By James M. Taylor

In a scene reminiscent of Michael Crichton’s novel *State of Fear*, global warming alarmists and realists squared off in federal district court in Vermont for two weeks in early May.

The issue in dispute was whether a Vermont...
WHY POOR COUNTRIES FIND OUR SOLUTIONS TO GLOBAL WARMING HARD TO SWALLOW.

For the projected cost of Kyoto in just the year 2010, the biggest health problem facing mankind could be fixed. We could provide clean drinking water and sanitation for every person in the world. Permanently.

Currently one billion people in the world use unsafe sources of drinking water. As a result of this contaminated water and lack of basic sanitation, 4,500 children die each day.

Worrying about deaths from global warming is, at best, a case of misplaced priorities. Obviously, we can’t ignore any real global warming threats. But, with limited resources, we need to make smart, moral choices about what we do.

Technological advancement is the key to controlling environmental pollution. And it takes wealth to make those advancements. If saving lives is our goal, we must advocate policies that will help developing countries prosper.

If you value human dignity as much as the environment, visit our website. Find valuable educational materials and connect with sound economic thinkers. Together, we can turn environmental concern into effective, moral action.

ACTON INSTITUTE
Connecting good intentions with sound economics.

WWW.ACTON.ORG/IMPACT
California Senate Rejects Dam Proposal

Global warming rationale fails to persuade

By H. Sterling Burnett

California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger’s (R) plan to build two new hydroelectric dams had founder ed, at least temporarily, as the California Senate on April 24 voted against the governor’s $4 billion proposal.

Schwarzenegger has vowed to continue pursuing construction of the dams, despite Democratic opposition in the Senate and mounting backlash from environmentalists.

Global Warming Concerns

Schwarzenegger contends the $5.9 billion dam project will help address a number of critical issues facing Californians. Most importantly, according to Schwarzenegger, are providing secure water supplies for a growing population in the face of decreased snowfall due to global warming, while providing additional supplies of renewable energy without increasing greenhouse gas emissions.

Republicans have generally supported the plan to build two hydroelectric dams and their associated reservoirs to increase California’s above-ground water supply. They and the governor note two-thirds of California residents rely on snowmelt from the Sierra Nevada Mountains for drinking water. In addition, central California farmers use snowmelt to irrigate their fields.

Some scientists, including researchers at California’s Department of Water Resources, say the state’s water supply is especially vulnerable to global warming and reduced mountain snowpack. Schwarzenegger had wanted to place a $3.95 billion bond package before the voters. In order to gain Democrats’ support for the plan, the governor sweetened the pot by including $2 billion in spending on various conservation, groundwater storage, and environmental protection and restoration projects.

Funding Problems

To provide partial funding for the dams, Schwarzenegger wanted to place a $2 billion bond package before the voters. In order to gain Democrats’ support for the plan, the governor sweetened the pot by including $2 billion in spending on various conservation, groundwater storage, and environmental protection and restoration projects.

Even this was not enough to overcome opposition in the Democrat-led Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee. It killed the bill on a 4-3 party-line vote.

Senators cited a number of reasons for rejecting the proposal. They argue it is too costly and note that dam projects historically have been boondoggles, with taxpayers picking up the bill.

To back their position, Senate Democrats pointed out the proposed dams lack commitments from local water authorities to help pay for them. In addition, they argue California’s future water needs could be met by more conservation.

“California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger’s plan to build two new hydroelectric dams has founder ed, ... as the California Senate on April 24 voted against the governor’s $4 billion proposal.”

Global Warming Worry

In opposing the dam projects, environmentalists cited research indicating that, contrary to popular perception, hydroelectric projects may exacerbate greenhouse gas emissions.

Some studies have shown that, depending upon local geology, climate conditions, and dam operation, reservoirs can be net emitters of both carbon dioxide and methane. Thus, instead of reducing global warming, dams may contribute to it.

Governor Still Fighting

Schwarzenegger rejects such assertions and continues to tout the projects as reducing California’s impact on the atmosphere. More directly, the governor and his allies in the legislature seem to believe that with a population expected to grow by as much as 30 percent in the next 20 years, conservation and improved irrigation will not be enough to address the state’s need for new, reliable above-ground sources of fresh water.

From that perspective, regardless of whether the dams contribute to climate change, they are necessary to counteract the impacts on the state’s water supply resulting from anticipated global warming.

State Sen. Dennis Cogdill (R-Modesto), a sponsor of the governor’s bill, said, “SB 59 is a holistic approach to meeting the water needs of California for the coming decades. It looks at all aspects of satisfying future water needs.”

Cogdill added, “Population has doubled, and so far we have met our needs with conservation, but looking ahead, given the fact that California is growing by half to three-quarters of a million people per year, and the hydrologic changes we face with less slow-melting snowfall and more rainfall, we must find a way to capture and store water that would otherwise run into the ocean.”

Unanswered Questions

State Sen. Darrell Steinberg (D-Sacramento) led opposition to the bill. Steinberg spokesperson Jim Evans explained why.

“There are too many unanswered environmental questions regarding this bill,” said Evans. “We have very little information on the potential benefits, yet quite a few questions regarding the potential environmental impacts of these dams. We need more information,” Evans added. “It would be premature to commit state funds to a project [about which] so little is known.”

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

Continued from page 1

Vermont law, which would require a 30 percent cut in greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles by 2016, was an impermissible attempt to establish fuel economy standards.

Back-Door Law

Automakers challenging the Vermont law, which is modeled after a California measure that is also being challenged in federal court, presented expert testimony that auto companies would have to raise average fuel economy to 43 miles per gallon to meet the law’s requirements.

Individual states have no legal authority to set fuel economy standards, as Congress has the exclusive authority to pass such legislation.

“Simply put, these regulations are fuel economy standards ... fuel economy standards with potentially devastating consequences,” said auto industry lead attorney Andrew Clubok in closing arguments.

Clubok presented email exchanges among California regulators acknowledging the law amounts to fuel economy standards. The California regulators cautioned each other in the emails to avoid discussing this in public, for fear of having the law struck down.

“There is something disturbing about public regulators trying to find a way to hide what this regulation is about,” said Clubok.

Standards Not Feasible

Experts further testified that automakers have neither the technological nor the financial ability to raise fuel economy to 43 miles per gallon by 2016.

The State of Vermont, supported by the State of New York and environmental activist groups, argued automakers already have all the technology they need to meet the more stringent standards.

Government Witnesses Falter

Experts presenting expert testimony, supported by computer simulations, that showed raising fuel economy to the amount required to sufficiently reduce greenhouse gases would require some auto companies to raise prices more than $5,000 per vehicle.

Vermont’s main witness, independent automotive consultant K.G. Duleep, asserted the law would add $1,500 to the cost of each new vehicle.

More Witness Problems

The auto industry called Donald Patterson, an automotive textbook author and leading automotive engineer from the University of Michigan, who testified Duleep’s analysis was not credible.

“He used a fudge factor ... that is entirely arbitrary,” said Patterson. “You could not independently test his model.”

Similarly, independent automotive expert Tom Austin testified Duleep used faulty data and methodological irregularities to reach an unsupported conclusion about compliance costs.

The State of Vermont flew in another University of Michigan professor to defend Duleep’s analysis. After taking the professor’s deposition outside the courtroom, the state’s representatives changed their mind about calling the professor to the stand.

A Moot Issue?

Even if the state’s lawyers make a good impression on Judge William Sessions, a Clinton appointee, Vermont may not be able to move ahead with the standards, said Sterling Burnett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis.

“The entire issue may be moot,” said Burnett, “as EPA has not granted California a necessary waiver to implement its own fuel economy standards. Unless such a waiver is granted, Vermont cannot do anything, anyway.

“Vermont’s actions are premature here,” Burnett added. “States cannot adopt California’s clean air standards unless California itself adopts such standards.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is senior fellow for environment policy at The Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Science Steals the Show at Vermont Trial

By James M. Taylor

The high-profile global warming trial in Vermont focused on the legal question of whether Vermont’s proposed law amounted to de facto automotive fuel efficiency standards. But clashes between scientists regarding the theory of global warming itself stole the show.

Hansen: ‘Guaranteed Disaster’

Vermont called NASA scientist James Hansen as its primary science witness. Hansen, who has received a quarter-of-a-million dollars in grant money from the left-wing Heinz Foundation run by Teresa Heinz Kerry, testified that if global temperatures rise by 2 to 3º Celsius over the next century, there would be a “guaranteed disaster” of melting ice sheets in Antarctica and Greenland, flooding the world with up to 100 feet of sea level rise.

Christy: Flooding Scare Unfounded

Alabama State Climatologist John Christy, who is also director of the Earth Systems Science Center at the University of Alabama-Huntsville, refuted Hansen’s alarmist claims.

Christy pointed out Hansen’s sea level prediction is outside the mainstream of scientific thought and is contradicted by estimates from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which predicts a seven-inch rise in sea levels during the upcoming century.

“The high-profile global warming trial in Vermont focused on [a] legal question ... [b]ut clashes between scientists regarding the theory of global warming itself stole the show.”

Christy: Flooding Scare Unfounded

Alabama State Climatologist John Christy, who is also director of the Earth Systems Science Center at the University of Alabama-Huntsville, refuted Hansen’s alarmist claims.

Christy pointed out Hansen’s sea level prediction is outside the mainstream of scientific thought and is contradicted by estimates from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which predicts a seven-inch rise in sea levels during the upcoming century.

“Rapid sea level rise is unsupported by the evidence,” Christy summarized.

In an interview for this story, Christy further explained, “We know that 8,000 to 10,000 years ago, Greenland was 2 to 3 degrees warmer than it is today, and yet its ice sheet did not melt. Hansen has asserted that a rapid melting is occurring in Greenland, yet the allegedly rapid melting would have risen sea level by only 1 1/2 inches over the next 100 years. “But even that point is moot,” Christy said, “as the allegedly rapid melting occurred over a period of only two to three years, and it has essentially stopped.

Of the two main glaciers responsible for that temporary melting, one has stopped entirely and the other has slowed down by half. This is why you don’t extrapolate from just [a few] years of data.”

Law Is Merely Symbolic

Christy also testified the impact of the Vermont law on global climate “would be below our ability to measure or detect.” Even if the entire country and all nations in the world adopted the Vermont restrictions, Christy noted, only one or two hundredths of a degree of warming would be mitigated.

Vermont’s law, even if implemented worldwide, “will have no discernible impact on climate,” Christy testified.

During cross-examination, Hansen admitted Christy’s statement was correct. “But even a small change is potentially important,” Hansen argued.

Plant Growth Harmful?

Auto industry attorneys grilled Hansen about inconsistencies in his testimony, using video clips of Hansen in prior testimony that differed from his testimony at trial.

In cross-examination of Christy, State of Vermont lawyer Matt Pawa pointed out Christy has frequently cited scientific research showing higher levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide help plants grow. Pawa tried to cast that as a negative, asking Christy if he were aware this would also help weeds grow.

“Alarmism focuses on poison ivy,” Christy replied. “I like to focus on the fact that food production has increased 16 percent solely because of the extra CO2 we’ve put back in the atmosphere.”

— James M. Taylor
Fluorescent Bulbs Hazardous

Although environmentalists are advocating the use of compact fluorescent light bulbs (CFLs) to replace incandescent ones, CFLs pose real environmental hazards, according to those same activists and public authorities.

“Incandescent light bulbs are one step closer to being banned in California, after the California Assembly Utilities and Commerce Committee voted 7-2 on April 23 to enact such a ban.”

As reported in an April 12 article in the Ellsworth (Maine) American, Brandy Bridges had the misfortune of breaking a CFL during installation in her daughter’s bedroom. It dropped and shattered on the carpeted floor.

Each CFL contains “one of the most poisonous forms of pollution.” Bridges called her local Home Depot for advice. The store told her the CFL contained mercury and that she should call the Poison Control hotline, which in turn directed her to the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

The DEP sent a specialist to Bridges’ house to test for mercury contamination. The specialist found mercury levels in the bedroom more than six times the state’s “safe” level for mercury contamination, 300 billionths of a gram per cubic meter.

Cleanup Costly

The DEP specialist recommended Bridges call an environmental cleanup firm, which reportedly gave her an estimate of $2,000 to clean the room. The room then was sealed off with plastic, and Bridges began gathering finances to pay for the cleaning. Reportedly, her insurance company wouldn’t cover the costs because mercury is a pollutant.

Given that the replacement of incandescent bulbs with CFLs in the average U.S. household is touted as saving as much as $180 annually in energy costs—and assuming Bridges doesn’t break any more CFLs—it will take her more than 11 years to recoup the cleanup costs in the form of energy savings after dropping one light bulb on a carpeted floor.

And that’s assuming the energy savings are as big as CFL supporters claim.

No Feasible Alternative

The alternative, do-it-yourself approach to CFL cleanup is also problematic.

Consider the procedure offered by the Maine DEP’s Web page titled, “What if I accidentally break a fluorescent bulb in my home?”

According to DEP, you shouldn’t vacuum bulb debris, because a standard vacuum will spread mercury-containing dust throughout the area and contaminate the vacuum. Instead, you should ventilate the area and reduce the temperature. Wear protective equipment such as goggles, coveralls, and a dust mask.

“Fluorescent lights simply cannot match the light spectrum of incandescent lights. Not only is the light inferior, but so, too, are the aesthetics. Say goodbye to chandeliers and other forms of lighting art.”

Steven Milloy (junkman@junkscience.com) publishes JunkScience.com and CSRWatch.com. He is a junk science expert, an advocate of free enterprise, and an adjunct scholar at the Competitive Enterprise Institute.
Global Warming 101: Al Gore’s Carbon Dioxide Theory. Willie Soon, Ph.D. Dr. Soon is Chief Science Researcher at the Center for Science and Public Policy and author of The Maunder Minimum.

A Critique of the 4th IPCC Report on Global Climate Change. S. Fred Singer, Ph.D. Internationally known for his work on environmental issues, Dr. Singer pioneered rocket and satellite technology.

Health Effects of Internally Deposited Radionuclides. Otto G. Raabe, Ph.D. The principal author of Internal Radiation Dosimetry will include the facts on Po-210, Pu, Ra, Sr, and depleted uranium.

Low-Level Radiation and Health. Bobby R. Scott, Ph.D. Dr. Scott, Senior Scientist at Lovelace Respiratory Research Inst, authored more than 100 papers on radiobiologic effects.

How to Use Environmentalism to Destroy American Agriculture. Jay Lehr, Ph.D. Dr. Lehr is editor of McGraw Hill’s Standard Handbook on Environmental Science, Health, and Technology.

Is Acute Radiation Sickness Treatable? Robert Housman, J.D. Mr. Housman, a homeland security consultant, has advised Hollis-Eden and Cleveland Biolabs on drugs for ARS.

Bioterrorism: the Impact of Particle Size on Aerosol Infectivity. William Patrick III. In his 48 years of experience in biowarfare, Mr. Patrick has worked with USAMRIID, DIA, FBI, and many other institutions.

Air Pollution, Tobacco, and the Scientific Method. Jerome C. Arnett, Jr., M.D. Dr. Arnett is a practicing pulmonologist and member of the editorial board of the J American Physicians and Surgeons.

The Effect of the Radical Green Agenda on Africa. John Meredith. Mr. Meredith, principal of Meredith Advocacy Group, has worked with Project 21 to fight radical “green” projects.

Revolutionizing Medicine with Consumer-Based Diagnostics and the Internet. Arthur Robinson, Ph.D. Dr. Robinson is founder of the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine and editor of Access to Energy.

Delaying the Degenerative Diseases of Aging. Bruce Ames, Ph.D. Dr. Ames, inventor of the Ames test for mutagenicity, is Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at U.C. Berkeley.

Liquid Fuels from U.S. Coal Sources. S.S. Penner, Ph.D. A foremost authority on world energy issues, Dr. Penner is with the UC San Diego Center for Energy Research.

The Urgent Need for Ballistic Missile Defense. Brian T. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy is President of the Claremont Institute and directs its Ballistic Missile Defense project.

Islam: What the West Needs to Know. Gregory M. Davis. Mr. Davis co-directed a DVD by this title and authored Religion of Peace? Islam’s War Against the World.

Strategic Medical and Biologic Threats to the U.S. Michael S. Baker, M.D. Dr. Baker is a retired Navy admiral who still works on strategic issues and disaster planning.

Nuclear War Survival Skills: the U.S. Government Plan for Civil Defense. Stephen Jones. Mr. Jones, a civil defense activist for decades, is an expert on instructing the public in expedient civil defense.

REGISTRATION & TAPE or CD/DVD ORDERS

___ Please reserve a place for me (us) at the 25th Annual Meeting of Doctors for Disaster Preparedness.

The registration fee of $160, plus $95 for each additional family member, is enclosed.*

___ I would like to order a complete set of audiotapes or audio CDs for $99.

___ I have circled the audiotapes or CDs (specify which) that I would like and enclose a check for $10 each. (Note: not all speakers are confirmed yet.)

___ I would like the indicated DVDs ($20 each). Please show clearly that you would like a DVD, not an audio.

___ I (we) plan to take the Alcatraz/San Francisco tour (Friday all day). $60 for each adult, $50 for children.

* Registration fee includes the reception, two luncheons, and a banquet.
American Lung Association’s 2007 Report Distorts Air Quality Facts

By Joel Schwartz

If only one child in a class fails a test, should the teacher assign failing grades to everyone? That’s exactly how the American Lung Association (ALA) assigns air quality grades to America’s cities and counties in its annual State of the Air report, released on May 1.

For example, even though 99 percent of San Diegans live and work in areas that comply with the federal eight-hour ozone standard, ALA counts all 10 million residents live in areas as breathing dirty air.

Similarly, ALA claims Harris County (Houston) averaged 38 days per year exceeding the eight-hour ozone standard in 2003-05. But a look at the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) ozone monitoring data shows the county’s 14 monitors ranged from two to 15 exceedance days per year.

Thus even for the most polluted site in Houston, ALA overstated ozone violations by more than double. For the average Houston location (eight exceedance days per year), ALA exaggerated by nearly a factor of five.

ALA inflates particulate air pollution as well. State of the Air 2007 claims Allegheny County (the Pittsburgh metro area) had the second worst fine particulate (PM2.5) pollution in the nation during 2003-05, averaging 20.8 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m3). But this value applies only to the town of Liberty, in the meteorologically isolated Mon Valley.

The next worst location in Allegheny County averaged a substantially lower 16.5 µg/m3. In fact, half the monitors in the county complied with EPA’s 15 µg/m3 annual standard for PM2.5. Nevertheless, based solely on the localized data from Liberty, ALA claims the entire Pittsburgh metro area has the second worst PM2.5 levels in the nation.

Fictional Trends

ALA’s claims about air pollution trends are equally fictional. State of the Air 2007 claims PM2.5 pollution is on the rise. And indeed, PM2.5 rose in 2005 after dropping steadily each year from 1999 to 2004. But national PM2.5 data for 2006 were already available by the time ALA released State of the Air 2007 on May 1. These data show 2005 was an anomaly, as PM2.5 hit a new record low in 2006.

For Allegheny County in particular, PM2.5 in 2006 was more than 10 percent below the average for 2003-05.

Power Plant Myths

Conveniently, ALA provides a fictional “explanation” of the fictional rise in PM2.5: “power plants are likely the source of much of the increase in particulate pollution in the eastern United States, driven by increased electricity production during the period.”

Note how ALA is careful never to claim explicitly that power plant pollution increased, but merely that electricity production increased. The reader is led to assume that more electricity production means more power plant air pollution and therefore higher PM2.5 levels. Actually, power plant sulfur dioxide (SO2) emissions—the source of the sulfate component of PM2.5—remained unchanged during the year when ALA claimed they were increasing.

The figure accompanying this article compares average PM2.5 levels and power plant SO2 emissions for the eastern half of the United States since 1994. (National PM2.5 monitoring didn’t begin until 1999.) Note the unique jump in PM2.5 in 2005, with steady declines both before and after. Also note that under existing law SO2 emissions must decline another 70 percent over the next several years, ensuring far more PM2.5 improvement in the future.

CONTINUED on right
“How polluted is the air you, your family, and neighbors are breathing in your community?” begins an email I recently received from the ALA. The email announced the release of State of the Air 2007 and invited readers to type in their ZIP code to find out their local air quality. I decided to type in a few ZIP codes for Sacramento County, which I have frequently studied, to find out what information ALA would provide. It turned out that no matter what the ZIP code, the ALA reported the exact same ozone and particulate pollution information. I knew this information had to be wrong, because pollution levels vary widely around Sacramento County and most other counties in the nation. ALA claims Sac County had 63 ozone exceedance days from 2002-05. But according to the actual monitoring data, Folsom has the worst ozone, with 52 exceedance days. Downtown Sacramento had only two ozone exceedance days in 2002-05, or less than one-thirtieth of ALA’s claim.

ALA claims to be telling Americans about air quality where they live. But for any given county, no matter what ZIP code you type into ALA’s database, it always returns the same drastically inflated result.

Historically Clean Air
National polls routinely show most Americans believe air quality has been steady or declining. In reality, the nation’s air quality has been steadily improving for decades and has never been better. The public believes otherwise because most of the information they receive on the environment comes from environmental activist groups and government regulators—interest groups who need to keep us scared in order to maintain their powers and budgets. No matter how clean the air is, they continue to find ways to make it seem we’ve made little progress and that things will only worsen without aggressive new regulatory programs.

No Health Concerns
Even without the activists’ exaggerations, millions of Americans do live in areas that violate one or more federal air pollution health standards. “[N]ational PM2.5 [fine particulate matter] data for 2006 were already available by the time ALA released State of the Air 2007 on May 1. These data show 2005 was an anomaly, as PM2.5 hit a new record low in 2006.”

But that’s not actually a cause for concern, either. In the next issue of Environment & Climate News, I’ll show how the air pollution fear industry not only exaggerates pollution levels but also exaggerates the harm from any given level of pollution. In reality, the underlying health research shows our air is already safe to breathe and our current, historically low air pollution is at worst a minor factor in people’s health.

Joel Schwartz (joel@joelschwartz.com) is a visiting fellow at the American Enterprise Institute.

INTERNET INFO

www.cei.org/energy.htm
Rush to Fight Global Warming Misses Adaptation Opportunities

By Robert L. Bradley Jr.

U.S. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) has set out to pass a greenhouse gas emissions cap-and-trade bill as a proposed remedy to global warming. The measure’s Senate prospects are uncertain. Some states and localities are likewise embracing initiatives related to climate change.

The mainstream media assert there is a “scientific consensus” regarding manmade global warming, and they are pushing for wholesale changes in the energy marketplace in a supposedly carbon-constrained world.

These are heady times for energy and climate Malthusians, who argue that our modern energy practices are poised to cause massive, imminent global catastrophe.

Predictions Not New

This is exactly the issue that made headlines across America almost 20 years ago. In the hot, dry summer of 1988, NASA scientist James Hansen testified before Congress that heat waves and droughts were related to an enhanced greenhouse effect.

Two years before that, in July 1986, Al Gore stated, “There is no longer any significant disagreement in the scientific community that the greenhouse effect is real and already occurring.”

Back then the United States and the world were burning, respectively, 72 quadrillion and 200 quadrillion BTUs (quads) of fossil fuels a year. Several thousand quads of oil, gas, and coal consumption later, with global usage now running about 400 quads a year, fossil fuels account for more than 80 percent of U.S. and world energy consumption.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration and the International Energy Agency, oil, gas, and coal will represent more than 85 percent of the worldwide energy market for decades to come.

On the question of energy, consumers are speaking with a mighty voice. They like the affordability and reliability of conventional energies.

“No Reason for Guilt

How should America’s oil and gas industry respond to the fever-pitch issue of global climate change? Obviously, every company and employee has much at stake, given that hydrocarbons are in the crosshairs of climate-related public policy proposals.

But the question is not merely one of business impact—there also is a human curiosity about what a former vice president calls “a planetary emergency.” Is there really a carbon-based energy problem that cannot be solved by the growing wealth of a free society? There also is a personal curiosity: Should those in the oil and gas industry feel guilty about their work?

Addressing these questions will help us answer the bottom-line question: How should the industry position itself in the debate?

Malthusian Mindset

To get to the answer, the Malthusian mindset that has polluted much framing and study of the issues must be discounted. Climate science has become as much political science as physical science, because so many practitioners start with the premise that nature is optimal and study of the issues must be discounted.

But if the “planetary emergency” is exaggerated and proposed solutions are not up to the task (remember that most environmental activists are at war with nuclear and hydroelectric power as well), there will be a public backlash against carbon rationing. Political momentum will turn against climate alarmism and its legislative and regulatory progeny.

Carbon may be priced, but it will find its political ceiling at a level far too “low” to make a climatic impact under anyone’s math. It will be little more than regulation for its own sake—and very wasteful, distasteful regulation at that. It will be a “hassle factor” for industry, but one that will become less and less defensible so long as reason trumps emotion in the debate.

Thus, the real issue will shift from forced carbon rationing to adaptation to climate change and weather events, for whatever reason and in whatever direction the events may occur. At that point, the Malthusians will have to acquiesce in the rationality—indeed the morality—of modern, prosperous living, complete with a non-politicized energy sector.

Robert L. Bradley Jr. (iretx@swbell.net) is president of the Institute for Energy Research (http://www.energyrealism.org) and the author of five books on energy, including Climate Alarmism Reconsidered and Energy: The Master Resource. Bradley is writing a multi-volume energy history that climaxes with the rise and fall of the late Kenneth L. Lay and Enron, where he worked for 16 years.
NASA Chief Downplays Global Warming
But perennial alarmist Hansen publicly berates his boss

By James M. Taylor

Global warming is not a crisis and should not be a high-priority issue for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), NASA Administrator Michael Griffin said in an interview broadcast May 31 on National Public Radio. Griffin’s public comments sparked a remarkably insubordinate tirade of criticism from NASA scientist and perennial global warming alarmist James Hansen.

Climate Always Changing
“I have no doubt that ... a trend of global warming exists,” said Griffin. However, he noted, “I am not sure that it is fair to say that it is a problem we must wrestle with. To assume that it is a problem is to assume that the state of Earth’s climate today is the optimal climate, the best climate that we could have or ever have had, and that we need to take steps to make sure that it doesn’t change.”

Griffin then criticized that assumption: “First of all, I don’t think it’s within the power of human beings to assure that the climate does not change, as millions of years of history have shown, and second of all, I guess I would ask which human beings—where and when—are to be accorded the privilege of deciding that this particular climate that we have right here today, right now, is the best climate for all other human beings. I think that’s a rather arrogant position for people to take.

“Nowhere in NASA’s authorization, which of course governs what we do, is there anything at all telling us that we should take actions to affect climate change in either one way or another,” Griffin added. “We study global climate change—that is in our authorization—we think we do it rather well. I’m proud of that, but NASA is not an agency chartered to quote ‘battle climate change.”

Publicly Slams Boss
Hansen, who has received a quarter-of-a-million dollars in grant money from Teresa Heinz Kerry’s left-wing Heinz Foundation, and thereafter publicly endorsed Heinz’s husband, John Kerry, for president in 2004, has given more than 1,400 on-the-job interviews regarding global warming.

Although Hansen’s views conflict with those of Griffin, Hansen’s NASA superiors have rarely if ever said anything directly critical of Hansen’s comments. Nevertheless, Hansen received tremendous media attention last year by asserting NASA was engaging in censorship by asking him to notify his superiors before granting on-the-job interviews.

Despite his claims of being subjected to censorship, Hansen was quick to vilify Griffin for saying global warming is not a crisis.

“It’s unbelievable,” Hansen added. “I thought he had been misquoted. It’s so unbelievable.”

Countered Griffin in a news release, “NASA is the world’s preeminent organization in the study of Earth and the conditions that contribute to climate change and global warming: ... It is NASA’s responsibility to collect, analyze, and release information. It is not NASA’s mission to make policy regarding possible climate change mitigation strategies.”

Griffin’s Job Threatened
Hansen’s criticisms of Griffin led to a wave of criticism from global warming alarmists, with some calling for Griffin to be fired.

“I was shocked by the statement, and I think the administrator ought to resign. I don’t see how he can be the effective leader of a science agency if he doesn’t understand the threat of global warming,” said Michael Oppenheimer, a Princeton University professor, lead author for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and longtime manager of the environmental extremist group Environmental Defense, in an interview with ABC News.

Hansen Refuted
Hansen himself, however, has been publicly exposed as being on the wrong side of science.

In May 2007 testimony in a federal district court, Hansen claimed a 2 to 3° warming of the Earth this century would melt the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets, resulting in sea levels rising up to 100 feet. Such an assertion directly contradicts the IPCC, which believes a 3° rise in temperatures is likely this century but that Antarctica will nevertheless not lose any ice mass.

“Rapid sea level rise is unsupported by the evidence,” summarized Alabama State Climatologist John Christy in testimony rebutting Hansen’s claims.

S. Fred Singer, professor emeritus of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia and former director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, noted the hypocrisy of alarmists seeking to silence the NASA administrator. “Mike Griffin is speaking as an independent scientist,” Singer said.

“Global warming is not a crisis and should not be a high-priority issue ... NASA Administrator Michael Griffin said in an interview broadcast May 31 on National Public Radio.”

“Griffin is essentially saying, ‘Show me the evidence for manmade global warming,’” Singer added. “The evidence does not exist, Griffin knows, because NASA pioneered the satellite instruments for measuring atmospheric temperatures—the only truly global data we have. The data show no warming trend since 1998.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is senior fellow for environment policy at The Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
A Penny for Your Thoughts
On CO₂

If the Earth’s atmosphere was a $100 bill,
$78.08 would represent nitrogen
$20.95 would represent oxygen
$ .93 would represent argon

200 years ago, prior to the wide-spread use of fossil fuels,
3 cents would represent the carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere (280 ppm).

Over the past 200 years, 1 cent would represent the CO₂ that has been added to the Earth’s atmosphere (currently measured at 380 ppm vs 280 ppm 200 years ago).

It is this penny’s worth of CO₂ upon which man-made global warming advocates depend to advance their theory.
Organic Food Is Not Better for You

By Samuel Aldrich and Jay Lehr

It is unfortunate that the term “health food” has become established in food marketing. It implies that other food is not healthy or is less healthy.

The centerpieces of the “health food” movement are crops grown without commercial fertilizers, pesticides, or genetic movement are crops grown without commercial fertilizers, pesticides, or genetic.

These constraints, officially approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in December 2000 for food to be labeled “organic,” were put into place in 2002.

In taking this action the department does not indicate that organic food is better in any way. The standards are merely to ensure uniformity for persons who desire a single standard for the term “organic.”

Misleading Claims

Many organic farming enthusiasts claim organically grown food has better flavor and is more nutritious, and they either directly state or imply it is more healthful. Here is a representative quotation from an advertisement for organically grown foods:

“This is not a scare ad. If you can read—let alone smell, taste, and breathe—you are probably scared enough. Because you know that a flood of poisonous chemicals have invaded your family’s diet, robbing your food of its flavor and wholesomeness. Robbing you of your health and perhaps years of life as well.”

Dr. William Sebrell, former director of the National Institutes of Health, in testimony at a hearing convened by New York State Attorney General Louis LeFkowitz in 1972, stated he knew of “no acceptable medical benefits or nutritional advantages, to be obtained from the use of organic foods.” He also stated he knew of no disadvantages, thus implying the medical and nutritional qualities were the same for organically grown and conventionally grown food.

Falsehoods Debunked

Dr. Jean Mayer, a Harvard University nutritionist, was quoted in the August 27, 1973 issue of U.S. News & World Report as follows:

“Question: Will the recent trend to natural foods—those grown without chemical fertilizer and pesticides—lead to better nutrition?

“Answer: I don’t think so. The reason is that this effort is unscientific and full of internal contradictions. With regard to fertilizers, if we don’t use them throughout the world we’re going to starve. You just cannot produce the amount of food we need in the world without fertilizers.

“Also, there is no evidence that this alters unfavorably the quality of food. Whatever you feed the plant, it eats the same thing, whether it’s organic or inorganic.”

“Most organically grown food is neither more nutritious nor less than conventionally grown food. Yet organic is more expensive to grow, yields less food per acre of cultivation, and has a shorter shelf life.”

High Price of Misinformation

Most organically grown food is neither more nutritious nor less than conventionally grown food. Yet organic is more expensive to grow, yields less food per acre of cultivation, and has a shorter shelf life.

Misleading assertions that organic food is better for you simply rob people of their disposable income and lead to more environmental degradation to sustain the inefficient growing techniques.

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.
that reduction—8.5 billion gallons per year—is to come from increased gas mileage requirements for new cars and light trucks, known as Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards.

**Deadlier than Realized**
The NHTSA concluded in an October 2003 report that CAFE standards are even deadlier than the agency previously thought. According to NHTSA, every 100 pound reduction in the weight of small cars (those weighing 2,950 pounds or less) has increased annual traffic fatalities by as many as 715 deaths.

For larger cars and light trucks, the agency estimated each 100 pound reduction in weight would increase annual traffic fatalities by as many as 303 and 296 deaths, respectively.

“When two vehicles collide, the laws of physics favor the occupants of the heavier vehicle (momentum conservation),” explained NHTSA. “Furthermore, heavier vehicles were in most cases larger, wider, and less fragile than light vehicles. In part because of this, they usually had greater crashworthiness, structural integrity, and directional stability. They were less roll-over prone and easier for the average driver to control in a panic situation.”

“President George W. Bush announced on May 14 a plan that would force U.S. consumers and businesses to reduce gasoline consumption by 20 percent over the next 10 years.”

**Sticker Shock Inevitable**
In addition, “Fuel efficiency is not a free good,” said Jerry Taylor, senior fellow at the Cato Institute. “All things being equal, it costs more money to manufacture a fuel-efficient car than it does to manufacture a fuel-inefficient car. If it were otherwise, then all our cars would get 40+ miles per gallon.

“How much more expensive both cars and light trucks will become is unknown because the details are yet to come,” Taylor added. “But to put this in perspective, the National Research Council reported a few years ago that improvements in automotive fuel efficiency would increase sticker prices for passenger cars by $1,018-$3,578, depending upon how aggressive those fuel efficiency improvements were and the vehicle class in question.”

Steven Milloy (junkman@junkscience.com) publishes JunkScience.com and CSRWatch.com. He is a junk science expert, an advocate of free enterprise, and an adjunct scholar at the Competitive Enterprise Institute.
conclude caps on carbon dioxide emissions would be tremendously costly to American consumers.

MIT: Human Welfare Losses
The MIT study calculated the cost of carbon emission caps in terms of welfare costs. Welfare costs—essentially, reductions in our well-being—are described as aggregate market consumption and effects on leisure time. According to MIT, carbon caps in a scenario where the United States matches the carbon reductions of other developed nations will cost 1.45 percent of total U.S. well-being by 2050.

A more aggressive strategy of carbon emissions caps, where the United States takes on more of the burden—a scenario that has been demanded under the Kyoto Protocol, for example—would cost 1.79 percent of total U.S. well-being by 2050. For this cost, less than 0.5° Celsius of warming would be mitigated.

Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK) explained the costs in tangible terms. “A new MIT study concludes that the Sanders-Boxer approach would impose a tax-equivalent of $366 billion annually, or more than $4,500 per family of four, by 2015. And the annual costs will grow after 2015. “The Lieberman-McCain bill is not much better,” Inhofe said, “imposing more than $3,500 on families each year.”

CBO: Even Modest Cuts Costly
The CBO study similarly reported that capping carbon dioxide emissions would impose tremendous costs on the economy.

“Most of the cost of meeting a cap on CO2 emissions would be borne by consumers, who would face persistently higher prices for products such as electricity and gasoline. Those price increases would be regressive in that poorer households would bear a larger burden relative to their income than wealthier households would,” the study reported.

Even a very modest 15 percent cut in carbon dioxide emissions—far less than what is being sought by global warming alarmists—would impose substantial economic costs on American consumers. “A 15 percent cut in CO2 emissions would cost the average household in the lowest one-fifth (quintile) of the income distribution about 3.3 percent of its average income,” CBO observed.

Multitude of Economic Harms
A cap on carbon dioxide emissions would harm the economy, and American citizens, in many different ways, both studies found.

“Any policy that reduced U.S. emissions of carbon dioxide would inevitably create costs for existing workers. Job losses could occur throughout the economy,” the CBO study noted.

Moreover, “A CO2 cap would worsen the negative effects” of “existing taxes that dampen economic activity—primarily taxes on labor, capital, or personal income, such as payroll taxes and individual or corporate income taxes,” CBO reported. “The higher prices caused by the cap would lower real (inflation-adjusted) wages and real returns on capital, indirectly raising marginal tax rates on those sources of income.”

Local, state, and federal governments would also suffer a revenue crunch.

“A cap-and-trade program for CO2 emissions would tend to increase government spending and decrease revenues,” the CBO study observed. “Like other consumers, the government would face higher prices for energy and other carbon-intensive goods and services. In addition, by leading to a decline in the production of goods and services, the cap would cause a decline in the taxes collected on corporate profits.”

The CBO study also refuted assertions that the economic harm would be merely temporary until advances in renewable energy technology are realized. “The price increases resulting from a cap on CO2 emissions would persist as long as the cap remained in place, affecting both current and future consumers,” concluded the study.

James Hoare (ljahoare@aol.com) is an attorney in Rochester, New York.
Idaho County Stands by Aquatic Herbicides

By James M. Taylor

Guided by the findings of a blue-ribbon panel of aquatic plant managers, Bonner County, Idaho commissioners agreed on May 8 to continue using aquatic herbicides as the centerpiece of their program to eradicate Eurasian milfoil.

Last summer, Idaho communities benefited from a newly established state fund to wage war on invasive milfoil. Eurasian milfoil is a highly aggressive aquatic weed native to Europe and Asia. It takes root at the bottom of ponds and lakes and sends long, spindly tendrils to the water’s surface.

Near the surface, the plants form a dense mat of entangling weeds that deprives the water of oxygen and chokes out native plants and animals. The mat of weeds emits a noxious order and is often thick enough to make swimming, boating, and other recreation hazardous or even impossible.

Comprehensive Review

Local water management districts in Idaho and nationwide use aquatic herbicides as their weapon of choice against milfoil.

To ensure aquatic herbicides are as effective and safe for the environment as advertised, the Idaho State Department of Agriculture (ISDA) in September 2006 assembled a panel of aquatic plant experts from across the country to review the state’s Eurasian Watermilfoil Control Program. The panel completed its review in December.

County Approves Herbicides

Armed with the panel’s findings and recommendations, Bonner County commissioners approved a plan to spend $1.7 million of its $1.8 million 2007 milfoil budget on aquatic herbicide applications. The remaining money will be spent on divers hand-pulling weeds and installing weed barriers on lake bottoms.

The commissioners’ decision implements a recommendation from the county’s Aquatic Invasive Species Task Force, which recommended the program on May 7.

Todd Crossett cast the lone dissenting ballot among the Bonner County commissioners. Crossett asserted more funds should have been directed to biological controls such as weevils that feed on milfoil.

Herbicide Success Story

But “biological controls do not eradicate,” noted Matt Voile, manager of the ISDA noxious weeds program. “All of this money that came through the legislature to eradicate milfoil, the language by the legislature very specifically states that we can only fund eradication technologies.

“There is not a biological scientist out there anywhere that will tell you that biological control is an eradication tool,” Voile continued. “Biological controls merely help contain the problem, but do not eradicate it.

“Even at its very best, research shows biological controls affect only the top 18 inches of milfoil,” Voile explained. “It by no means kills the plant. In North Idaho we have very pristine lakes with water clarity of more than 25 feet deep. When we talk about dealing with only the top 18 inches and leaving the remaining 24 feet unaffected, this is clearly not a viable eradication option. The language of the statute specifically says the money must be spent on eradication.”

Voile emphasized that aquatic herbicides have an established record of successful eradication without any adverse environmental effects.

“Last year in the north end of the state, herbicides were our predominant weapon,” Voile observed. “No negative environmental effects were reported to the Department of Environmental Quality, and we did redundant water sampling to verify this. We had investigators on the boat and at the dock for every herbicide application. I myself was present at many of these. We take extensive measures to verify that no environmental damage is done.

“In the lakes that have been treated, we have had seven or more native plants that have taken the lake back,” Voile noted. “We are finding very limited milfoil but abundant native plants. We are having good native plant response.”

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is senior fellow for environment policy at The Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News.

‘Unbiased’ Advisory Group Exposed

Global warming group shown to be funded by extremists

By James M. Taylor

The Center for Climate Strategies, an advisory organization that contracts with state governments to implement global warming strategies, is funded by and linked to some of the nation’s most alarmist environmental activist foundations, according to an April 30 article in the Carolina Journal.

The publication launched its investigation of the Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) after the organization began working with commissions set up to advise North Carolina legislators on the causes of global warming and the costs and benefits of greenhouse gas reduction strategies.

CCS sells itself as an unbiased and politically neutral source of ideas for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Ties to Climate Alarmists

It didn’t take long for the Journal to find alarmist links and funding sources for CCS. “The Center for Climate Strategies’ background is complex,” noted the Journal’s Paul Chesser in an April 30 exposé. “It is a policy center of Entering Environmental Solutions, Inc. (EESI), a nonprofit organization.

“However, behind that nonprofit organization is yet another nonprofit organization: the Pennsylvania Environmental Council,” Chesser reports. “As for the global warming debate, the Pennsylvania Environmental Council squarely sides with the belief that human-industrial activity is the cause and carbon dioxide reduction is the remedy. Some others in the science community disagree and attribute the Earth’s temperature rise to natural trends.”

Rockefeller Funding

Perhaps because of this predisposition toward global warming alarmism, CCS receives significant funding from two notoriously left-wing policy foundations.

Such as Einstein.

Since 2005 the Rockefeller Brothers Fund has donated more than a quarter-million dollars to CCS. The Capital Research Center, which examines funding sources of nonprofit organizations, noted in January 2005 that the Rockefeller Brothers Fund is characterized by “reflective anti-capitalism.”

In his 2006 book, The Green Wave: Environmentalism and Its Consequences, Bonner Cohen, a senior fellow with the National Center for Public Policy Research, writes, “the Rockefeller Brothers Fund has generously supported Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, Rainforest Action Network, and Environmental Media Service.”

Directly Funded State Contract

Undermining CCS claims of being unbiased on the topic, Rockefeller Brothers Fund money has been directly linked to the North Carolina contract.

The 2002 Clean Smokesacks Act requires the North Carolina Division of Air Quality (DAQ) to study carbon dioxide emissions. DAQ justified hiring an outside organization to help it comply by asserting it did not have the time, budget, or skills necessary for due-diligence compliance.

Rather than open the contract to competitive bidding, however, DAQ contract-ed with CCS because “a large additional portion of funding to support this process will come from an outside grantor [Rockefeller Brothers Fund] directly to (EESI) and would not be available without their efforts,” DAQ officials explained in the contract.

Biased Advice

“I have been part of the climate process that Center for Climate Strategies has run for North Carolina. I am on one of the working groups,” said Daren

CONTINUED at right
Global Warming Activists Target Farmers

By James M. Taylor

When politicking in Farm Belt states, global warming alarmists frequently assert global warming legislation will benefit farmers. They say the measures will encourage ethanol production and induce industry to purchase carbon sequestration credits from farmers engaging in no-till agriculture.

Once out of the farmers' earshot, however, global warming alarmists make it all too clear they see farmers as more of a problem that needs correction than a friend who deserves reward.

“Once out of the farmers' earshot, ... global warming alarmists make it all too clear they see farmers as more of a problem that needs correction than a friend who deserves reward.”

Ag in Crosshairs

Stephan Singer, the World Wildlife Fund's European Head of Climate and Energy Policy, told Reuters on April 30 that farmers are unlikely to be paid free money for sequestering carbon dioxide. According to EPA, U.S. forests sequestered 50 times as much carbon dioxide as agricultural soils in the United States in 2001. Agricultural soils in the United States sequestered 15.2 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (mmtCO2e), compared to total agricultural emissions of 526 mmtCO2e. Emissions were roughly 35 times as great as sequestration.

The LEAD report does not acknowledge agriculture as a good gadget in the climate change debate. Nor does it envision enriching farmers as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

To the contrary, the report claims, “The livestock sector is a major player, responsible for 18 percent of greenhouse gas emissions. This is a higher share than transport.”

Farmers unsure of whether they are seen as friends or foes of global warming alarmists need only consider the following statement in the LEAD report:

“At virtually each step of the livestock production process substances contributing to climate change or air pollution are emitted into the atmosphere, or their sequestration in other reservoirs is hampered. Such changes are either the direct effect of livestock rearing, or indirect contributions from other steps on the long road that ends with the marketed animal product.”

Money for Nothing?

Despite promises to the contrary, U.S. farmers are unlikely to be paid free money for sequestering carbon dioxide. In any cap-and-trade carbon legislation, sequestration would be rewarded only if it exceeds today’s sequestration baseline. Status quo sequestration will receive no reward; only additional sequestration will be rewarded.

In any carbon trading scheme, farmers would be net purchasers rather than net sellers of carbon sequestration credits. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), in 2001 agricultural soils in the United States sequestered 15.2 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (mmtCO2e), compared to total agricultural emissions of 526 mmtCO2e. Emissions were roughly 35 times as great as sequestration.

To the extent non-farmers may be required to purchase carbon sequestration credits, they will get far more bang for their buck paying for the preservation or planting of forests than they will by giving money to farmers. According to EPA, U.S. forests sequestered 50 times as much carbon dioxide equivalent in 2001 as did agricultural soils, even though farm acreage was greater than forest acreage by more than 25 percent.

The Environmental Defense publication “What Business Can Do about Global Warming” tells businesses, “forests can sequester more carbon more quickly than agricultural lands.”

Ethanol False Promise

Farmers hoping ethanol revenue will compensate for the sacrifices that will be asked of them will be disappointed. Corn is already obsolete as an ethanol resource. According to the Houston-based CLEAN Energy group, Brazilian-grown sugarcane is more than five times more efficient for ethanol production than U.S.-grown corn.

Any serious ethanol market will send money to Brazil rather than to U.S. farmers.

Even in the short term, farmers' higher corn income will be mitigated by higher costs associated with greenhouse gas restrictions. Agriculture is an energy-intensive industry, and higher fertilizer and fuel prices will offset higher corn income. Additionally, corn farmers' gain will be livestock farmers' loss, as livestock farmers are forced to pay higher prices for animal feed.

Farmers beware: Greenhouse gas restrictions are not as farmer-friendly as global warming alarmists would like you to believe.

James M. Taylor (taylor@heartland.org) is senior fellow for environment policy at The Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Skeptics Are Scoring Points, Changing Global Warming Debate

By Tom DeWeese

With great fanfare, former Vice President Al Gore took Capitol Hill this March like a conquering hero as he testified on global warming before both houses of Congress.

Fresh from conquests at the Academy Awards, where adoring Hollywood elites showered him with coveted golden statues for spreading their favorite propaganda, Gore was determined to turn his personal conquest into draconian federal law and human misery.

“It’s quite possible ... that [former Vice President Al] Gore’s appearance on [Capitol] Hill actually represents the beginning of the end of his influence on climate policy, rather than the start of a legislative tsunami.”

Debate Is Changing

Gore’s words to Congress were predictable. The Earth is warming. The polar ice caps are melting. Polar bears are on the run. And it’s man’s fault. Solution? Ban or control human activities.

The mantra of the religion of global warming is getting a little boring. It’s quite possible, however, that Gore’s appearance on the Hill actually represents the beginning of the end of his influence on climate policy, rather than the start of a legislative tsunami.

Why? Because even after the global warming storm troopers—armed with billions of dollars, the backing of the Hollywood elite, the news media, and most of academia—have done everything possible to threaten, bully, and force their one-sided propaganda on us, the so-called global warming skeptics seem to be coming out of their hiding places in ever greater numbers.

The debate is now taking a dramatic change. As the skeptics’ side is heard, more Americans are beginning to understand there are legitimate reasons for skepticism. Here are just a few of the latest developments.

Inconvenient Truths

Item: Just days before Gore’s charge up Capitol Hill, a high-profile climate debate between prominent scientists ended with global warming skeptics being voted the clear winner.

Before the start of the debate, held in New York City, the audience polled 57.3 percent to 29.9 percent in favor of believing that global warming was a crisis. After the debate, 46.2 percent of the audience said they believe global warming is not a crisis, while 42.2 percent said it was a crisis. Conclusion: When people hear both sides, they can easily judge for themselves what is truth, and they reject the alarmists.

Item: On March 13, the New York Times, one of the most adamant promoters of the global warming gospel, published a landmark article stating, “scientists argue that some of [former Vice President Al] Gore’s central points are exaggerated and erroneous.”

Item: French scientist Claude Allegre, a prominent Socialist and supporter of global warming dogma, recanted his belief in manmade, catastrophic global warming and now says promotion of the idea is motivated by money.

Switching Sides

Item: One of Israel’s top young scientists, Nir Shaviv, recently reversed his opinion, noting the link between emissions and climate variability has nothing more than “circumstantial evidence” to support it.

“As the [global warming] skeptics’ side is heard, more Americans are beginning to understand there are legitimate reasons for skepticism. Here are just a few of the latest developments.”

Item: The United Kingdom’s famed environmental activist David Bellamy also recently converted to skepticism, as did meteorologist Reid Bryson, who has switched from originally supporting the 1970s global cooling scare and has become a global warming skeptic.

Item: A report by The Heartland Institute, titled “What Climate Scientists Really Say About Global Warming,” exposes the weakness of the “consensus” claims of the global warming shock troops. To reach its findings the report examined two surveys conducted among climate scientists; the first in 1996 and the second in 2003. Both surveys confirm scientists are divided on the issue. Says the report:

- More climate scientists “strongly disagree” than “strongly agree” with the notion that climate change is caused by humans.
- Most climate scientists do not believe “the current state of knowledge is able to provide reasonable predictions of climate variability” over 100-year periods.
- Only 2 percent of climate scientists surveyed “strongly agree” modeling programs designed to predict climate changes are accurate.
- Almost all climate scientists agree climate change could have “positive effects for some societies.”

‘Consensus’ Claims Refuted

Item: After global warming propagandists rushed to declare the 2007 report of the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) proved conclusively that global warming was caused by human action, the report itself predicts less global warming than was forecast by previous IPCC reports.

Item: New research by international scientists is confirming that the sun has been a major driver of climate variability. Solar specialist Henrik Svensmark of the Danish National Space Center explained, “We have the highest solar activity we have had in at least 1,000 years.”

As Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK) sums it up, “The usual suspects will still insist that there is a ‘consensus’ of scientists who agree with Gore. And yes, many governing boards and spokesmen of science institutions must toe the politically correct line of Gore-inspired science, but rank and file scientists are now openly rebelling.”

As real debate finally exposes the factual inaccuracies of headline-making one-liners, the truth will become ever more inconvenient for Al Gore and his global warming zealots.

Tom DeWeese (amPolicyCenter@hotmail.com) is president of the American Policy Center.
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**GLOBAL SATELLITE TEMPERATURES**

**HOW MUCH GLOBAL WARMING?**

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

**MAY 2007**

**GLOBAL AVERAGE**

The global average temperature for May was 0.18°C above normal.

**NORTHERN HEMISPHERE**

The Northern Hemisphere’s temperature was 0.20°C above normal.

**SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE**

The Southern Hemisphere’s temperature was 0.17°C above normal.
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