

## The Week That Was (June 6, 2009) brought to you by SEPP

\*\*\*\*\*

**World Environment Day 5 June 2009** **D-Day June 6, 1945**

\*\*\*\*\*

### Quote of the Week:

The battle over global warming and low-carbon policies will not be decided over scientific issues. It will be determined by governments and lawmakers on the basis of politics and special interests

-- Benny Peiser

\*\*\*\*\*

### THIS WEEK

#### New Climate Change Report Applauded by Scientists, Economists, Policymakers

News release by the Heartland Institute\*\*

WASHINGTON, D.C. June 2, 2009 – It's not often a book receives an ovation at a business conference, but an 880-page, 1-1/2 inch-thick, six-pound rebuttal of global-warming alarmism earned that distinction at the *Third International Conference on Climate Change (ICCC)*.

The book, released during the one-day conference attended more than 250 scientists, economists, policy makers, and media, is *Climate Change Reconsidered*, the 2009 report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC).

Joseph Bast, president of The Heartland Institute, which published the tome, said the NIPCC report fills a gaping hole in the arsenal that global warming skeptics need to counter the United Nations' bible of global-warming alarmism, the 2007 Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

The science underlying the U.N. report is dissected, rebutted, and refuted in *Climate Change Reconsidered*, coauthored by Dr. S. Fred Singer and Dr. Craig Idso. The two scientists wrote nine chapters and cited thousands of peer-reviewed research papers and books, including many that were ignored by the U.N. or published after the U.N. report's release.

Bast, the book's editor, reviewed the history of skeptics' literature for the attendees and said the NIPCC report signaled "a new chapter in the debate over global warming." As he hoisted a copy of the report from under the podium and held it up, the audience broke into applause.

Co-author Idso, a geologist and founding president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, said the conclusions in the U.N. Report "far outstrip or even contradict the implications of a vast array of real-world data."

Singer, who for decades has been in the vanguard of skeptic opposition to alarmist junk science, said the NIPCC report made three broad points: ■ No evidence that the rise in global temperatures in the past 50 years is due to human activity. On the contrary, human activity has "no significant influence" at all on temperature change. ■ Increases in carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere are harmless, and proposed efforts to mitigate them are "ineffectual" and "won't have the slightest impact on climate." ■ The debate about global warming "is not about the science." To great applause, he said the political effort to regulate CO2 emissions "is about money and power."

=====

YouTube **videos** from the press conference:

Heartland President Joseph Bast, editor of *Climate Change Reconsidered*:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zABwTwQ-KQ4>

Craig D. Idso Ph.D., coauthor: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KNZjMB1BzYo>  
 S. Fred Singer Ph.D., coauthor: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IEfDGn8MgJM>

=====  
 \*\*The Heartland Institute is a 25-year-old nonprofit research and education organization based in Chicago and devoted to discovering, developing, and promoting free-market solutions to social and economic problems.

*Climate Change Reconsidered* by Craig Idso and S. Fred Singer ISBN-13 978-1-934791-28-8 \$154 paperback perfect bound To order, call 312-377-4000 or visit [www.heartland.org](http://www.heartland.org) or [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com)  
 \*\*\*\*\*

**SEPP Science Editorial #16-2009 (6/6/09)**

### **Why I am a Climate Realist**

*Guest column by Dr Willem de Lange, University of Waikato, NZ, 23 May 2009*

In 1996 the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Second Assessment Report was released, and I was listed as one of approximately 3000 "scientists" who agreed that there was a discernable human influence on climate.

I was an invited reviewer for a chapter dealing with the economic impact of sea level rise on small island nations. In keeping with IPCC procedures, the chapter was written and reviewed in isolation from the rest of the report, and I had no input into the process after my review of the chapter draft. I was not asked if I supported the view expressed in my name, and my understanding at the time was that no evidence of a discernable human influence on global climate existed.

The chapter I reviewed dealt primarily with the economic consequences of an assumed sea level rise of 1 meter causing extensive inundation. My response was that I could not comment on the economic analysis; however, I disagreed with the initial assumptions, particularly the assumed sea level rise in the stated time period. Further, there was good evidence at the time that sea level rise would not necessarily result in flooding of small island nations, because natural processes on coral atolls were likely to raise island levels.

The IPCC Second Assessment Report assessed sea level rise by AD 2100 as being in the range 0.20-0.86 m, with a most likely value of 0.49 m (less than half the rate assumed for the economic analysis). Subsequent research has demonstrated that coral atolls and associated islands are likely to increase in elevation as sea level rises. Hence, the assumptions were invalid, and I was convinced that IPCC projections were unrealistic and exaggerated the problem.

-----  
**MORE at NZ Centre for Political Research** <http://www.nzcprr.com/guest147.htm>

\*\*\*\*\*

- 1. Martin Feldstein on Cap&Trade costs**
- 2. Chances of a global climate agreement are fading rapidly**
- 3. BBC policy on Climate Change reports: Satire**
- 4. Global Warming skeptic may get French ministry post**
- 5. Ethanol's costly grocery bill**
- 6. A shock at the pump**

## 7. Chevy Volt likely to shock Government Motors

## 8. A statement/letter on World Environment Day 5 June 2009

## 9. Climate change morality

\*\*\*\*\*

### NEWS YOU CAN USE

It looks like **Cap and Trade** may not make it into law this year but that does not say the movement is dead. Far from it, the discussion will continue to see how to split up the pie. The fact is that this is too lucrative a tax potential to overlook and that it will eventually happen. Many corporations are pushing it as they also see green. As for cause---destruction of the environment, who cares? This movement is only about \$\$\$: <http://www.carbontax.org/blogarchives/2007/05/25/is-cap-and-trade-big-greens-dead-end-2/>

\*\*\*\*\*

**Recommended: International Climate Science Coalition (ICSC)** has links to NIPCC and others: <http://www.climatescienceinternational.org/>

Website: <http://www.drroyspencer.com/> with several very clear explanations of topics pertaining to the current controversy over climate change and global warming. **Roy Spencer** has taken extra effort to sort out the conflicting claims about how CO2 affects the earth's temperature.

\*\*\*\*\*

Obama's Green Delusions: The false promises of **renewable energy**.

<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=MjRkNmE5ZmVmMzI4NGExMmNhYzgwYTAyODM5Y2RjYmY=>

**Solar** on life support -- surviving only thanks to taxpayers and ratepayers

<http://www.nature.com/naturejobs/2009/090604/full/nj7247-740a.html>

\*\*\*\*\*

**VAT Means Big Government:** The evidence from Europe shows that consumption taxes, like Value Added Tax, go hand-in-hand with rising income taxes.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124407379245683253.html#mod=djemEditorialPage>

\*\*\*\*\*

**Russia makes major shift in climate policy:** Prime Minister Vladimir Putin has called for a Russian climate-action plan that includes measures to improve energy efficiency.

<http://www.nature.com/news/2009/090526/full/news.2009.506.html>

26 May 2009 | Nature | doi:10.1038/news.2009.506

Not a bad idea: Energy savings internally, also means more oil and gas for export.

\*\*\*\*\*

### UNDER THE BOTTOM LINE

Even the BBC can be skeptic: "*The Global Humanitarian Forum, headed by former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, released a 103-page report estimating that 'every year climate change leaves over 300,000 people dead, 325 million people seriously affected, and economic losses of US \$125 billion.'* The report contains so many extrapolations derived from guesswork based on estimates inferred from unsuitable data sets that you have to ask some serious questions about the methodology." --Richard Cable, BBC Climate Change blog, 1 June 2009 H/t CCNet

Skepticism from Andy Revkin of the NYT: "*There are significant questions about the robustness of the numbers at the heart of the new report estimating that more than 300,000 deaths are already being caused each year by global warming, with nearly twice that number possible by 2030.*" <http://dotearth.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/05/29/warming-and-death/?emc=eta1>

=====

**Man bites dog:** BBC blog makes fun of GW!! <http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/climatechange/>  
\*\*\*\*\*

Ottawa, Canada, June 4, 2009 -<http://tinyurl.com/qo4v2l> **Climate forecasts** by the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change <http://globalchange.mit.edu/index.html> have been blasted by scientists of the International Climate Science Coalition (ICSC) as having little connection with reality and being irrelevant to public policy <http://www.climatescienceinternational.org/>  
\*\*\*\*\*

**GM's Concept Car:** The 2010 Obama-wagen: <<http://www.junkscience.com/>> June 3, 2009 Government Motors and CEO Barack Obama are pleased to present the first car to run on broken promises and hot air... Check out full story at <[www.GreenHellBlog.com](http://www.GreenHellBlog.com)>  
\*\*\*\*\*

Congressman (and climate expert) Henry **Waxman** produced this gem worthy of George W. Bush in an interview (April 13, 2009) with Tavis Smiley on PBS: [http://www.pbs.org/kcet/tavissmiley/archive/200904/20090413\\_waxman.html](http://www.pbs.org/kcet/tavissmiley/archive/200904/20090413_waxman.html)  
See the video at <http://torydroy.blogspot.com/2009/06/henry-waxman.html>

*"We're seeing the reality of a lot of the North Pole starting to evaporate, and we could get to a tipping point. Because if it evaporates to a certain point - they have lanes now where ships can go that couldn't ever sail through before. And if it gets to a point where it evaporates too much, there's a lot of tundra that's being held down by that ice cap."*



**1. OPINION: THE FOLLY OF UNILATERAL CAP-AND-TRADE**

By Martin Feldstein, *The Washington Post*, 1 June 2009  
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/05/31/AR2009053102077.html>>

The Obama administration and congressional Democrats have proposed a major cap-and-trade system aimed at reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Scientists agree that CO2 emissions around the world could lead to rising temperatures with serious long-term environmental consequences. But that is not a reason to enact a U.S. cap-and-trade system until there is a global agreement on CO2 reduction. The proposed legislation would have a trivially small effect on global warming while imposing substantial costs on all American households. And to get political support in key states, the legislation would abandon the auctioning of permits in favor of giving permits to selected corporations.

The leading legislative proposal, the Waxman-Markey bill that was recently passed out of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, would reduce allowable CO2 emissions to 83 percent of the 2005 level by 2020, then gradually decrease the amount further. Under the cap-and-trade system, the federal government would limit the total volume of CO2 that U.S. companies can emit each year and would issue permits that companies would be required to have for each ton of CO2 emitted. Once issued, these permits would be tradable and could be bought and sold, establishing a market price reflecting the targeted CO2 reduction, with a tougher CO2 standard and fewer available permits leading to higher prices.

Companies would buy permits from each other as long as it is cheaper to do that than to make the technological changes needed to eliminate an equivalent amount of CO2 emissions. Companies would also pass along the cost of the permits in their prices, pushing up the relative price of CO2-intensive goods and services such as gasoline, electricity and a range of industrial products. Consumers would respond by cutting back on consumption of CO2-intensive products in favor of other goods and services. This pass-through of the permit cost in higher consumer prices is the primary way the cap-and-trade system would reduce the production of CO2 in the United States.

The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that the resulting increases in consumer prices needed to achieve a 15 percent CO2 reduction -- slightly less than the Waxman-Markey target -- would raise the cost of living of a typical household by \$1,600 a year. Some expert studies estimate that the cost to households could be substantially higher. The future cost to the typical household would rise significantly as the government reduces the total allowable amount of CO2.

Americans should ask themselves whether this annual tax of \$1,600-plus per family is justified by the very small resulting decline in global CO2. Since the U.S. share of global CO2 production is now less than 25 percent (and is projected to decline as China and other developing nations grow), a 15 percent fall in U.S. CO2 output would lower global CO2 output by less than 4 percent. Its impact on global warming would be virtually unnoticeable. The U.S. should wait until there is a global agreement on CO2 that includes China and India before committing to costly reductions in the United States.

The CBO estimates that the sale of the permits for a 15 percent CO2 reduction would raise revenue of about \$80 billion a year over the next decade. It is remarkable, then, that the Waxman-Markey bill would give away some 85 percent of the permits over the next 20 years to various businesses instead of selling them at auction. The price of the permits and the burden to households would be the same whether the permits are sold or given away. But by giving them away the government would not collect the revenue that could, at least in principle, be used to offset some of the higher cost to households.

The Waxman-Markey bill would give away 30 percent of the permits to local electricity distribution companies with the expectation that their regulators would require those firms to pass the benefit on to their customers. If they do this by not raising prices, there would be less CO2 reduction through lower electricity consumption. The permit price would then have to be higher to achieve more CO2 reduction on all other products. Some electricity consumers would benefit, but the cost to all other American families would be higher.

In my judgment, the proposed cap-and-trade system would be a costly policy that would penalize Americans with little effect on global warming. The proposal to give away most of the permits only makes a bad idea worse. Taxpayers and legislators should keep these things in mind before enacting any cap-and-trade system.

=====  
*Martin Feldstein, a professor of economics at Harvard University and president emeritus of the nonprofit National Bureau of Economic Research, was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers from 1982 to 1984.*  
 =====

**SEPP Comment: Feldstein is basically correct. C&T is not about climate; it's about money.**

\*\*\*\*\*

## **2. CHANCES OF A GLOBAL CLIMATE AGREEMENT ARE FADING RAPIDLY**

By *BENNY PEISER, CCNet*

The battle over global warming and low-carbon policies will not be decided over scientific issues. It will be determined by governments and lawmakers on the basis of hard-nosed national and economic interests. This is where the green utopia for a low-carbon transition in the near future is likely to crash into the buffers.

As we get closer to the Copenhagen conference, the chances of a global climate agreement are fading rapidly. In fact, the probability of a Kyoto-style treaty with legally binding emissions targets are now close to zero as the gap between the developed and the developing nations has been growing ever wider.

The global economic crisis has rendered costly climate policies more or less untenable. It has become hugely unpopular among voters who are increasingly hostile to green taxes. The intriguing fact that the global warming trend of the late 20th century appears to have come to a halt has led to growing public scepticism about claims of impending climate catastrophe.

Carbon taxes and cap-and-trade schemes have turned into considerable liabilities for political parties and governments alike. A climate revolt among Eastern and central European countries has forced the EU to renounce its unilateral Kyoto-strategy. President Obama's administration is struggling to push its cap-and-trade bill through the US Senate because senators of his own party, the Blue Dog Democrats, are opposed to proposals they fear as being too costly and too risky.

Developing nations are demanding financial support to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars (per year) in return for their support of a post-Kyoto climate treaty. In view of the astronomical demands made by China, India and Africa, Western governments and their voters are increasingly reluctant to agree to injurious obligations that risk weakening their economic competitiveness even further.

Perhaps the most critical factor for the growing scepticism in Europe is the vanishing strength of Europe's centre-left and green parties, whose members were once among the most forceful climate alarmists. Labour and green parties throughout Europe have lost much of their popularity and support. Today, few have remained in positions of power.

The principles of fairness, technological progress and economic growth used to stand at the heart of social democratic governments. Advancing the interests of poor and disadvantaged members of society was essential to the popular appeal of [European] social-democratic and Labour parties. The centre-left have substituted these social-democratic ideals for an environmental programme in which the rhetoric of saving the planet has taken priority over the principle of liberating the underprivileged and disadvantaged from poverty and dereliction today.

In effect, green policies are gradually pricing the working and lower-middle classes out of their comfort zone. Labour parties may sincerely believe that their utopian low-carbon plans will save the planet. But in the process they are destroying the very foundations of their political support and movement.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **3. THE UNBEARABLE NAKEDNESS OF CLIMATE CHANGE**

<http://omniclimate.wordpress.com/2009/05/31/explanation-for-bbc-science-news-webpages-climate-change-policy/>

*By Maurizio Morabito, from a letter to CCNet, 31 May 2009*

Having carefully watched the BBC "Science & Environment" news web page for several weeks now, I am inclined to identify the following as their underlying "Climate Change" reporting policy:

1. No day shall pass without at least one climate-change-related link somewhere on that page
2. Reporting on scientific articles supporting AGW will be strictly confined to a slight change of the original press release with the smallest and most inconsequential of doubt and criticism in the results
3. Whatever Prince Charles or any other environmental celebrity has to say will be considered worthy of publication
4. No such luck for anything not supporting AGW, however authoritative the source.

5. Point 4 will not apply once a quarter or so, in order to demonstrate "balanced reporting"
6. No climate-change link will be considered too trivial to report
7. There will be links to Richard Black's blog <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/thereporters/richardblack/>>
8. There will be no link to the BBC's own "Climate Change - The Blog of Bloom" blog <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/climatechange/>>. After all, it does make fun of AGW

And so there goes my licence money at work supporting the fight against the destruction of the world by evil SUV drivers...

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **4. GLOBAL WARMING SKEPTIC MAY GET FRENCH MINISTRY POST**

<http://news.newsmax.com/?ZK4vYqGFR4KhmXMbSctNhEWKk3yftfU1Z>

French President Nicolas Sarkozy has reportedly decided to appoint France's most outspoken global warming skeptic to head the nation's super-ministry of industry and innovation.

Dr. Claude Allegre, a former believer in manmade global warming, reversed his views in recent years and mocked climate change alarmist Al Gore's Nobel Prize as "a political gimmick."

Allegre is a former French Socialist Party leader, a member of both the French Academy of Sciences and the United States National Academy of Sciences, and the recipient of numerous scientific awards.

Twenty years ago he became one of the first scientists to warn about manmade global warming, but he now argues that the cause of climate change is "unknown."

Allegre's appointment to the high post "would send political earthquakes through Europe and the rest of the world," Climate Depot's Web site observes.

His possible appointment has drawn strong protests from environmentalists, according to the Financial Times.

Putting Allegre in charge of scientific research would be tantamount to "giving the finger" to scientists, Nicolas Hulot, France's best-known environmental activist, told the Times.

Allegre has been harsh in his attacks on global warming alarmists. "The ecology of helpless protesting has become a very lucrative business for some people," he told a French publication. He also criticized the "nonsense" in Gore's 2006 documentary "An Inconvenient Truth," calling it "scandalous" and "all politics."

Oklahoma Republican Sen. James Inhofe, Ranking Member of the Environment and Public Works Committee and Capitol Hill's leading global warming skeptic, has said in a speech on the Senate floor: "I find it ironic that a free market conservative capitalist in the U.S. Senate and a French socialist scientist both apparently agree that sound science is not what is driving this debate, but greed by those who would use this issue to line their own pockets."

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **5. ETHANOL'S GROCERY BILL**

The Obama Administration is pushing a big expansion in ethanol, including a mandate to increase the share of the corn-based fuel required in gasoline to 15 percent from 10 percent. Apparently no

one in the Administration has read a pair of new studies that expose ethanol as a bad deal for consumers with little environmental benefit, says the Wall Street Journal.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reported last month that Americans pay another surcharge for ethanol in higher food prices:

- o From April 2007 to April 2008, "the increased use of ethanol accounted for about 10 percent to 15 percent of the rise in food prices," because millions of acres of farmland and 3 billion bushels of corn were diverted to ethanol from food production.
- o Americans spend about \$1.1 trillion a year on food, so in 2007 the ethanol subsidy cost families between \$5.5 billion and \$8.8 billion in higher grocery bills.

According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), reductions in CO2 emissions from burning ethanol are minimal and negative, while the process of making ethanol requires new land from clearing forest and grasslands that would otherwise sequester carbon emissions.

"As with petroleum based fuels," the report concludes, "greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are associated with the conversion and combustion of bio-fuels and every year they are produced, GHG emissions could be released through time if new acres are needed to produce corn or other crops for biofuels."

Both CBO and EPA find that in theory ethanol would reduce carbon emissions. However, as CBO emphasizes, "current technologies for producing cellulosic ethanol are not commercially viable."

The ethanol lobby is attempting a giant bait-and-switch: keep claiming that cellulosic ethanol is just around the corner, even as it knows the only current technology to meet federal mandates is corn ethanol, says the WSJ.

Source: Editorial, "Ethanol's Grocery Bill," Wall Street Journal, June 2, 2009.  
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124389966385274413.html> H/t NCPA

\*\*\*\*\*

## **6. A SHOCK AT THE PUMP**

Rising gasoline prices are back. Millions of Americans at the end of May faced prices for regular gas averaging \$2.35 per gallon, a full 30 cents higher than the beginning of the month and nearly 60 cents more than at the start of the year. But don't expect any help from Congress. In fact, Washington is working on a bill that would raise costs further, says Ben Lieberman is a senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation.

The proposed American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 (the Waxman-Markey proposal) essentially would limit how much gasoline and other fossil fuels Americans can use. The aim is to cut emissions of carbon dioxide from energy use; yet, prices would have to rise high enough so the public would be forced to drive less and meet the ever-tightening energy rationing targets.

How high? A Heritage Foundation analysis estimates that gasoline costs will rise \$118 annually for a typical four-person household once the bill's provisions take effect in 2012:

- o That's about 10 cents more per gallon, and the impact goes up as the bill demands tougher energy use restrictions each year, tacking on an additional \$1.23 to the inflation-adjusted price per gallon by 2035.
- o Electricity is also hit hard; in fact, the main target of the bill is coal, which affordably provides 50 percent of America's electricity. The costs would filter down to consumers and boost electric bills by \$235 in 2012, rising to \$468 by 2035; that's a 90 percent increase over current rates.
- o The bill also would cost jobs, especially in the manufacturing sector.

Overall, this is a regressive tax that would harm the working poor the most. At the same time, it would leave a million or more people without a paycheck to deal with the higher costs.

Source: Ben Lieberman, "A shock at the pump?" Heritage Foundation, June 1, 2009.

<http://www.heritage.org/Press/Commentary/ed060109a.cfm> H/t NCPA

\*\*\*\*\*

## **7. CHEVY VOLT LIKELY TO SHOCK GOVERNMENT MOTORS**

*By Tom Randall, June 4, 2009 trandall@winninggreen.com*

Former General Motors management spent billions of dollars on development of "it". Environmentalists tell us "it" will save the planet. Liberal politicians, particularly the president, extol "its" virtues. But "it," the plug-in hybrid Chevy Volt, seems likely to be a car with no market.

First of all, GM says the little car's lithium battery is good for "up to" 40 miles on a full charge. "Up to" is code for ideal conditions. How much does that range go down when you turn on the heater or air conditioner, drive at high speed or on very hot or very cold "battery-draining" days? Government Motors, so far, isn't saying. Our guess is the range would decrease a lot. So, that seems to limit the car's market to major cities like Chicago. It wouldn't even make a useful commuter vehicle in a major metropolitan area where rush-hour traffic reporters talk about delays in terms of hours, not miles per hour..

In Chicago, like other big cities, most people park on the streets or in condominium parking garages; single-family garages are the exception. But, parking places on city streets have no electrical outlets. In our condo building we would need about a 375-foot extension cord to reach from 19th floor, where we live, to where our car resides on the third floor of the adjacent parking garage.

So, it would seem the Volt's most viable market isn't really viable at all.

But there are other problems.

Early indications are that the small little economy hybrid will sell in the neighborhood of \$40,000. For that kind of money, customers can get a relatively fancy set of wheels that still gets what most of us would consider acceptable mileage. A \$7,500 taxpayer subsidy cuts the price to \$32,500 still high. And, the car's big battery carries with it other problems.

First of all, it appears the battery will be so expensive that Government Motors is considering not selling it with the car but leasing the battery separately. Secondly, the lithium for the battery comes from Bolivia. So we would be trading less use of oil from unstable parts of the world for lithium from another unstable country.

When the battery loses its charge, the car has to run on its gasoline engine. When the battery goes dead, what kind of mileage will its "auxiliary" gasoline engine get? GM isn't saying but dragging around the massive, heavy battery is not conducive to good mileage.

Finally, by the time the much-delayed Volt hits the road, it is likely to face stiff competition from advanced, efficient, low-emission, conventional drive trains being developed by a number of competitors, including the only U.S. car company President Obama has not yet nationalized Ford.

Of course, Government Motors won't pay for this impending product development/marketing failure. We will. We pay all the government's bills.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **8. A STATEMENT/LETTER ON WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY**

*By Mr Viv Forbes, Chairman of the Carbon Sense Coalition.*

If environmentalists were really concerned for the environment, they would spend time on **World Environment Day** worshipping carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in the atmosphere, not demonising it.

All life in the biosphere depends on the carbon cycle.

The cycle starts when plants using solar energy and photosynthesis extract carbon dioxide from the atmosphere converting it into plant sugars and proteins. In that process, plants provide food for all herbivores (and vegetarians) and also for the carnivores that live on them. Plants extract carbon from the carbon dioxide and return oxygen to the atmosphere for the use of animal life. To complete the carbon cycle, the waste products and decaying bodies of all living things return the carbon to the atmosphere. Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is the key element in the cycle of life and worthy of worship on World Environment Day.

Life on earth evolved in times when CO<sub>2</sub> levels were about 400% higher than at present. The current level of 386 ppm is not far above the 200 ppm level at which plants stop growing because of carbon dioxide starvation. Nurserymen know this and use gas burners to increase the CO<sub>2</sub> level in their greenhouses and plant nurseries to 1,000 ppm or more. If the atmosphere reached this level there would be massive improvement in plant growth, with benefits for the whole environment. There is no danger to humans at this level - the CO<sub>2</sub> levels in submarines may reach 8,000 ppm without problems for humans, and our exhaled breath has about 40,000 ppm of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Warmth, increased evaporation from the oceans, increased precipitation and increased CO<sub>2</sub> would be the magic combination for a greener planet. Burning fossil fuel adds CO<sub>2</sub> and water to the atmosphere, and helps to return the world to the verdant conditions prevailing when our great coal deposits were formed.

However most environmentalists, in their hatred of humanity and technology, are trying to take us back to the days of the horse and sulky. They extol the simple life where a few lucky people lived in a Garden of Eden with no nasty cars, trains, planes, engines or electricity.

Our pioneering ancestors lived such a life, and one grandmother summarised the feeling of many of them on The Good Old Days when she said: "Thank God the good old days are over."

For a true story about life on a genuine green farm in the horse-and-sulky days, see:

<http://carbon-sense.com/2009/06/03/good-old-green-days/>

\*\*\*\*\*

## **9. CLIMATE CHANGE MORALITY:**

### **The duplicitous politics of money, power, control and corporate rent-seeking**

*By Paul Driessen*

The climate crisis is a moral issue that requires serious debate, Al Gore proclaimed in an April 27 AlGore.com blog post.

His conversion to the Anglo-American tradition of robust debate came a mere three days after the ex-VP refused to participate in a congressional hearing with Lord Christopher Monckton, former science advisor to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Republicans had invited Monckton to counter Gores testimony before the House Energy and Commerce Committee. But Gore froze like a terrified deer in headlights, and Chairman Henry Waxman told the UK climate expert he was uninvited.

Their hypocritical cowardice simply reflects a recognition that their entire energy-rationing crusade would collapse if they ever allowed real debate.

Monckton would have focused on the science. But it is morality that truly requires serious debate. Climate Armageddon claims are being used to justify malignant policies that have no rational basis.

Global average temperatures peaked in 1998 and since have cooled slightly, despite steadily rising CO2 levels. Except in its Western Peninsula, Antarctica is gaining ice, and Antarctic sea ice reached an all-time high in 2007. Arctic ice is seasonably normal, and in 2008 the Northern Hemisphere was covered by more snow than ever before recorded.

Scientists are hard-pressed to point to long-term state or country climate trends that differ from historic experience and can reasonably be linked to anthropogenic warming crises. Merely asserting that obesity causes warming or increased malaria and house cat populations are due to [warming](#) does not make it so.

Even more devastating to alarmist claims, long-held assumptions about the deep Atlantic counter-current or conveyor belt below the Gulf Stream have been undermined by [recent studies](#). Those assumptions underlie many climate models and their scary worst-case scenarios about alleged planetary crises. The models and GIGO scenarios are now even more questionable.

Yet, model results are constantly portrayed as evidence proof that immediate, drastic action is required to avert disaster. Nonsense. Climate changes and their causes are complex, our knowledge is still limited, and the inputs and assumptions are deficient.

Climate models are no more reliable than computer predictions of future Super Bowl winners and scores. Their Frankenstein scenarios are no more valid as a basis for law and policy than the special effects in *The Day After Tomorrow* or *Jurassic Park*.

Worse, even the 942-page Waxman-Markey climate bill's absurd target of a 17% reduction in US carbon dioxide emissions by 2020 and 83% by 2050 would have no detectable benefits, even if CO2 does cause climate change. Research climatologist Paul Chip Knappenberger calculates that even these draconian measures would result in global temperatures rising a mere [0.1 degrees F](#) less by 2050 than doing nothing, mostly because Chinese and Indian emissions would quickly dwarf Americas job-killing reductions.

Meanwhile, China and South Africa want developed nations to slash carbon emissions 40% by 2020 and give poor countries \$200 billion annually, to help them cope with global warming's imagined disasters. Bolivia wants \$700 billion a year. Our children will get the bill for that, too.

None of this apparently matters to congressional leaders, Climate Action Partnership members or other professional alarmists and rent seekers. If anything, it has spurred them into even hastier action, to transform America's energy and economic system, regardless of the consequences. Waxman-Markey was approved by the E&C Committee May 21 on a mostly party-line vote.

Above all, they want to replace vile hydrocarbons with wind power. That would require \$\$\$ billions in taxpayer subsidies; hundreds of thousands of turbines, across millions of acres of scenic land, habitats and sea lanes; thousands of miles of new transmission lines and towers; and billions of tons of concrete, steel, copper and fiberglass plus raw materials and natural gas for backup generators.

Spain's experience should be cautionary, but probably won't be. According to a [study](#) by Dr. Gabriel Calzada, Spanish taxpayers spent \$754,000 for each new job in the wind turbine industry (mostly installing towering turbines) and destroyed 2.2 regular jobs for each green job, primarily because pricey renewable electricity forced companies to lay off workers, to stay in business.

A recent Lauer Johnson Research poll found 78% of respondents saying even a \$600 per year increase in utility bills would be a hardship. They should be so lucky.

Compared to no cap-and-tax regime, Waxman-Markey would cost the United States a cumulative \$9.6 trillion in real GDP losses by 2035, according to an updated [study](#) by the Heritage Foundation's Center for Data Analysis. The bill would also cost an additional 1.1 million jobs each year, raise electricity rates 90% after adjusting for inflation, cause a 74% hike in inflation-adjusted gasoline prices, and add \$1,500 to the average family's annual energy bill, says Heritage.

The Congressional Budget Office says the poorest one-fifth of families could see annual energy costs rise \$700 while high income families could see their costs rise \$2,200 a year. Harvard economist Martin Feldstein estimates that the average person could pay an extra \$1,500 per year for energy. MIT says household energy costs could climb \$3,000 per year.

Where will families find that extra cash? What do I tell a single mom, making \$8 an hour? asked North Carolina congressman (and Congressional Black Caucus member) G. K. Butterfield.

That was a few days before he and his Democrat colleagues voted *against* amendments to Waxman-Markey that would have suspended the punitive law if electricity prices go up more than 10% after inflation, unemployment reaches 15% or gasoline prices hit \$5. What *will* he tell that single mom?

Eco-activists gleefully predict that oil, gas and coal companies, utilities, vehicles and investors are destined for extinction. No wonder lobbyists have descended on Washington -- over 2,300 of them just on climate change: 4.4 per member of Congress.

Some are getting \$400-\$850 an hour for their skill in promoting mandates, subsidies, legal measures to hobble competitors, and cap-tax-and-trade versions of the mortgage derivatives market. Al Gore alone boasts of having received \$300 million (from unnamed sources) to trumpet alarmism and draconian legislation.

Colleges, scientists, activists, unions and companies receive billions in taxpayer money, to hype climate chaos claims, intimidate skeptics and lobby Congress. African bureaucrats get millions from the UN (and thus US taxpayers) to hype climate disaster claims that [keep millions of Africans](#) impoverished and deprived of the life-enhancing benefits of reliable, affordable electricity.

President Obama says the Bush Administration made decisions based upon fear, rather than foresight, and all too often trimmed facts and evidence to fit ideological predispositions. He and his Democrat allies in Congress should take that critique to heart on global warming.

As it stands, this Congress is rapidly shaping up to be the most unethical, immoral and dictatorial in history. When the people finally rebel, it won't be a pretty sight.

-----  
*Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and Congress of Racial Equality, and author of Eco-Imperialism: Green power Black death.*