located in Geauga County 44 miles northeast of Cleveland, the marginal benefit of the new regulations seems very minor considering the cost of the new water treatment facility. Statistically, Middlefield is unlikely to see even a single premature death caused by its current arsenic levels.

Middlefield is not alone in paying a steep price for these statistically unlikely health benefits. The nearby communities of Chardon and Seville must also upgrade their water treatment facilities. The 3,000 households in the two communities will pony up a total of $9 million, or $3,000 per household, to reduce their arsenic levels by just a few parts per billion.

Harper of the Ohio Department of Health.

“Unfortunately, arsenic is just the tip of the iceberg,” Logomasini added. “EPA is considering several more unreasonable standards, including a standard for radon, which is likely to levy even more steep costs on households around the nation in exchange for little verified public health benefits.”

It is statistically unlikely that anybody in Middlefield will realize any health benefits from the new requirements, agreed Sterling Burnett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis. “Imposing a bill of $7,400 per household on the citizens of Middlefield is imposing real, measurable harm to Middlefield citizens. How many citizens will have to forgo health insurance or healthier but more expensive food as a result?”

“EPA is overstating hypothetical, phantom risks while ignoring the real benefits that people would be able to accrue by keeping their own money,” Burnett added.

James Hoare (ljhoare@aol.com) is an attorney practicing in Rochester, New York.
Asbestos Removal: Our Most Costly Environmental Scam

By Jay Lehr and Samuel Aldrich

This article is the tenth 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.

Asbestos removal, not asbestos use, is the subject of this analysis. It has been a fiasco.

Asbestos has been widely used in many places around the world because of its fire resistance. In modern times asbestos has been used for insulation, for wrapping heating pipes, and in automobile tires. Those usages have saved tens of thousands of lives.

Following the Coconut Grove nightclub fire in Boston in 1942, which killed 490 persons, many states required asbestos to be used to help suppress fires in private and public buildings. The lifesaving characteristics of asbestos seem to have been lost in the recent rush to get rid of it.

About 1900 it was learned that after long-term exposure in asbestos mines, many workers developed lung cancer. In the early 1970s, medical evidence mounted that lung cancer and respiratory ailments were common among workers in trades where asbestos was processed. Because lives are priceless, the act of Congress seems reasonable. But was it? Consider the facts. About 95 percent of the asbestos in buildings is in the form of chrysotile, which according to world scientific experts on the subject does not increase the risk of asbestos-associated disease at current exposure rates in the workplace or public buildings.

Feds Overreacted

In 1986 Congress passed the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act requiring all public and private schools to inspect for asbestos and to inform parents if asbestos was found. If so, schools were required to file a plan for removal, under threat of a $5,000 fine per day for failing to meet the deadline.

The impact of the mandate is illustrated by the experience of Tartan High School in Oakdale, Minnesota. The school district found that liquid asbestos had been sprayed legally on beams, and the school district proceeded to remove it. The district then brought suit against the manufacturer of the product. After four weeks in court, a jury awarded $820,750 for clean-up, plus $2,462,250 in punitive damages.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) also required that asbestos be removed from all buildings being demolished. Many businesses embarked on costly asbestos removal programs out of fear of lawsuits alleging negligence.

Asbestos Exposure Minimal

Even where the asbestos fibers stay in dry and easily crumbled, airborne concentrations were only slightly higher than in outside air.

When left alone, asbestos fibers in place and thus are harmless. If any action is needed, it should be to wrap or otherwise encapsulate the asbestos so none can escape into the air. But in the process of being removed, they are stirred up, and workers are exposed to far higher levels than normal exposure in the workplace or in schools.

Costs Have Been Great

The estimated cost for the unnecessary asbestos removal is between $200 and $400 for each family in the United States.

How did this fiasco develop? Congress caused it by rushing through a law without adequate scientific input. Moreover, EPA was given a mandate to develop regulations to carry out the intent of the act, and thus must bear responsibility for the costly and unwise programs it developed.

As the preponderance of evidence has shown in recent decades, there appears to be no evidence that asbestos in buildings has caused even a single case of cancer or any other asbestos-related disease. The asbestos removal fiasco can be blamed on hysteria generated by environmental activists and their political allies. Worse still, the fiasco has become a model for litigation run amok in a host of environmental arenas.

Adding asbestos-related bankruptcies to unnecessary asbestos removal, the financial burden to each U.S. family has reached $1,000 and continues to rise.

It is worth repeating that asbestos has saved thousands of lives and was required by law in many public buildings to reduce the fire hazard. Large and small cities have lost huge amounts in tax revenues because manufacturing plants were closed, jobs were lost, and bankruptcies declared.

Jay Lehr, Ph.D. Lehr@heartland.org is science director for The Heartland Institute. Samuel Aldrich is an emeritus professor at the University of Illinois. His groundbreaking book for laymen, Smoke or Steam? A Guide to Environmental, Regulatory, and Food Safety Concerns, is available from The Heartland Institute for $12. The table of contents of the book, containing 211 topics, can be viewed at http://www.heartland.org/smokeorssteam.pdf.
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“Instead of addressing real problems, Congress is occupying itself with elaborate hearings on global warming and with fabricating outlandish schemes of controlling the emission of carbon dioxide (read: the use of energy),” agreed Dr. S. Fred Singer, president of the Science and Environmental Policy Project. “All these schemes are quite ineffective in reducing the global growth of atmospheric CO2—the mind-boggling in having any effect on climate. The schemes do have one thing in common: They will damage the U.S. economy and hurt the pocketbooks of every consumer of energy—the folks who drive cars, heat their homes, and pay electric bills.”

Avery and Singer are the coauthors of Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1,500 Years, which was #24 on the New York Times best-seller list in early March.

“The Summary further states there is no scientific link between global warming and severe weather events such as tornadoes ...”

Science Revised to Fit Summary

The 18-page IPCC Summary was formally approved at the 10th session of Working Group I in Paris. The work is the product of 33 drafting authors and 18 draft contributing authors.

The study authors were representative of governments, not the scientists who produced the data. Prior to release of the Fourth Assessment in May, IPCC scientists will have to revise their scientific assessments to comport with the assertions made by the nonscientists in the Summary.

“The Summary for Policymakers is designed to be a propaganda document that will promote global warming alarmism. It is not written by the scientists who wrote the report, but by the governments that belong to the IPCC.”

Myron Ebell
Director of Energy and Global Warming Policy
Competitive Enterprise Institute

The new Summary’s middle-of-the-road projection is for a roughly 2.5°C increase in temperatures by the end of the twenty-first century. This is down from the Third Assessment’s projected 3.0°C temperature rise.

Additionally, the “worst-case” scenarios have also been toned down. The Third Assessment projected a 5.8°C rise in temperatures as a worst-case scenario, while the new Summary projects a 4.5°C worst-case scenario.

Small Sea Level Change

The Summary suggests sea level will increase between 7 and 23 inches by the end of the century, with “best estimates” calling for roughly 13 inches. This estimate is also a significant downward revision from the Third Assessment, which projected a worst-case sea level rise of 3 feet.

The document estimates there will be a loss of ice in Greenland, but that the “Antarctic ice sheet will remain too cold for widespread surface melting and is expected to gain in mass due to increased snowfall.”

The Summary further states there is no scientific link between global warming and severe weather events such as tornadoes, refuting assertions made by global warming alarmists and in Al Gore’s movie An Inconvenient Truth.

Better Data Undermine Alarmism

The document further states that the scientific community has better data than it has had in the past and has made use of this improved data in the new report.

“The IPCC Summary projects less temperature rise and less sea level rise than it did in 2001,” observed Iain Murray, senior fellow with the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

Referring to the complete Fourth Assessment due to be released in May, Murray said, “The underlying science from the full report itself will predict climate change impacts over the next century more modest than previous reports, and far below claims made by organizations and individuals predicting imminent catastrophic changes.”

Michael Coulter (mcoulter@gcc.edu) teaches political science at Grove City College.

Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1,500 Years

By S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery

“Real science in, real science out. A masterpiece of understanding, dispelling the computer myths of manmade global warming. Please read this book.”

—David Bellamy, Order of the British Empire, academic, author, and host of British TV documentaries

“This book is must reading for anyone concerned about global warming. The authors stress that ‘consensus’ has no place in science, only hard-headed testing of speculation. Their testing of the earth’s erratic, moderate warming since 1850 leads them to the planet’s recently discovered—but already broadly studied—1,500-year climate cycle.”

—Frederick Seitz, former president, National Academy of Sciences

“Fred Singer and Dennis Avery have put together an impressive collection of ‘reasons to believe that global warming may not be as bad as some people are telling us’—in other words, that natural variations, rather than human-emitted greenhouse gases, have tended to control climate. Their exhaustive list of scientific references, mostly from refereed journals, only underscores their statements. Bravo for a job well done!”

—George H. Taylor, state climatologist, Oregon Climate Service

S. Fred Singer was the founding dean of the School of Environmental and Planetary Sciences at the University of Miami, the first director of the U.S. National Weather Satellite Service, and served five years as vice chairman of the U.S. National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmospheres.

Dennis T. Avery has been a senior fellow of the Hudson Institute since 1989. Prior to that, he was a senior analyst in the U.S. Department of State (1980-88), where he was the National Intelligence Medal of Achievement in 1983.
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San Francisco Reconsidering Ban on Phthalates

By James M. Taylor

The heads of two San Francisco departments have asked the city’s supervisors to reconsider a proposed ordinance that would severely restrict the commercial availability of products containing chemicals known as phthalates and bisphenol A.

According to a January 23 request by Dr. Michael Katz, the city’s director of public health, and Jared Blumenfeld, the city’s environmental department director, the city should reduce the number of products affected by the ordinance.

In late 2006 San Francisco enacted an ordinance banning the sale, distribution, and manufacture of baby-related items containing any level of the chemical bisphenol A and certain levels of phthalates.

Bisphenol A is an industrial chemical essential to the polycarbonate plastics used in baby bottles and many other consumer products. Phthalates are commonly used primarily to make vinyl plastic flexible, in everything from children’s toys to kitchen flooring.

Doubts About Studies

The San Francisco measure is a response to environmental activists’ allegations that rodents exposed to bisphenol A and certain phthalates experienced abnormalities in the development of sexual organs. Scientific studies have concluded real-world human exposure poses no threat to adults or babies.

The ordinance banning phthalates and bisphenol A in baby products was scheduled to take effect December 1, 2006, but implementation was delayed by a pair of lawsuits challenging San Francisco’s authority to enact it. The request by Katz and Blumenfeld promises to further delay implementation, if not scuttle the measure entirely.

Katz and Blumenfeld are asking the city to delay the ordinance for at least a year while the California legislature investigates the chemicals and decides whether to regulate them. The department heads also seek to codify and reduce the number of children’s products covered by the phthalate ban.

“The heads of two San Francisco departments have asked the city’s supervisors to reconsider a proposed ordinance that would severely restrict the commercial availability of products containing ... phthalates and bisphenol A.”

No Health Risks

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has investigated phthalates and bisphenol A and has found no health risks associated with current exposure to the chemicals.

A newly released study of bisphenol A supports EPA’s findings. The European Union’s Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has just released a report concluding there is no reliable evidence that low-level exposure to bisphenol A threatens human health.

According to the report, “low-dose effects of BPA [bisphenol A] in rodents have not been demonstrated in a robust and reproducible way, such that they could be used as pivotal studies for risk assessment.”

Moreover, a number of other studies applying low doses of BPA were also unable to demonstrate low-dose effects on reproduction or development,” the report observes.

Children Not Vulnerable

A February 1 news release from the George Mason University Statistical Assessment Service notes the European study “not only reaffirms the safety of BPA, it sharply criticizes the methodology used in many of the low-dose exposure studies on rodents (which have formed the basis for activist attempts to have BPA proscribed). These conflict with recent tests more rigorously conducted using ‘comprehensive protocols’ that did not show reproductive damage to rodents.”

“The American Council on Science and Health [ACSH] did a blue-ribbon panel report ... on the subject of phthalates and health about four years ago. We could find no evidence that phthalates pose any risk to human health.”

ELIZABETH WHELAN
PRESIDENT
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON SCIENCE AND HEALTH

“In most cases children are no more susceptible than the general population,” Whelan said. “We wrote a whole book on the topic of child exposure. It is an issue where environmental activists try to get around the science by playing the fear card and attempting to appeal to the protective emotions of adults toward their children.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Radiation Myths Harming Public Health

Review of
Underexposed: What If Radiation Is Actually Good for You?
By Ed Hiserodt
Laissez Faire Books, 2005
247 pages, $14.95, ISBN 0930073355

I was recently invited to lunch by the editors of Newsweek magazine in New York City to discuss with them my views on what should be included in their next special issue on the nation’s environmental priorities. They were quite shocked when I told them that one of my top three, just behind applying DDT to stamp out malaria and improving drinking water supplies for impoverished nations, was reducing the unwanted fear of low-level radiation that grips most of the world’s population.

I was determined to call this issue to Newsweek’s attention because I had recently read Ed Hiserodt’s new book, Underexposed. I cannot recommend this book too strongly, nor can I praise it articulately enough.

Identifies False Theory
Let us first examine the Linear No-Threshold (LNT) theory, by which we have been held hostage for so long. To take it to an absurd extreme so you will easily understand it, the theory basically says that if 100 percent of a given population will die from a fall from a 100 foot cliff, and 50 percent would die when falling from a height of 50 feet, then we can expect that one person of a hundred would die when falling from a height of one foot.

Silly as this seems, we use the same theory when studying the effects of chemicals and heavy metal intake by humans. Substances such as mercury, lead, tin, cadmium, oxygen, fluorine, arsenic, and selenium are toxic in large quantities, yet critical to our health in small quantities.

We call the phenomenon of harm at high doses and help at low doses “hormesis,” derived from the Greek word “hormos,” which means to excite. Thus, a substance that excites a positive bodily response at a low dose and is harmful at high doses is considered hormetic. Vitamins and trace minerals clearly show the difference a dose makes. The same is true of sunlight, noise, and stress.

Radiation Fears Unwarranted
A common measure of nuclear radiation is the millirem, or mrem. The average background radiation in the United States is 300 mrem per year, though higher at altitudes well above sea level, such as Denver.

Low-level radiation is a “green issue.” The media tends not to criticize their green friends who oppose any and all forms of radiation. Indeed, if low levels of radiation are realized to be benign, then there goes a central argument of anti-nuclear activists.

There is in fact no scientifically credible evidence that low-level radiation is harmful, yet there is substantial evidence that it actually inoculates the body to resist the negative effects of future high doses. At the same time, low-dose radiation appears to have positive effects in increasing immune system competency.

Hiserodt informs us that if we want to avoid our natural annual background radiation, we would have to move to Antarctica or live underwater in a nuclear submarine. We could also encourage people to move from the high plains of Colorado—where the cancer rates are low—to states where background radiation is low … but cancer rates are higher.

But of course we are not going to do any of these things, because if an increase in low-level radiation caused any problems at all we would have seen the evidence long ago, in the form of dead bodies. If low-level radiation harmed human health, Deadwood, Colorado (elevation 11,000 feet) would be well known for its citizens’ short life spans, but that is not the case. In fact, the opposite is true.

According to Hiserodt, the only people who think there is any real danger from low-level radiation are the regulators, antinuclear activists, environmental zealots, and government scientists who cling to the Linear No-Threshold hypothesis.

Background Radiation Cuts Cancer
Hiserodt recounts how Dr. Bernard Cohen’s studies were published in 1980, and an even more comprehensive study was reported 15 years ago. It conclusively showed positive effects of low-level radiation on 72,358 workers.

Perhaps the most telling real-world evidence of the benefits of low-level radiation is how the uneven distribution of background radiation around the world parallels the variations in human cancer rates. The higher the natural background radiation, the lower the local cancer rates.

Hiserodt briefly but clearly describes nuclear reactors, saying, “the new designs are even safer than the old—but how do you get safer than no deaths, no injuries, and no negative effects to the public from several thousand reactor years of operation with thousands of giga watt-hours of life-enhancing electrical energy having been generated?”

Wasting Money, Lives
The question of whether tiny amounts of radiation must be avoided, even at great cost, is neither abstract nor trivial. Hundreds of billions of dollars are targeted to remediate U.S. sites even though there is no scientific basis for claiming any health or other benefit from removing low-level radiation.

Worldwide, Hiserodt tells us, the cost of such remediation has been estimated at more than a trillion dollars. This is in addition to the unquantifiable cost of lives lost by fear and avoidance of mammograms, irradiated food, and other beneficial uses of radiation.

I cannot recommend Hiserodt’s book too highly. It addresses a subject few understand, but thanks to this author’s comprehensive research and clear writing ability, you are now within a few dollars and a few hours of grasping this important subject.

Jay Lehr, Ph.D. (lehr@heartland.org) is science director for The Heartland Institute.
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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*