Atrazine Ban Would Endanger Illinois Economy

By Bonner R. Cohen

A ban on atrazine, a widely used weed-killing herbicide, would inflict enormous financial damage on the Illinois economy and degrade the state’s environment, according to a study released February 27. Activists are pushing for such a ban in Illinois and other states.

“Without atrazine, Illinois growers would absorb a loss in the first year between $161 million and $577 million,” the study stated.

Climate Realists Beat Alarmists in NY Debate

By James M. Taylor

Claims by global warming alarmists that “the debate is over” took a significant hit on March 14 when an audience at a prestigious New York debating society declared three prominent climate realists the winners in a debate on climate change science sponsored by Intelligence Squared and distributed to National Public Radio affiliates nationwide.

A debate was sponsored by Intelligence Squared, which holds debates eight times a year on important current events. For each debate topic, the organization invites three prominent proponents and three prominent opponents to debate each side of the proposition in front of an audience numbering in the hundreds. The debate is taped by National Public Radio (NPR) and distributed to NPR affiliates across the nation.

A pre-debate poll of audience members indicated that by a 2 to 1 margin (57 percent to 29 percent, with 14 percent undecided) they believed global warming is a crisis. After the debate, however, the audience indicated by 46 percent to 42 percent they do not believe it is a crisis, with 12 percent undecided.

Supporting the proposition that global warming is not a crisis were Richard S. Lindzen, professor of meteorology at MIT; Michael Crichton, best-selling author and climate change realist; and Philip Stott, University of East Anglia. The three propounded that climate change is not a crisis at any level, that the focus on global warming is a distraction from real environmental problems such as overfishing, overgrazing, deforestation, and pollution, and that modern climate science is riddled with mistakes.

By John Dale Dunn

Texas Utilities (TXU) announced in February a preliminary agreement for the largest company buyout in U.S. history, which may bring a resolution to an ongoing dispute over the utility’s proposal to build 11 coal-fired power plants with modern emissions-reduction technology.

In testimony before the U.S. Congress on March 21, former vice president Al Gore asserted “there is no longer any serious debate over the basic points that make up the consensus on global warming.” He advocated laws that would force U.S. companies to reduce emissions.

By James M. Taylor

In testimony before the U.S. Congress on March 21, former vice president Al Gore asserted “there is no longer any serious debate over the basic points that make up the consensus on global warming.” He advocated laws that would force U.S. companies to reduce emissions.
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Minn. Legislators Hear Latest Global Warming Science

By James Hoare

Minnesota state legislators set aside March 8 to hear firsthand the latest scientific developments regarding global warming. State Sens. Mike Jungbauer (R-East Bethel) and David Hann (R-Reden Prairie), along with Reps. Tom Emmer (R-Delano) and Mike Beard (R-Shakopee), sponsored a symposium at the State Capitol on “What Scientists Are Really Saying about Global Warming.”

Latest Science Presented

The Earth has been warming at a steady rate for the past three decades, reported the symposium’s first speaker, Dr. Patrick Michaels, past president of the American Association of State Climatologists and a visiting professor at Virginia Tech University.

Michaels emphasized that temperatures have been rising by 0.18 degrees Celsius per decade since a recent cool spell ended in the late 1970s. The rate of warming is likely to remain steady for the foreseeable future, Michaels noted.

Michaels presented data from numerous computer models and showed real-world temperatures have failed to match most of the computer projections. Only the computer models predicted the minimal future warming have accurately forecast recent temperatures, Michaels reported.

Computer models predicting more dramatic warming rely on unrealistic projections of Third World economic growth, resulting in a dramatic rise in greenhouse gas emissions in those regions, Michaels explained.

While a rise in global carbon dioxide emissions will likely result in warmer temperatures, Michaels said, realistic projections of future economic growth and greenhouse gas emissions will result in a mild planetary warming no less gradual than is currently occurring.

Evangelical Alliance Refuted

The symposium’s second speaker, Dr. Calvin Beisner, national spokesman for the Interfaith Stewardship Alliance, challenged recent media reports of an emerging alliance between evangelical Christians and global warming alarmists.

Beisner observed that while global warming alarmists have launched a public relations initiative based on the recent conversion of a few prominent evangelicals, evangelicals as a whole are far more skeptical of alarmists’ warming claims.

Beisner noted that groups such as the Interfaith Stewardship Alliance and the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty have gone even further, taking an active role in questioning the wisdom of diverting precious resources to very speculative warming predictions.

Christians who seek to improve the global environment and the plight of Third World communities can have a more positive impact by directing their resources to fighting malaria and providing running water and affordable electricity to the increase in Third World communities, Beisner said.

Beisner noted some of the most prominent and respected scientists who challenge global warming alarmism are themselves evangelicals.

Myths Debunked

The symposium’s final speaker, James M. Taylor, senior fellow for environmental policy at The Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, gave a point-by-point refutation of the most commonly asserted global warming catastrophes.

Taylor reported scientists are deeply divided on the causes and extent of global warming, and that no scientific consensus exists on the issue. Taylor noted more than 17,000 scientists have signed a petition challenging alarmist global warming theory, and that recent surveys of climate scientists show a significant skepticism toward the alleged “scientific consensus.”

Citing refereed scientific literature to support each of his statements, Taylor noted:

- Himalayan alpine glaciers are growing rather than shrinking;
- Global warming is not affecting the ice cap on East Africa’s Mt. Kilimanjaro, as local temperatures are cooling and the ice cap is shrinking due to local deforestation rather than warming temperatures;
- Global warming is not leading to an increase in tornado activity;
- Global warming is having little or no impact on hurricanes; and
- The Sahara desert is shrinking—not expanding—due to increasing levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide.

Taylor also pointed out:

- Greenland’s ice sheet is in rough equilibrium;
- The Gulf Stream is in no danger of a shutdown that could trigger an ice age;
- Antarctic temperatures are falling, and the continent is gaining rather than losing ice;
- Polar bears are in little danger from warming temperatures; and

- The planet’s moderate warming is unprecedented by historic standards.

Future Symposia Expected

“This was a very worthwhile event,” Jungbauer said in an interview for this story. “Not only did we present to legislators the latest sound science regarding global warming, but we also have generated a good deal of media interest in covering all sides of the global warming debate.

“We would like to build on the success of this event for future, similar symposia,” Jungbauer added.

James Hoare (ljahoare@aol.com) is an attorney practicing in Rochester, New York.
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Ethanol Driving Up Corn Prices
Eliminating tariff could provide relief

By John Dale Dunn

Continuing high demand for corn, fueled by increasing ethanol production, will keep corn prices at historic levels for the foreseeable future, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) announced on March 1.

“The continuing high demand for corn, fueled by increasing ethanol production, will keep corn prices at historic levels for the foreseeable future...”

Fuel Displacing Food
New ethanol requirements for transportation needs in the U.S. will pass the 2.15 billion bushels of corn projected for 2007 and rise to more than 3 billion in 2008, USDA reports. Corn consumers, including livestock farmers, will feel the impact as corn prices hover near $4 per bushel. The primary driver of the rise in corn prices is the Bush administration’s strategy to replace 20 percent of petroleum usage with alternative fuels, such as corn-based ethanol, within the next decade.

Sugar cane, grown primarily in tropical climates, is a more efficient source of ethanol, but it cannot be widely grown in the United States. The U.S. currently imposes a $4.54 cent tariff on ethanol imports.

Not Viable Without Subsidies
Jon Hawkins of the left-wing Natural Resources Defense Defense Council explained the economics of ethanol versus petroleum fuels at the Heartland Institute’s March 17 Energy Summit in Chicago. Taylor pointed out that without government subsidies and mandates, there would be no commercial market for ethanol because it would cost roughly $4 to $6 per gallon at the pump. “Ethanol subsidies are directly draining the wallets of American taxpayers,” Taylor said in an interview after the conference. “Not only that,” Taylor noted, “ethanol subsidies are raising prices for fuel consumers, raising prices for corn consumers, and causing a related rise in the price of numerous other food crops.”

Tentative Deal Reached
In a February 26 news release, Dave Hawkins of the left-wing Natural Resources Defense Council called the proposed buyout “the largest leveraged buyout in history.” The deal, however, faces hurdles from a skeptical state legislature.

Continued from page 1

Texas

“Continuing high demand for corn, fueled by increasing ethanol production, will keep corn prices at historic levels for the foreseeable future...”

The price shock is also being felt by the agriculture industry. Livestock and poultry farmers told the U.S. House of Representatives Agriculture Committee on March 8 high corn prices are making it difficult for them to meet feed costs. “U.S. pork producers support the development and use of alternative and renewable fuels as a way to reduce America’s dependence on foreign oil,” Joy Philippi, a Nebraska farmer and past president of the National Pork Producers Council, told the committee, “but we continue to have jitters over the rapid expansion of the corn-based ethanol industry and the unintended consequences it is having on the U.S. livestock industry.”

Ethanol subsidies are directly draining the wallets of American taxpayers,” Taylor said in an interview after the conference. “Not only that,” Taylor noted, “ethanol subsidies are raising prices for fuel consumers, raising prices for corn consumers, and causing a related rise in the price of numerous other food crops.”

Jill Kravis of the Heartland Institute, expressed optimism about continuing its efforts to meaningfully reduce existing carbon emissions and seeks to join United States Climate Action Partnership (USCAP). “...As part of our support for USCAP, we are also pledging to support the mandatory cap and trade program to regulate carbon emissions.”

Texas Energy Future said that to break the short-run vs. long-run power demands and the planned reduction in new building capacity, “TXU will implement an aggressive demand reduction program through a $450 million investment in conservation and energy efficiency activities over the next five years.”

“The truth is that we need not just three but all 11 of TXU’s proposed plants...If they don’t build those plants we will have to pay higher prices for energy and we may well have less-reliable power sources.”

BILL PEACOCK
DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM
TEXAS PUBLIC POLICY FOUNDATION

Legislators Skeptical
Texas legislators, however, expressed concern about the deal. Lawmakers are considering legislation that would delay or nix the deal by requiring the state’s Public Utility Commission to study and approve the deal before it can take effect. Additionally, U.S. Rep. Joe Barton (R) in a March 9 letter asked the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to review the proposed deal.

“I want to ensure first and foremost that the leveraged buyout by KKR is in the best interest of the ratepayers of Texas,” Barton said in a March 12 news release. “If New York investors benefit as well, all the better. I will not, however, stand idly by while investors from New York or anywhere else benefit on the backs of the Texas electricity grid or the Texas ratepayers.”

Higher Costs Looming
Bill Peacock, director of the Center for Economic Freedom at the Texas Public Policy Foundation, emphasized the need for the added capacity originally proposed by TXU.

“The attack by environmental activists on the proposed coal-fired plants will likely have a negative impact on both prices and reliability in our state’s electricity market,” observed Peacock. “The truth is that we need not just three but all 11 of TXU’s proposed plants to keep the lights on and the state’s economy growing,” Peacock said. “If they don’t build those plants we will have to pay higher prices for energy and we may well have less-reliable power sources.”

Dallas, Texas Mayor Laura Miller opposes the new, low-emission power plants proposed by TXU.
Biotech Cottonseed Shows Promise to Alleviate Third World Hunger

By Bonner R. Cohen

A new, high-protein and low-cost food for people struggling with hunger in Third World nations may soon be available thanks to advances in biotechnology, researchers reported in the January 27 Science Daily.

Researchers at Texas A&M University are using gene-splicing techniques to reduce gossypol, a highly toxic compound, from cottonseed to a level considered safe for human consumption.

Gene Silenced

The cottonseed from genetically modified plants meets World Health Organization and U.S. Food and Drug Administration standards for food consumption.

Keerti Rathore, a Texas Agricultural Experiment Station plant technologist who has led the research, noted in a Texas A&M news release that the genetically modified seed has the potential to provide a nutritious and affordable food source for as many as 600 million people a year.

Rathore used RANI, a technology that can “silence” a gene, to achieve his breakthrough. RANI technology allowed Rathore to target the gossypol gene only in the cottonseed but let the gene express itself in the rest of the plant. Z. Fire and Craig C. Mello discovered RANI, an achievement that landed the two scientists the Nobel Prize for medicine in 2006.

“Very few people realize that for every pound of cotton fiber, the plant produces 1.6 pounds of seed,” Rathore pointed out in the Texas A&M news release.

High-Quality Protein

Global cottonseed production is currently 44 million metric tons every year. Cottonseed typically contains about 22 percent protein. The cottonseed protein is considered high quality by nutritionists.

The food value of the genetically modified crop will be especially beneficial in countries “where there are small farmers who grow cotton, and if they could use the seed they could get much more value from it,” Rathore noted.

The researchers have been successful in maintaining the trait through three generations in the lab. The next step will be to screen for the best plants from the many lines they have produced, then grow the cotton plants with the trait in a greenhouse.

Field demonstrations will follow that, Rathore said.

Multiple Benefits Envisioned

Rathore estimates it will take at least another decade in the development of cotton varieties for widespread commercial production. Plants with the new trait developed by the team of scientists could make the cottonseed more valuable both as a food crop and as a more palatable livestock food source.

“One could utilize the cottonseed either directly as food if there is no gossypol or as feed for livestock,” Rathore pointed out.

Cattle can tolerate the gossypol, but only after digesting it through the four compartments in their stomachs.

Natural Scientific Progression

Henry Miller, a research fellow at Stanford University’s Hoover Institution, noted virtually all of the 200 major crops grown in the United States have been genetically engineered in some way. “Plant breeders—not Mother Nature—gave us seedless grapes and watermelons, the tangelo, and fungus-resistant strawberries,” said Miller.

“In North American and European diets, only fish and wild game and berries may be said not to have been genetically engineered in some way,” Miller added.

Bonner R. Cohen (bonnercohen@comcast.net) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research in Washington, DC and author of The Green Wave: Environmentalism and its Consequences, published by the Capital Research Center.


Organic Farming Strains Environment

By James M. Taylor

You can cross off “saving the environment” as a reason to purchase organic foods, according to a new study conducted for the United Kingdom’s Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs.

The 200-page report, completed in December 2006 and released to the media in February 2007, supports comments from British Environment Secretary David Milibrand, who in January 2007 said organic food is simply a “lifestyle choice” that may not be any more beneficial than conventionally grown foods.

No Environment Benefit

After studying 150 organic and non-organic food products, lead author Ken Green, professor of environmental management at the Manchester Business School, reported, “There is certainly insufficient evidence available to state that organic agriculture overall would have less of an environmental impact than conventional agriculture.”

The researchers found no evidence that organic farming provides any overall environmental advantages ... and also found that many popular organic products strain the environment much more than food products produced through conventional methods. Organically grown vegetables were singled out as particularly stressful on natural resources.

“The new report from the Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs in the U.K. demonstrates once again that organic food is just marketing hype designed to separate consumers from more of their dollars,” said Alex Avery, director of research at the Hudson Institute’s Center for Global Food Issues.

“Just like so many other past organic-benefit claims—for example, that organic food is more nutritious, itself lies, and safer than conventional food—when examined under the cold, harsh light of reality, the supposed eco-benefits of organic farming vanish like a phantom,” said Avery.

Organic Produce Wasteful

Organically grown vine tomatoes, the report documented, require more than six times as much space to grow to maturity as do conventionally produced tomatoes.

In addition to requiring more cropland, organic tomatoes consume nearly double the energy it takes to grow conventional tomatoes. In addition, organic tomatoes, typically grown in heated greenhouses, generate 100 times as much carbon dioxide as tomatoes grown conventionally in warm climates.

Organic milk production also creates tremendous environmental strain, it requires 80 percent more land to produce a gallon of organic milk than it takes to produce conventional milk, the study found. Organic milk production emits 20 percent more carbon dioxide and produces double the unwanted runoff of nitrogen and other “natural” byproducts that lead to water pollution and soil acidification, the report noted.

Organic Chicken Problems

It takes 25 percent more energy to raise organic chickens than to raise them conventionally, according to the study.

Organic chicken production emits nearly 50 percent more carbon dioxide and produces nearly double the soil and water pollutants as conventionally raised chickens. Moreover, organic chickens deplete 340 percent more natural resources than conventionally raised chickens, the study reported.

“Consumers should avoid being misled into shopping out of fear and propaganda,” said Avery, “and instead realize that the modern food system is not only incredibly safe—last fall’s spinach E. coli outbreak was caused by organically grown spinach on a pasture-based, 100 percent grass-fed beef ranch—it is also incredibly efficient. And that is just good for the environment.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Brazilian Sugarcane Subsidies Are No Model for U.S. Policy

By James M. Taylor

Ethanol subsidies and mandates similar to those imposed by Brazil during the past 30 years are not an economically viable option for the United States,” Xavier writes. “This is due to several factors, including the superiority of sugarcane to corn as an ethanol feedstock, Brazil’s large unskilled labor force (sugarcane production is very labor intensive), and a climate ideally suited to growing sugarcane.

“While the U.S. and Brazil make about the same volume of ethanol, the U.S. uses almost twice as much land to cultivate corn for ethanol as Brazil does to cultivate sugarcane for the same purpose,” Xavier adds.

Impossible Without Subsidies

Xavier notes corn-based ethanol is not capable of competing in the free market absent substantial federal subsidies.

“American taxpayers today pay twice for ethanol,” Xavier observes, “once in crop subsidies to corn farmers and again in a 51-cent subsidy for every gallon of ethanol. Without such a subsidy, ethanol simply would not be cost-competitive with gasoline.”

Harms Environment

Xavier also notes ethanol may damage the environment when produced on a large scale from low-yielding crops such as corn.

Expanding corn acreage to meet artificially inflated ethanol demand will come at the expense of forests and prairies that are presently not cultivated, Xavier observes.

Government Distorting Markets

Jerry Taylor, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, agrees with Xavier that Brazil is not a good model for U.S. policy. “The history of government subsidies and mandates, be they for corn ethanol, sugar ethanol, hydrogen, hybrids, or whatever, is one of economically painful distortions to the free market,” Taylor said.

“If ethanol is or will be a viable competitor to petroleum, then private citizens certainly will not require government to force them or induce them to pursue ethanol,” Taylor added. “In the meantime, why should government mandate substantial economic investment in a technology that may ultimately fail, and certainly has failed to date?”

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

Biotech to Ease Ethanol-Related Corn Shortage

By Bonner R. Cohen

Biotechnology will play a key role in boosting corn production to meet the growing demand for ethanol fuel stock, two former presidents of the National Corn Growers Association told Hawaii state legislators and various farmers’ groups during a week-long tour of the state in mid-March.

Important to Economy

“There are real benefits to biotech corn, which is why so many American farmers have been quick to adopt the technology,” Fred Yoder, a past president of the National Corn Growers Association, explained in a public briefing.

“Biotechnology will play a key role in boosting corn production to meet the growing demand for ethanol fuel stock ...”

“Since most of the corn planted around the world—including biotech corn—spent at least some portion of its development time in Hawaii, we want elected officials to understand how important Hawaii is to our industry as a technology incubator. We need to be able to continue counting on their support,” said Yoder.

Demand Growing

Facing rapidly growing demand for corn-based ethanol in the United States, scientists are busily exploring ways to modify corn genetically so as to increase yields and better serve the nation’s energy needs. The proliferation of ethanol plants across the country has put huge strains on America’s supply of corn, as farmers who use the crop as feed vie with colleagues who produce corn for ethanol.

Relief could come through application of agricultural biotechnology to the growing of corn, a process that is already underway. In 2006, 61 percent of the corn grown in the United States was genetically modified, compared to 52 percent in 2005 and 46 percent in 2004, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. To satisfy the voracious appetite for corn from the food and energy sectors, scientists want to make corn more resistant to
insects, weather, and disease.

“The corn used to produce biofuels is increasingly coming from biotech crops,” said Yoder. “American farmers are willing and able to meet market demands, and the crop biotech R&D being done in Hawaii is playing an increasingly important role in our ability to do so.”

Supply Problems Remain
Gregory Conko, director of food safety policy at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, agrees biotech will help increase yields. “Biotechnology can help improve the efficiency of generating ethanol, either by altering the composition of a plant species to make sugar extraction more efficient or by altering the composition of the enzymes that ferment those sugars into alcohol,” Conko said.

Nevertheless, “using more corn for ethanol means either using less for food or bringing new land into corn production, and that means either food prices will have to rise or undeveloped land will have to be brought under plow,” said Conko.

“Neither of those outcomes is desirable,” Conko continued. “Plus, government subsidies for corn ethanol will cause private capital to flow away from research into competing alternative energy technologies, which means that we might overlook a viable future fuel source.”

Further Gains Expected
Bill Niebur, vice president for genetics research and development at DuPont, told attendees at the 2007 Commodity Classic in Tampa, Florida on March 1, “The incredible productivity gains we are seeing from advanced plant breeding and biotechnology today [are] only just the beginning.”

Niebur reports DuPont is researching corn that would be genetically modified to enhance ethanol uses. “By applying cutting-edge science across the biofuel value chain, we will be able to help farmers more than double the gallons of ethanol produced from an acre of corn—600 gallons from grain and 200 gallons from stover—within the next 10 years,” Niebur said at the Tampa event.

Niebur expects eventually as much as 55 percent of the corn planted in the United States will be genetically modified varieties.

“It is great that DuPont is researching ethanol-specific corn technology,” said Alex Avery, director of research and education at the Hudson Institute’s Center for Global Food Issues. “Any extent that DuPont can raise net energy gain is a step toward weaning the industry off government subsidies.”

Bonner R. Cohen (bonnercohen@comcast.net) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research in Washington, DC and author of The Green Wave: Environmentalism and its Consequences, published by the Capital Research Center.

CONTINUED from left

Bush Moves to Curb Agency Guidance Abuse

By William L. Kovacs

With very little fanfare, President George W. Bush quietly signed an executive order on January 18, 2007 approving major changes to the federal regulatory review process. EO 13422 gives the president and his appointees greater management authority over executive agencies, and specifically over the quasi-regulatory “guidance documents” that have until now escaped executive review.

Loophole Closed
It took a full week following the signing of the order before the mainstream media realized its significance. But once it did, the story became front-page news.

Following a New York Times above-the-fold article, several environmentalists and non-government organizations publicly denounced the order as an unwarranted expansion of executive power that would roll back public safeguards.

To the contrary, supporters argue, the executive order closed a legal loophole that had allowed federal agencies to circumvent regulatory review and planning requirements through the issuance of guidance documents.

By law, guidance documents have never had any legally binding effect—they are merely an agency’s interpretation of how the public can comply with a particular rule or regulation.

Even so, the use of guidance documents to regulate the public had become a common practice. Even though guidance documents do not have legally binding effect, they have practical binding effect when issued in a manner that pressures private citizens to act according to their directives.

‘Guidance’ Becomes Requirement
An example of a guidance document masquerading as a rule is the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) environmental justice guideline, “Interim Guidance for Investigating Title IV Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits,” issued in February 1998.

In light of the profound legal and policy ramifications of this document, the House Committee on Government Reform asked the General Accounting Office (GAO) to determine whether the guidance document was actually a rule. On January 20, 1999 GAO sent a letter to the subcommittee confirming the guidance document was indeed a rule and should have gone through the formal notice and comment period required for a rulemaking.

Used as Shortcut
It is far easier for federal agencies to issue guidance documents than to undergo the rigorous of rulemaking. Rulemakings require internal agency review; public participation (including notice and comment under the Administrative Procedure Act); compliance with the analytical requirements of Executive Order 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act; Office of Management and Budget review; Congressional review; and potentially judicial review.

Because of these increasingly stringent analytical requirements—which are primarily instituted by Presidents Carter and Clinton—agencies have had a strong incentive to issue “rules” in the form of procedurally onerous guidance documents that—intentionally or not—cut the public and the regulated community out of the regulatory process.

“[Executive Order] 13422 gives the president and his appointees greater management authority over executive agencies ...”

Agencies Now Accountable
Now, Bush’s Executive Order 13422 requires the president’s executive agencies to (1) state why a rule is needed; (2) give an accurate accounting of costs and benefits of an individual rule and the aggregate costs and benefits of all rules issued by the agency that year, and (3) create a Regulatory Policy Officer (RPO) within each agency to ensure the executive order is implemented by the agency.

The RPO will be a political appointee, responsible to the president, and will be required to coordinate with the Office of Management and Budget.

Want Congressional Control
Critics have complained the executive order politicizes the regulatory process by allowing a political appointee—who reports to the president and not Congress—to control over an agency’s regulatory output. They say they fear the activities of the RPO will not be subject to the same transparency and accountability as, say, an agency administrator, who is confirmed by, and reports to, Congress.

Yet the RPO is most certainly accountable—to the chief executive. Like an agency administrator, the RPO serves at the pleasure of the president and is ultimately responsible to him. Hence, supporters of the executive order say, the criticism is simply a bid by Congress for more direct power over executive branch officials.

Critics continue to decry EO 13422 as an unwarranted and possibly unconstitutional expansion of executive power, yet it is certainly well-settled that the president has the power to make political appointments of officers within his own executive agencies.

Hysterical claims of unconstitutional “power grabs” serve only to distract us from the important and sizable problems with the regulatory process that EO 13422 is intended to address.

William L. Kovacs (pr@uschamber.com) is vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Environment, Technology, and Regulatory Affairs Division.
Global Warming Creates Need for New Dams: Schwarzenegger

By Bonner R. Cohen

Hoping to rally support for California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger’s (R) $4 billion plan to build two new hydroelectric dams, state Sen. Dave Cogdill (R-Modesto) told the California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF) on March 1 that the dams are needed to counteract potential global warming effects.

Schwarzenegger, who has made countering the effects of climate change a high-profile issue for his administration, is asking California voters to approve in 2008 $4 billion for two new reservoirs, both of which will be hydroelectric projects.

“With California’s booming population, and with the impact that global warming will have to our snow packs, we need more infrastructure, a widespread water storage and delivery system, including above-ground facilities,” Schwarzenegger said in a January 9 news release.

“This funding is critical to upgrade our water infrastructure so the next generation of Californians is not faced with a shortage of this precious resource,” the governor continued. “We need a modern, comprehensive approach to addressing our growing water needs that includes storage, conveyance, and conservation.”

If approved by voters, the dams would be the first new state-owned dam and reservoir projects in more than 30 years.

Seeking Approval

Cogdill was skirted by the support of the California Farm Bureau Federation, which to date has taken no position on the proposal, at the March 1 CFBF Leadership Conference.

“Whatever your position may be on global warming and climate change,” Cogdill said, “the data are pretty clear on the changes in hydrology relating to snowfall in this state. If we do in fact deal with more rain in the future when we’ve had snow in the past, then we’ve got to do a better job of managing that flow of precipitation. An important component is to make sure our ability to store and manage that runoff is enhanced, and that’s where our bill comes in.”

Responding Skeptically

New research reported in the February 16 Sacramento Bee suggests the governor’s scheme may increase the amount of greenhouse gases put into the air. Substantial greenhouse gas emissions, the Bee asserts, will be released when cement is made for the dam, when the dam is under construction, and when the land behind it is flooded, causing vegetation to rot, which releases carbon dioxide and methane into the air.

“If these [dams] are going to be built as a response to climate change, you at least need to convey some people to study the effect it will have,” Danny Cullenward, a research associate at the Program for Energy and Sustainable Development at Stanford University, told the Bee. “The facts are in that it’s not a zero-impact source from an emissions standpoint.”

According to several recent research projects summarized by the Bee, some reservoirs absorb more carbon dioxide than they emit, while the net effects at other manmade lakes vary according to geology, climate, reservoir operations, and other factors.

Studying Effects

To date, only one such study has been carried out in California. The study, released in 2004 by researchers at the University of Quebec in Montreal, produced mixed results. It found California’s Shasta Lake released 224 tons per day of carbon dioxide, equal to about 14,500 average automobiles, each driven 40 miles a day. Emissions at California’s Lake Oroville equaled about 3,400 cars. By contrast, California’s New Melones reservoir, probably because of a difference in water acidity, absorbed carbon dioxide equal to about 975 cars.

Emitting Methane

Reservoirs also emit methane, a more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. The Canadian researchers found each of the three California lakes they studied emitted about a ton of methane a day.

Cullenward, who has published a review of the science of reservoir emissions in the journal Climatic Change, says methane from reservoirs may boost global methane inventories 20 percent. California has yet to count reservoir emissions in its own greenhouse gas inventory.

“The science is still unsettled,” said Sterling Burnett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis. “Ironically, Schwarzenegger’s proposal may add to greenhouse gas emissions, although it is hard to tell.

“What we do know,” Burnett added, “is that dams have historically been prone to boondoggles, forcing taxpayers as a whole to pay for benefits for a few.”

While the fate of the reservoirs will be determined by voters (and perhaps by courts), the environmental issues raised by the governor’s initiative show unintended consequences are alive and well in the climate debate, critics say. Schwarzenegger’s water project demonstrates how a technology deemed “clean” in certain quarters can be seen as a “pollutant” by others.

Bonner R. Cohen (bonnercohen@comcast.net) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research in Washington, DC and author of The Green Wave: Environmentalism and its Consequences, published by the Capital Research Center.

INTERNET INFO


Democrats Support Less-Expensive Alternative

While the California Farm Bureau Federation has yet to take a position on California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger’s (R) proposal to have citizens fund a $4 billion dam project, Democratic legislators strongly oppose the plan. Democrats say the state can more economically augment its water storage capacity by expanding Lake Mead on the Colorado River.

Environmental tests performed in February concluded that expanding Lake Mead by another 1.5 million acre-feet would provide enough water for an additional 3 million households each year without significant environmental consequences.

“Democrats say the state can more economically augment its water storage capacity by expanding Lake Mead on the Colorado River."

Much Less Costly

Importantly, expanding capacity in Lake Mead would be substantially less expensive than building new dams, Democrats point out.

“Democrats say the state can more economically augment its water storage capacity by expanding Lake Mead on the Colorado River."
citizens to cut their greenhouse gas emissions by 90 percent by mid-century.

Little Prior Notice
Gore’s testimony became controversial even before it started, as he violated Congressional rules requiring persons who voluntarily present testimony to submit a written version of their remarks at least 48 hours prior to making a personal appearance.

Gore failed to do so, submitting some written remarks only moments before making his personal appearance. Rep. Joe Barton (R-TX) protested that this deprived representatives the opportunity to scrutinize Gore’s testimony for factual accuracy.

In addition to being late in submitting his remarks, Gore delivered substantially different testimony than appeared in his written remarks.

New Restrictions Proposed
In his verbal testimony, Gore called for new taxes related to carbon dioxide, cap-and-trade carbon limitations, a ban on incandescent light bulbs—to force people to switch to fluorescent bulbs, which use less power but are substantially more expensive—and a ban on the construction of coal-fired power plants.

Gore justified these impositions by asserting in his written remarks, “Hurricanes are getting stronger. Sea levels are rising. Droughts are becoming longer and more intense. Mountain glaciers are receding around the world.”

Scientific Literature Disagrees
Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) noted at the hearing, however, that Gore’s assertions have been thoroughly refuted in the scientific literature.

“It is my perspective that your global warming alarmist pronouncements are now and have always been filled with inaccuracies and misleading statements,” said Inhofe. “Many of the peer-reviewed studies published in such journals as Nature, Geophysical Research Letters, and Science are radiically at odds with your claims.”

A review of the scientific literature supports Inhofe’s claims.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) on November 29, 2005 found a recent upsurge in North Atlantic hurricanes is due to “natural occurring cycles” and “is not related to greenhouse warming.”

According to the most recent findings of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, sea level is expected to rise by only a foot over the next century.

Film’s Claims Refuted
Claims by Gore in An Inconvenient Truth that drought is expanding the southern frontier of the Sahara Desert were refuted by the September 16, 2002 issue of New Scientist magazine, which reported, “Africa’s deserts are in ‘spectacular retreat.’” New Scientist added, “The southern Sahara desert is in retreat, making farming viable again in what were some of the most arid parts of Africa.”

Assertions that global warming is causing a retreat of mountain glaciers were refuted by the March 13, 2005 Insurance Digest and the American Meteorological Association’s September 2006 Journal of Climate. According to the Journal of Climate, “Glaciers are growing in the Himalayan Mountains, confounding global warming alarmists who have recently claimed the glaciers were shrinking and that global warming was to blame.”

Scientists’ have also refuted Gore’s assertions that global warming is causing the glacier atop Africa’s Mt. Kilimanjaro to shrink. According to a November 23, 2003 article published by Nature magazine, “Although it’s tempting to blame the ice loss on global warming, researchers think that deforestation of the mountain’s foothills is the more likely culprit. Without the forests’ humidity, previously moisture-laden winds blew dry. No longer replenished with water, the ice is evaporating in the strong equatorial sunshine.”

Public Catching On
“The public is catching on,” Inhofe pointed out to Gore. “Even the New York Times last week published an article about scientists, many of them your supporters, who say you have overstated your case on global warming—in fact, they warn that you may be hurting the so-called cause with your ‘alarmism.’”

Inhofe challenged Gore to go beyond friendly media and make his claims on the same stage as climate realists.

Given the scientific literature refuting Gore’s claims, “it is no wonder you have turned down the chance to debate the president of the Czech Republic, Vaclav Klaus,” said Inhofe. “And now I understand a debate challenge has been issued by Lord Monckton [of Brenchley]” of Great Britain.

A March 14 debate in New York City between prominent global warming alarmists and prominent climate realists offered insight into why Gore might be refusing to debate. Before the debate, audience members indicated by a 2 to 1 margin they believed global warming is a crisis. After the debate, global warming skeptics outnumbered those believing global warming is a crisis. (See article on page 1.)

“The alarmists have refused to debate for years, despite repeated efforts to get them to do so. Now, we know why,” said Myron Ebell, director of energy and global warming policy at the Competitive Enterprise Institute. “When the facts were presented to an educated and sophisticated audience that was predisposed to believe the alarmists, they lost.”

Rationing Energy Use
At the close of Gore’s testimony, Inhofe challenged Gore to take a pledge to practice what he preaches. Presenting a “Personal Energy Ethics Pledge,” Inhofe challenged Gore to commit to using no more energy in his Tennessee residence than the typical American household.

Inhofe presented a graph showing the Gore residence uses 20 times the energy of the average American household. Although repeatedly asked to sign the pledge, Gore refused to do so.

“Al Gore proved yet again why he not only is the ideal alarmist spokesman from the skeptics’ point of view, but why he also has been canceling con-

Inhofe referred to Gore’s personal energy use

The Heartland Institute’s free online research database. Point your Web browser to http://www.policybot.org and search for document #20895.
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Al Gore’s Testimony before the United States House of Representa-

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
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Global Warming Outlook Far from Alarming

By Patrick J. Michaels

From Hollywood to Capitol Hill, Al Gore’s global warming horror movie An Inconvenient Truth is receiving a tremendous amount of attention this spring. It is a riveting work of science fiction.

Sea Levels Overstated

The main point of the movie is that, unless we do something very serious, very soon about carbon dioxide emissions, much of Greenland’s 630,000 cubic miles of ice is going to fall into the ocean, raising sea levels more than 20 feet by the year 2100.

Where’s the scientific support for this claim? Certainly not in the recent Policymaker’s Summary from the United Nations’ much-anticipated compendium on climate change.

Under the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) medium-range emission scenario for greenhouse gases, a rise in sea level of between 8 and 17 inches is predicted by 2100. Gore’s film thus exaggerates the rise by about 2,000 percent.

Even 17 inches is likely to be an excessively high estimate, because it assumes the concentration of methane, an important greenhouse gas, is growing rapidly. Atmospheric methane concentration hasn’t changed appreciably for seven years, and Nobel Laureate Sherwood Rowland recently pronounced the IPCC’s methane emissions scenarios as “quite unlikely.”

“From Hollywood to Capitol Hill, Al Gore’s global warming horror movie An Inconvenient Truth is receiving a tremendous amount of attention this spring. It is a riveting work of science fiction.”

Nonetheless, the top end of the U.N.’s new projection is about 30 percent lower than it was in its previous report in 2001. “The projections include a contribution due to increased ice flow from Greenland and Antarctica for the rates observed since 1993,” according to the IPCC, “but these flow rates could increase or decrease in the future.”

Greenland Ice Sheet Stable

According to satellite data published in Science in November 2005, Greenland was losing about 25 cubic miles of ice per year. Dividing that by 630,000 total cubic miles of ice yields the annual percentage of ice loss, which, when multiplied by 100, shows Greenland was shedding ice at 0.4 percent per century.

“Was” is the operative word. In early February, Science published another paper showing the recent acceleration of Greenland’s ice loss from its huge glaciers has suddenly reversed.

Honesty vs. Advocacy

Nowhere in the traditionally refereed scientific literature do we find any support for the hypothesis of An Inconvenient Truth. Instead, there’s an unreferred editorial by NASA climate firebrand James E. Hansen, in the journal Climate Change—edited by Steven Schneider of Stanford University, who said in 1989 that scientists had to choose “the right balance between being effective and honest” about global warming—and a paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences that was reviewed by only one person, chosen by the author, again Hansen.

These are the sources for the notion that we have only 10 years to “do” something immediately to prevent an institutionalized tsunami. And given that Gore conceived of his movie only about two years ago, the real clock must be down to eight years!

No Realistic Alternative

It would be nice if my colleagues would actually level with politicians about various “solutions” for climate change. The Kyoto Protocol, if fulfilled by every signatory, would reduce global warming by 0.07 degrees Celsius per half-century. That’s too small to measure, because the Earth’s temperature varies by more than that from year to year.

The Bingaman-Domenici bill in the U.S. Senate would have less effect on global temperature than Kyoto—i.e., less than nothing—for decades, before mandating larger cuts, which themselves will have only a minor effect out past somewhere around 2075. (Imagine, as a thought experiment, if the Senate of 1925 were to have dictated our energy policy for today.)

Ethanol No Solution

Mendacity on global warming is bipartisan. President George W. Bush proposes we replace 20 percent of our current gasoline consumption with ethanol over the next decade. But it’s well-known that even if we turned every kernel of American corn into ethanol, it would displace only 12 percent of our annual gasoline consumption.

The effect on global warming, like Kyoto, would be too small to measure, though the United States would become the first nation in history to burn up its food supply to please a political mob.

Even if we figured out how to process cellulose into ethanol efficiently, only one-third of our greenhouse gas emissions come from transportation. Even the Pollyannish 20 percent displacement of gasoline would reduce our total emissions by only 7 percent below present levels—resulting in emissions about 20 percent higher than Kyoto allows.

And there’s other legislation out there, mandating, variously, emissions reductions of 50, 66, and 80 percent by 2050. How do we get there if we can’t even do Kyoto?

“Imagine, as a thought experiment, if the Senate of 1925 were to have dictated our energy policy for today.”

When it comes to global warming, apparently the truth is inconvenient. And it’s not just the movie that’s fiction. It’s the rhetoric of Congress and the chief executive, too.

Patrick J. Michaels (pmichaels@cato.org) is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and a past president of the American Association of State Climatologists. This article first appeared on National Review Online on February 23, 2007.
Carbon Dioxide Levels Are a Blessing, Not a Problem

By Dudley J. Hughes

For centuries, bloodletting was an accepted medical procedure administered by physicians to treat patients for most illnesses. In today's world, we find it almost inconceivable that such a practice was condoned by entire populations.

Similarly, the claim that increased carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere is causing “global warming” has been accepted as “fact” in many countries worldwide. This belief has no more scientific foundation than the bloodletting of past generations.

Atmospheric carbon dioxide may be gradually rising, but there is no compelling evidence that such a modest rise in CO₂, which still comprises significantly less than 1 percent of the Earth’s atmosphere, will have any substantial negative effect on the Earth’s environment.

“Little publicity is given to the large number of qualified scientists who... contend that if CO₂ plays any part in global warming, it is so insignificant that it can barely be measured, let alone be the major cause.”

Sci. Ignored

Activists have successfully pressured governments to declare CO₂ a pollutant and to take drastic measures to reduce the amount entering the atmosphere. By contrast, little publicity is given to the large number of qualified scientists who strongly contest the claims of the advocacy groups. These scientists contend that if CO₂ plays any part in global warming, it is so insignificant that it can barely be measured, let alone be the major cause.

One rationale given for claims that Earth’s recent, moderate warming is being caused by increases in atmospheric CO₂ is the high surface temperature of Venus, which stands at approximately 472° C. Venus is an Earth-size planet that has a predominantly CO₂ atmosphere.

However, a comparison between Venus and the Earth’s recent moderate increase in atmospheric CO₂ is misleading, because there is 25,000 times as much CO₂ in Venus’s atmosphere as there is in the atmosphere of Earth.

CO₂ Rare in Atmosphere

Earth’s atmosphere is made up of several major gases. For simplicity, let us picture a football stadium with about 10,000 people in the stands. Assume each person represents a small volume of one type of gas. The approximate numbers of people representing the various types of gas are set out in the accompanying table.

Table: If the Earth’s Atmospheric Were a Football Stadium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospheric Gas</th>
<th>Percent in Atmosphere</th>
<th>People in the Stadium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen (N₂)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen (O₂)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argon (A)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Dioxide (CO₂)</td>
<td>0.038%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“[T]he claim that increased carbon dioxide ... in the atmosphere is causing ‘global warming’ ... has no more scientific foundation than the bloodletting of past generations.”

CO₂ Now Historically Low

A thin veneer of sedimentary rocks blankets the Earth’s surface and, along with ice cores from glaciers, can provide a reasonable geologic history of the Earth’s past atmosphere. Scientific study of these rocks suggests the Earth’s atmosphere in ancient times had considerably more CO₂ than today.

Many experiments have demonstrated that the rate of plant growth is largely governed by the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere. As atmospheric CO₂ increases, the growth rate of plants increases dramatically. Similarly, the plant growth rate decreases as atmospheric CO₂ decreases.

Atmospheric carbon dioxide is the basic food for plants, and since plants provide the food for animal life (including humans), CO₂ is the base of the food chain for all advanced life forms on Earth.

The present level of CO₂ in the atmosphere is extremely low by historical standards. If atmospheric CO₂ is significantly reduced, it is more likely that slower plant growth could affect world food supplies while having little effect on global warming. The life of all plants and animals on Earth is dependent on CO₂ for food and oxygen.

Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant. It is the staff of life for our planet.

Dudley J. Hughes (awbyrd@bellsouth.net) is a retired geologist and author of A Geologic Reinterpretation of the Earth’s Atmospheric History, Inferring a Major Role by CO₂, published in 1998 by the College of Geosciences at Texas A & M University.
Senator Challenges Media to Report Objectively

Following the promotion of *An Inconvenient Truth* [last summer], the press did not miss a beat in their role as advocates for global warming fears. ABC News put forth its best effort to secure its standing as an advocate for climate alarmism when the network put out a call for people to submit their anecdotal global warming horror stories in June 2006 for use in a future news segment.

**Brokaw’s Biased Documentary**

In July 2006, the Discovery Channel presented a documentary on global warming narrated by former NBC anchor Tom Brokaw. The program presented only those views of scientists promoting the idea that humans are destroying the Earth’s climate.

You don’t have to take my word for the program’s overwhelming bias; a Bloomberg News TV review noted, “You’ll find more dissent at a North Korean political rally than in this program” because of its lack of scientific objectivity.

Brokaw also presented alarmist James Hansen to viewers as unbiased, failing to note his quarter-million-dollar grant from the partisan Heinz Foundation or his endorsement of Democrat presidential nominee John Kerry in 2004 and his role promoting former Vice President Gore’s Hollywood movie.

Brokaw, however, did find time to impugn the motives of scientists skeptical of climate alarmism when he featured paid environmental partisan Michael Oppenheimer of the group Environmental Defense accusing skeptics of being bought out by the fossil fuel interests.

**Big Alarm Dollars**

The fact remains that political campaign funding by environmental groups to promote climate and environmental alarmism dwarfs spending by the fossil fuel industry by a 3 to 1 ratio. Environmental special interests, through their 527s, spent over $19 million compared to the $7 million that oil and gas [interests] spent through PACs [political action committees] in the 2004 election cycle.

I am reminded of a question the media often asks me about how much I have received in campaign contributions from the fossil fuel industry. My unapologetic answer is “not enough”—especially when you consider the millions [of dollars] partisan environmental groups pour into political campaigns.

**Engineered ‘Consensus’**

Continuing with our media analysis: On July 24, 2006 the *Los Angeles Times* featured an op-ed by Naomi Oreskes, a social scientist at the University of California at San Diego and the author of a 2004 *Science* magazine study. Oreskes insisted a review of 928 scientific papers showed there was 100 percent consensus that global warming was not caused by natural climate variations. This study was also featured in former Vice President Gore’s *An Inconvenient Truth*.

However, the analysis in *Science* magazine excluded nearly 11,000 studies, or more than 90 percent of the papers dealing with global warming, according to a critique by British social scientist Benny Peiser.

Peiser also pointed out that less than 2 percent of the climate studies in the survey actually endorsed the so-called “consensus” that human activity is driving global warming, and some of the studies actually opposed that view.

**New York Times Hype**

But despite this manufactured “consensus,” the media continued to ignore any attempt to question the orthodoxy of climate alarmism.

As the dog days of August rolled in, the American people were once again hit with more hot hype regarding global warming, this time from the *New York Times* op-ed pages. A columnist penned an August 3 column filled with so many inaccuracies it is a wonder the editor of the *Times* saw fit to publish it.

For instance, Bob Herbert’s column made dubious claims about polar bears and about the snows of Kilimanjaro, and he attempted to link this past summer’s heat wave in the United States to global warming—something even alarmist James Hansen does not support.

**How the Media Spread Gore’s Propaganda**

In May [2006], our nation was exposed to perhaps one of the slickest science propaganda films of all time: former Vice President Al Gore’s *An Inconvenient Truth*. In addition to having the backing of Paramount Pictures to market this film, Gore had the full backing of the media, and leading the cheerleading charge was none other than the Associated Press.

On June 27, the Associated Press ran an article by Seth Borenstein that boldly declared, “Scientists give two thumbs up to Gore’s movie.” The article quoted only five scientists praising Gore’s science, despite AP’s having contacted more than 100 scientists.

The fact that more than 80 percent of the scientists contacted by AP had not even seen the movie or that many scientists have harshly criticized the science presented by Gore did not dissuade the news outlet one bit from its mission to promote Gore’s brand of climate alarmism.

I am almost at a loss as to how to begin to address the series of errors, misleading science, and unfounded speculation that appear in the former vice president’s film. Here is what Richard Lindzen, a meteorologist from MIT, has written about *An Inconvenient Truth*:

“A general characteristic of Mr. Gore’s approach is to assiduously ignore the fact that the Earth and its climate are dynamic; they are always changing even without any external forcing. To treat all change as something to fear is bad enough; to do so in order to exploit that fear is much worse.”

“In May [2006], our nation was exposed to perhaps one of the slickest science propaganda films of all time: former Vice President Al Gore’s *An Inconvenient Truth.*”

**Numerous False Claims**

What follows is a very brief summary of the science that the former vice president promotes in either a wrong or misleading way:

He promoted the now-debunked “hockey stick” temperature chart in an attempt to prove man’s overwhelming impact on the climate.

He attempted to minimize the significance of the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age. He insisted on a link between increased hurricane activity and global warming that most scientists believe does not exist.

**Ice Myths**

He asserted that today’s Arctic is experiencing unprecedented warmth while ignoring that temperatures in the 1930s were as warm or warmer.

He claimed the Antarctic was warming and losing ice but failed to note that it is only true of a small region, and the not bulk [of Antarctica] has been cooling and gaining ice.

He hyped unfounded fears that God made the ice in danger of disappearing.

He erroneously claimed the ice cap on Mt. Kilimanjaro is disappearing due to global warming, even while the region cools and researchers blame the ice loss on local land-use practices.

**Political Agenda**

He completely failed to inform viewers that the 48 scientists who accused President Bush of distorting science were part of a political advocacy group set up to support Democrat presidential candidate John Kerry in 2004.

Now that was just a brief sampling of some of the errors presented in *An Inconvenient Truth*. Imagine how long the list would have been if I had actually seen the movie—there would not be enough time to deliver this speech today.

— Sen. James Inhofe
CONTINUED from left

Polar Bears Look Tired?
Finally, a September 15, 2006 Reuters news article claimed polar bears in the Arctic are threatened with extinction by global warming. The article, by correspondent Alister Doyle, quoted a visitor to the Arctic who claims he saw two distressed polar bears.

According to the Reuters article, the man said “one of [the polar bears] looked to be dead and the other one looked to be exhausted.” The article did not state the bears were actually dead or exhausted, rather that they “looked” that way.

Have we really arrived at the point where major news outlets in the U.S. are reduced to analyzing whether or not polar bears in the Arctic appear реal? How does reporting like this get approved for publication by the editors at Reuters? What happened to covering the hard science of this issue?

What was missing from this Reuters news article was the fact that according to biologists who study the animals, polar bears are doing quite well. Biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor from the Arctic government of Nunavut, a territory of Canada, refuted these claims in May when he noted that: “Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number. They are not going extinct, or even appear to be affected at present.”

Sadly, it appears that reporting anecdotes and hearsay as fact has now replaced the basic tenets of journalism for many media outlets.

Smear Campaign
It is an inconvenient truth that so far, 2006 has been a year in which major segments of the media have given up on any quest for journalistic balance, fairness, and objectivity when it comes to climate change. The global warming alarmists and their friends in the media have attempted to smear scientists who dare question the premise of manmade, catastrophic global warming, and as a result some scientists have seen their reputations and research funding dry up.

The media has so relentlessly promoted global warming fears that a British group called the Institute for Public Policy Research—a left-leaning think tank—issued a report in 2006 accusing the media outlets of engaging in what they termed “climate porn” in order to attract the public’s attention.

Bob Carter, a paleoclimatologist from James Cook University in Australia, has described how the media promotes climate fear: “Each such alarmist article is larded with words such as ‘if’, ‘might’, ‘could’, ‘probably’, ‘perhaps’, ‘expected’, ‘projected’, or ‘modeled’—and many involve such deep dreaming or ignorance of scientific facts and principles that they are akin to nonsense,” professor Carter concluded in an op-ed in April 2006.

False Projections
Another example of this relentless hype is the reporting on the seemingly endless number of global warming impact studies that do not even address whether global warming is going to happen. They merely project the impact of potential temperature increases.

The media endlessly hypes studies that purportedly show global warming could increase mosquito populations, or malaria, West Nile Virus, heat waves, and hurricanes, threaten the oceans, damage coral reefs, boost poison ivy growth, and [and] damage vineyards and global food crops. To name just a few.

Oddly, according to the media reports, warmer temperatures almost never seem to have any positive effects on plant or animal life or food production.

“Sadly, it appears that reporting anecdotes and hearsay as fact has now replaced the basic tenets of journalism for many media outlets.”

Alarmism Creates Skepticism
Fortunately, the media’s addiction to so-called “climate porn” has failed to seduce many Americans.

According to a July [2006] Pew Research Center Poll, the American public is split about evenly between those who say global warming is due to human activity versus those who believe it is from natural factors or not happening at all.

In addition, an August Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg poll found most Americans do not attribute the cause of recent severe weather events to global warming, and the portion of Americans who believe global warming is naturally occurring is on the rise.

Yes—it appears that alarmism has led to skepticism.

People Deserve Better
The American people know when their intelligence is being insulted. They know when they are being used and when they are being duped by the hysterical left.

The American people deserve better—much better—from our fourth estate. We have a right to expect accuracy and objectivity on climate change coverage. We have a right to expect fairness, and objectivity when it comes to human activity versus those who believe global warming is due to natural factors or not happening at all.

Above all, the media must roll back this mantra that there is scientific “consensus” of impending climatic doom as an excuse to ignore recent science. After all, there was a so-called scientific “consensus” that there were nine planets in our solar system until Pluto was recently demoted.

Breaking the cycles of media hysteria will not be easy since hysteria sells—it is very profitable. But I want to challenge the news media to reverse course and report on the objective science of climate change, to stop ignoring legitimate voices [in] this scientific debate, and to stop acting as a vehicle for unsubstantiated hype.
The Northern Hemisphere’s temperature (middle) was 0.67˚C above normal. The global average temperature (top) for February was 0.40˚C above normal. These numbers 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/tltghmam_5.2.
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The global average temperature (top) for February was 0.40˚C above normal. The Northern Hemisphere’s temperature (middle) was 0.67˚C above normal. The Southern Hemisphere’s temperature (third) was 0.13˚C below normal.

Lindzen Presents Science
Lindzen opened the debate by noting the Earth’s climate is never static and the planet is always either warming or cooling. According to him, the Earth’s recent moderate warming is not unusual or alarming in and of itself. The issue, Lindzen pointed out, is whether human activity is likely to cause a future warming that is significantly destructive to human civilization or our global environment.

Fears of alarming sea level rise, more frequent and intense tropical storms, and a spread of tropical diseases are not supported by sound science, Lindzen noted. Moreover, future warming is likely to be far less than alarmist projections would lead us to believe. Indeed, he said, the very computer models that predict alarming warming are working with faulty data that has predicted far more warming than has actually occurred or likely to overestimate future warming as well, Lindzen noted.

Finally, Lindzen observed that according to global warming theory, the middle troposphere should be warming faster than the surface, but the exact opposite is taking place. Because of this, “there are positive reasons to suspect that greenhouse warming is not significant,” Lindzen noted.

Somerville Advocates Alarm
Somerville, speaking next, immediately backpedaled from any notion that he believed global warming was alarming or catastrophic.

“The motion before us, global warming is not a crisis, means we ought to know what crisis means,” Somerville stated. “The word does not mean catastrophe or near-universal agreement that human-induced global warming is intensifying and is causing a litany of climate crises, such as rapid sea level rise, more frequent and severe tropical storms, and recording ice caps.

“None of these observational facts is a surprise to the science community,” Somerville claimed. “They are what we had predicted.”

Science Converted Crichton
Speaking next, Crichton immediately pointed out the irony of comparing global warming skeptics with deniers of plate tectonics. “The story of plate tectonics and is causing a litany of climate crises, such as rapid sea level rise, more frequent and severe tropical storms, and recording ice caps.

“None of these observational facts is a surprise to the science community,” Somerville claimed. “They are what we had predicted.”
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U.N. estimate is 3 degrees. Will it con-
tinue to go down? I expect so.”

Crichton also pointed out the hypocrisy of
some global warming alarmists. A
number of major climate leaders “clearly
have no intention of changing their lifestyle.
reducing their own consumption,
or getting off private jets themselves. If
they’re not willing to do it, why should anybody else?” Crichton asked.

Crichton concluded by challenging
priorities in addressing global crises.
“Every day 30,000 people on this planet
die of the diseases of poverty. A third
of the planet doesn’t have electricity. We
have a billion people with no clean water;
we have half-a-billion people going to bed
hungry every night. Do we care about
this? It seems that we don’t.

“It seems that we would rather look
100 years into the future than pay atten-
tion to what’s going on now. I think that’s
unacceptable,” Crichton continued.

“No Senator Barbara Boxer
[and] Al Gore have assured
us that on this particular
topic the debate is over.
Well, we took that as throw-
ning down the gauntlet.”

ROBERT ROSENKRANZ
CHAIRMAN
INTELLIGENCE SQUARED

Schmidt Attacks ‘Pseudo Science’
Schmidt followed, repeating Somerville’s
assertion that a consensus of scientists
believes global warming is a crisis. He
then compared scientists who disagree
with that proposition to creationists who
are repeatedly refuted by science but always “simply move on” to some other
creationist angle.

Global warming skepticism is a “pseu-
do debate” that is no more scientific
than assertions that smoking tobacco is
good for you, Schmidt asserted. “These
arguments are examples of pseudo
debates, scientific sounding points
that are designed not to fool the experts,
but to sow confusion and doubt in the minds
of the lay public.”

Recitations of prior climate predic-
tions that have failed to come to pass
are no more than anecdotes and “cherry
picking” the scientific data, Schmidt
asserted.

Stott Recalls Cooling Crisis
Responding to Somerville’s and Schmidt’s
repeated appeals to the asserted con-
sensus of scientists, Stott pointed out,
“Science does not progress by consensus;
it progresses by falsification.”

Stott listed examples of scientific con-
sensus that had been woefully wrong in
the past, including a scientific consensus
in the 1970s that humans were causing
an alarming cooling of the planet. After
quoting 1970s’ issues of the Christian
Science Monitor and the New York Times
regarding alarming cooling at the time,
Stott quoted a 1970s’ Newsweek article
asserting, “Meteorologists are almost
unanimous that catastrophic famines
will result from global cooling.”

Calling himself a political liberal,
Stott nevertheless said there are far
more pressing environment and human
health crises on the planet than global warming.

Rather than expend a tremendous
amount of resources fighting a specula-
tive problem that will have few concrete
direct impacts over at least the next
few decades, Stott said, nations should be
directing their resources to more press-

ing and deadly issues, mostly related
to global poverty.

Ekurzel Describes ‘Fever’
The final speaker, Ekurzel, compared
the Earth to a person with a fever. Just
a few degrees off the norm can be the
difference between life and death, she
asserted. Moreover, she said, “the Earth
is much more fragile than the body when
it comes to temperature.”

Ekurzel then presented a list of nega-
tive side effects she alleged are already
resulting from human-induced global
warming. According to Ekurzel, the
oceans are warming, plants and animals
are having to migrate to higher latitudes,
polar ice caps are shrinking, and sea
levels are rising.

“The Earth’s fever is only getting worse
and the animals and the plants that are
out there struggling are already giving us
the early warning signs,” Ekurzel said.

The only viable course for humans,
Ekurzel asserted, is an immediate
turn to alternative power sources such as
solar and wind power.

Consensus Does Not Exist
In response to audience questions after
each speaker’s presentation, Stott pointed
out that many scientists believe changes
in solar output are the primary driver of
recent temperature changes. Stott said
while he personally has not come to a
conclusion whether this theory is accu-
rate or not, it is worth considering.

Lindzen added that it is misleading for
alarmists to claim a scientific consensus
exists regarding global warming, and “to
pretend that this is settled is bizarre.”

Costs, Benefits Weighed
In response to a question regarding
whether the economic costs, estimated in
the hundreds of trillions of dollars just to
meet the terms of the Kyoto Protocol, are
worth the targeted outcome, Ekurzel
asserted no economic cost is too high.

“Everything, everything that we can
throw at solving this climate crisis—well,
this climate problem, is important,” said
Ekurzel.

Crichton responded that such money
could be far better spent addressing real,
deniable problems that are killing
thousands of real people every day.

“As we’re talking tonight, we’re all get-
ning very heated about something that
may or may not happen 100 years from
now. While we’re doing this, 3,000,
5,000, 10,000 people are dead” from
poverty and lack of access to modern
technology, Crichton said.

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.
org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
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"Corsi and Smith conclude that the fossil fuel theory is limiting in that we are looking for oil in the wrong places, [and] underestimating the availability of oil because we are locked into a belief that oil will have to run out."

Challenging ‘Dead Dinosaurs’

In 1982, Gold said in a publication with British scientist Fred Hoyle, “The suggestion that petroleum might have arisen from some transformation of squashed fish or biological detritus is surely the silliest notion to have been entertained by substantial numbers of persons over an extended period of time.”

The fossil fuel theory dates back to the Russian scientist Mikhail Lomonosov in 1757, when he stated in the Proceedings of the Imperial Academy of Science in St. Petersburg, “Rock oil originates as tiny bodies of animals buried in the sediments which, under the influence of increased temperature and pressure acting during an unimaginable long period of time, transform into rock oil.”

Dimitry Mendeleev, who first arranged the Periodic Table of Elements based on atomic mass in 1869, fiercely rejected Lomonosov’s theory. Nevertheless, Lomonosov’s theory took hold throughout most of the world. Mendeleev suggested oil is primordial material, but Russians themselves did not change their minds for more than half a century, and the rest of the world never did.

I was persuaded initially, many years ago, that oil was not derived from biologic material by the very same unanswered questions stated by Corsi and Smith: “Why don’t the text books show the oil transformation formulas specifying in equation form the amount of pressure that must be applied over what period of time? Where do we find the exact chemical formulae under which ancient leaves and bones became hydrocarbon petroleum? Where is the laboratory experimental proof?”

Fossil Challenge Not New


As an astronomer, he was aware that hydrocarbons are abundant in the universe, where we assume no life exists. Thus, how could hydrocarbons be organic chemicals resulting from life processes on Earth? He reasoned that hydrogen—being common in the universe—could combine with carbon to form hydrocarbon whether life is present or not. This idea was evidently never passed on to geologists.

Gold reasoned that we find more oil in the Middle East than Florida or Montana because deep subsurface structures in the Middle East are more fractured there, allowing the oil to flow upward due to its low specific gravity and the rotation of the Earth. He believed the reason we find oil in sedimentary rocks is not because they encased rotting ancient forests and dinosaurs, but because sedimentary rock is porous enough for the oil moving toward the surface of the Earth to pool within it.

Corsi and Smith then describe how Gold deduced that oil, as it travels upward from deep within the Earth’s mantle, is able to pick up various microbes and bacteria that live in the layers of rock through which the oil passes on its way to the Earth’s surface. These microbes are adapted to face. These microbes are adapted to

Therefore, oil could contain evidence of living organisms and still be a...
completely abiotic substance (one not requiring any form of living agent to be produced). Corsi and Smith conclude that “the fossil fuel theory is limiting in that we are looking for oil in the wrong places, [and] underestimating the availability of oil because we are locked into a belief that oil will have to run out.”

Peak Oil Deception
The authors lay much of the blame for this continuing confusion on the shoulders of M. King Hubbert (who happened to be one of my mentors), for telling the world in 1957 that oil production would peak in the 1970s and then decline. At the time, I questioned Hubbert to no avail, and regardless of the fact that he was known to be wrong by the time the 1980s came along, the energy doomsayers insisted that his core theory was right, but just a few decades off.

They still have not given up, despite the fact that new oil fields are being found worldwide. Today we have more proven oil reserves than ever before. There is no empirical evidence that these trends will ever stop.

The authors of *Black Gold* state emphatically that the world is not running out of oil. However, note the authors, this alternative hypothesis is “the one supporters of Hubbert’s Peak never contemplate seriously.” Hubbert’s Peak proponents simply say that no matter how much oil we find around the world, eventually explorers are bound to find all of it.

“The area on which the president wishes to produce oil in ANWR ... compares to the size of a postage stamp on a football field.”

Corsi and Smith nail current reality with the following observation: “Reading book after book predicting gloom and doom, we are left with the conclusion that the fossil-fuel advocates are locked into the type of thinking best characterized by Thomas Robert Malthus, whose famous 1789 essay predicted that population would ultimately outstrip our ability to produce food, resulting in a series of crises such as war and famine which in turn would cut back populations to more manageable levels.”

Malthus is famous not because his theory was right but because experience proved him wrong.

Oil Reserves Growing
To support their claim that we have more accessible oil available than ever before, with a great deal more on the horizon, Corsi and Smith describe in great detail many of the newest oil fields being put into production, including ones in Kazakhstan, Iran, and countless offshore areas, all of which support their abiotic theory.

Taking data from the United States Energy Information Administration, the authors explain that in 2005 proven world reserves totaled 1.28 trillion barrels, while in 1980 the proven reserves were only 645 billion barrels.

Alarmists fail to realize that we are finding more oil all the time. Nor do they acknowledge that their predictions that we are running out of oil have always been wrong. They simply keep pushing the year we will run out of oil further decades ahead.

If Corsi, Smith, and Gold are right, that decade is unlikely ever to arrive.

Small ANWR Footprint
Corsi and Smith describe the foolishness of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) being put off-limits for resource recovery by the very same people who insist we are running out of oil. The area on which the president wishes to produce oil in ANWR, they say, compares to the size of a postage stamp on a football field.

The footprint of 2,000 acres we need is science director of The Heartland Institute.
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Atrazine
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lion,” said Don Coursey, a University of Chicago professor and author of the study. “It is the equivalent of a huge tax hike on Illinois corn farmers.”

As the nation’s second-largest corn-producing state, Illinois would suffer enormously by the removal of the popular pesticide from the marketplace. “Illinois may become less competitive with respect to other states in the production of ethanol,” Coursey pointed out.

In 2005, sales of corn produced in Illinois amounted to $3.5 billion, or nearly 40 percent of the state’s total farm receipts, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Decades of Safe Use
Atrazine, produced by the Swiss agribusiness giant Syngenta, has been used in the United States for nearly half a century and is the most popular corn herbicide in the country. Some 70 million pounds of atrazine are used in the United States each year.

Over the years, environmental activists and some researchers have advocated banning atrazine, claiming the herbicide poses a threat to public health and the environment.

In 2002, for example, University of California-Berkeley researcher Tyrone Hayes said exposure to very low levels of atrazine could disrupt hormones and cause aberrant sexual development in male African clawed frogs. Hayes later produced a study finding atrazine appears to make leopard frogs—the most common native American frog—hermaphrodites in the wild.

“Without atrazine, Illinois growers would absorb a loss in the first year between $161 million and $577 million. It is the equivalent of a huge tax hike on Illinois corn farmers.”

DON COURSEY
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Hayes’ claims, however, have not been substantiated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

In the aftermath of Hayes’ findings, EPA released a “White Paper on Potential Developmental Effects of Atrazine on Amphibians,” in which the agency stated, “the available data do not establish a concordance of information to indicate that atrazine will or will not cause adverse developmental effects in amphibians.” EPA was critical of Hayes’ research, saying his “data did not show a clear dose-response relationship.” In June 2006 EPA concluded the cumulative risks associated with triazine herbicides, a group to which atrazine belongs, pose “no harm that would result to the general U.S. population, infants, children or other consumers.”

Environmental Benefits
In his study, Coursey finds the use of atrazine benefits the environment. Because the available alternatives to atrazine, in addition to being more expensive, also must be used in much greater quantities to combat the growth of weeds, banning the herbicide would lead to more sedimentary runoff, more chemical runoff, higher water treatment costs, increased use of fossil fuels, more carbon dioxide releases, reduced soil quality, and less habitat for wildlife.

“The availability of relatively inexpensive corn in Illinois is essential in reducing the nation’s dependence on foreign oil, further developing renewable and environmentally friendly fuel alternatives,” said Coursey in a news release accompanying the study. “Without atrazine, each of these efforts would be thwarted, making the solution harder and more expensive to attain.”

Critics Persist
Atrazine critics continue to push for a ban on the chemical in Illinois and other states, regardless of the findings of Coursey and EPA.

In early 2005, the Minnesota House Agriculture Committee rejected three bills that would have banned or restricted use of the herbicide. The case for atrazine was significantly strengthened by the state’s agriculture department, which in a 2004 survey found trace amounts of the weed-killer in only four of 71 drinking water wells in the state’s agricultural region. The highest was 1.52 parts per billion (ppb), well below the federal limit of 3 ppb in municipal water systems.

Bonner R. Cohen (bonnercohen@comcast.net) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research in Washington, DC and author of The Green Wave: Environmentalism and its Consequences, published by the Capital Research Center.

‘Precautionary Principle’ Triggers EU Atrazine Ban

The European Union (EU) has banned atrazine, effective next year, saying the herbicide has contaminated a number of drinking water systems.

Unlike the United States, which bases regulatory decisions on risk assessments such as the ones EPA carried out on atrazine, the EU is guided by the precautionary principle.

The difference between the two approaches is significant.

“The so-called precautionary principle,” Washington State University toxicologist Alan S. Felsot said, “essentially holds

“Unlike the United States, which bases regulatory decisions on risk assessments such as the ones EPA carried out on atrazine, the EU is guided by the precautionary principle.”

that when any concerns or allegations, no matter how spurious, are raised about the safety of a product, precautionary measures should be put in place and all burdens of proof to the contrary should fall on the proponent of the alleged unsafe product or activity.”

“Environmental lawyer calls to ban atrazine are environmentally irresponsible,” said Angela Logomasini, director of risk and environmental policy at the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

“The risks of atrazine are minimal and the benefits many,” Logomasini continued. “Proper use of herbicides—particularly atrazine—reduces the need to till soil, thereby reducing soil erosion. It is also a critically important tool for farmers to produce an affordable supply of fruits and vegetables.”

— Bonner R. Cohen

Internet Info

Science Proves Chemical Fears Unfounded

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

A typical statement in the news media regarding any potentially hazardous chemical is, “It has been linked to cancer, brain damage, and birth defects.” That is an example of the fear factor in action. The goal is to capture attention.

The message that is given to many readers or listeners is that the news is about a real risk, although the media makes no attempt to put the risk into perspective. No longer do the purveyors of fear tell us the concentrations of these chemicals or their allowable doses.

Microscopic Concentrations

In today’s laboratory we conventionally measure concentrations in parts per trillion (ppt), which is the ratio of a second of time to 32,000 years. Even a part per quadrillion—the ratio of a single hair on a human head to all the hairs on the heads of the entire Earth’s human population—can be measured by lab equipment.

If we were to believe the claims of alarmists about the effects of air pollution from smokestacks, auto emissions, radioactive materials from nuclear power plants, pesticide residues in food, etc., it would seem the lifespan of U.S. citizens should be declining—but in fact it is increasing.

Thousands of citizens suffer unnecessary fear simply because they do not understand what “safe” means as applied to the standards set for pesticide residues in food, chemicals in drinking water, radon in homes, radioactive releases from nuclear power plants, asbestos in schools and public places, and other items too numerous to list.

Illogical Chemophobia

Fear of chemicals has become so widespread that we now have the word “chemophobia” to describe it. People who suffer from it would not knowingly eat fruits that contain acetone, methyl butyrate, ethyl caproate, hexyl acetate, methanol, acrolein, and crotonaldehyde, yet they unknowingly do this every time they eat a strawberry.

Every fruit or vegetable is made up of chemicals with scary names. Consider this: Boric acid is a household product when used in laundry detergent. It is a drug used as an antiseptic eye wash. It is an insecticide used to kill cockroaches. It is a herbicide used to kill weeds.

Despite the image created by alarmists, safety has been widely achieved in all its uses.

Safe Doses

In 1987, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration conducted a comprehensive study of pesticide and fungicide residues in a Total Diet Study. The residues of pesticides and fungicides in typical diets proved to be less than one ten-thousandth of the amount required to obtain the first sign of a toxic effect with laboratory animals.

Alice Ottoboni, in her wonderful book The Dose Makes the Poison, wrote, “All living creatures have to deal with exposure to numerous noxious substances. No animal on Earth could survive a day if it were not capable of handling small amounts of a wide variety of foreign chemicals. It is only when we overwhelm the natural defense mechanisms of our bodies by taking in too much at one time or too much too often that we get in trouble.”

Hundreds of millions of healthy humans who currently populate the Earth would have died long ago if synthetic pesticides had not been used on their behalf. The well-known scientist Dr. Bruce Ames has said, “the amount of man-made chemicals that humans ingest in their diets is utterly trivial.”

The pesticides in our diet are 99.99 percent natural, because plants make off fungi, insects, and animal predators. For example, one cup of coffee contains more carcinogens than all the pesticide residues an average American eats in a year.

Fear Without Evidence

Former U.S. Surgeon General C. Everett Koop has pointed out, “No one has yet been made sick or killed by any pesticide found in food.” Yet any well-informed person who chooses to do so can postulate distantly possible catastrophes that cannot be refuted by any amount of excellent relevant, current research data.

Fear of the unknown is a powerful motivating force.

The late Dr. Philip Handler, former president of the National Academy of Sciences, said, “It’s been extraordinarily easy for a few persuasive people with some technical background to allege harm is being done, and it is extraordinarily difficult to demonstrate that it isn’t so.”

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/smokeorsteam.pdf.
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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](http://www.heartland.org), by clicking on the **Crichton is Right** button.