APRIL 2010

American Legislative Exchange Council

The State Factor

A PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL

BY Paul Driessen, APR, Esq.

Affordable Energy

The foundation of human rights and economic justice

INTRODUCTION

Even as the United States struggles with recession, unemployment and deficits, political forces seek to bring a wholesale transformation of the hydrocarbon-based energy system that supports U.S. economic vitality and living standards. Politicians and activists argue that carbon dioxide emissions are causing potentially disastrous global warming; drilling and mining result in unacceptable environmental damage; and renewable energy is more eco-friendly and sustainable than conventional fuels. They promote increased taxes, regulations and restrictions on hydrocarbon development and use—and mandates, standards and subsidies in support of wind and solar energy—to hasten this transformation.

Virtually all Americans are committed to environmental protection and energy conservation, and support for renewable energy remains strong. We love our planet and want to protect it. However, a growing majority of us want greater caution in implementing policies that hinder economic recovery, stifle job creation, and impose higher taxes and costs on families and society. Americans recognize that evidence for dangerous man-made global warming is weak. People also understand that we import well over half of our oil (63%), our nation needs the oil, natural gas and coal that still provide 85% of the energy that powers America, and we still have those resources in abundance in onshore deposits and off our shores.

Energy is the Master Resource—the vital fuel, the foundation for everything we eat, drink, drive, heat, cool, make, ship and do. Indeed, energy transforms constitutionally protected civil rights into rights we actually enjoy: jobs, homes, transportation, healthcare, living standards, opportunities, and other earmarks of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

With abundant, reliable, affordable energy, almost anything is possible, and we can improve, enrich and safeguard countless lives. Without it, hopes, civil rights, and the pursuit of happiness are hobbled.

"Laws and policies that restrict access to America's abundant energy resources drive up the price of energy and consumer goods," Congress of Racial Equality chairman Roy Innis points out. "They cause layoffs and leave workers and families struggling to survive. They roll back the progress for which civil rights revolutionaries like Dr. Martin Luther King struggled and died."[1]

Energy is the Master Resource—the vital fuel, the foundation for everything we eat, drink, drive, heat, cool, make, ship, and do. Indeed, energy transforms constitutionally protected civil rights into rights we actually enjoy: jobs, homes, transportation, healthcare, living standards, opportunities, and other earmarks of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

These policies block the door to opportunity, creating unnecessary and unacceptable obstacles to the natural, justifiable desire of poor and minority Americans to share in the American Dream. They tarnish the golden years of senior citizens, forcing many to choose between heating and eating.

Regressive energy laws and policies impair further civil rights progress, Innis adds, "deny minority and other poor families a seat at the energy lunch counter, and send us to the back of the economic bus."[2]

Burdensome taxes and restrictions on energy production and use also put activist pressure groups, bureaucrats, politicians and courts in control of what has made America a shining beacon for people the world over: liberty, economic freedom, optimism and the promise of upward mobility for all, regardless of education, ethnic background or status at birth. They hamper the pursuit of justice and trample on dreams and unalienable rights with which our Creator endowed us all.

America's economic quagmire

Orders for durable goods fell 20% in 2009. America's unemployment is at its highest level in decades: 10.2% officially, as of January 2010; 17% when the jobless count includes people who have given up finding full-time employment or lack the requisite training for available positions; and a stunning 49% for young black males.[3] Payrolls continue to shrink, and the number of Americans unemployed 27 weeks or longer continues to climb—to 39.8% of the workforce in December 2009, the highest since the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) began keeping records in 1948.

Nearly every state is operating in the red, with huge battles looming over higher taxes, soaring tuition, reduced services, and a frantic quest for ways to reform severely underfunded state pension systems.

The number of involuntary part-time workers, for whom full-time work is unavailable, has risen to 9.2 million. Jobs created in the temp help area fell 17% last December, meaning even temp workers are not finding work.[4] Some economists say the United States is entering a "perma-temp world," where more companies utilize "just-in-time labor forces" of temporary workers, who have no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no sick days, no vacation, no severance package and no access to unemployment insurance. But for many even this is a happy situation. At least the temps have jobs and incomes, albeit in many cases accompanied by higher risks of stress and mental health problems.[5]

Moreover, many who are still working have been forced to settle for lower pay. "Shockingly, pay for production and non-supervisory workers—80% of the private U.S. workforce—is 9% lower than it was in 1973, adjusted for inflation."[6] Poor and minority workers are among the hardest hit, and the "misery index" (unemployment rate plus budget deficit) stands at 20%—more than double its 2007 level.[7]

Nearly every state is operating in the red, with huge battles looming over higher taxes, soaring tuition, reduced services, and a frantic quest for ways to reform severely underfunded state pension systems. California is teetering on the edge of bankruptcy. Between 1990 and 2007, the (formerly) Golden State lost 26% of its factory jobs and 35% of its high-tech manufacturing jobs. Meanwhile, the number of state government employees grew 24% between 1997 and 2007.[8] California is not alone.

"State government revenues are a wreck," says Indiana Governor Mitch Daniels. "The drop in tax receipts is the worst in a half century. Fewer than ten states ended the last fiscal year with significant reserves, and three-fourths have deficits exceeding 10% of their budgets … [Many face] a near permanent reduction in state tax revenues that will require us to reduce the size and scope of our state governments."[9]

As of January 2010, 25 states have borrowed a combined $23 billion from the Federal Unemployment Trust Fund, to meet their obligations to work-deprived workers, Daniels observes. "The 'progressive' states that built their enormous public burdens by soaking the wealthy will hit the wall first and hardest. Already more than half have raised taxes, often on businesses, only to chase them and their tax payments away and into the arms of states like Indiana"[10]—or countries like India.

All this follows a $787-billion "stimulus," a massive Wall Street bailout, and government takeover of General Motors and a host of banks, supposedly to jump start the economy and create jobs.[11]

How will the United States cover these expenditures? "We're out of cash," President Obama has said. In response, the White House and Congress raised the national debt ceiling to $14 trillion—a 39% increase since early 2007." Budget deficits as a share of GDP are

now the highest in over a half century, the U.S. revenue shortfall now tops $1.3 trillion, and the federal deficit is on track to equaling the nation's entire gross domestic product by 2012.[12] Even worse:

Total U.S. government spending in 2009 equaled 37% of our Gross Domestic Product.[13] "If you factor in Social Security, Medicare, state and local debt, and what Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac owe, our total public debt is now at 141% of GDP," notes Research Affiliates chief Robert Arnott. "Add in household and corporate debt, and the unfunded portion of entitlement programs, and it's 840% of GDP."[14]

Even worse, the subsequent government responses were proposals to raise taxes—and enact nationalized healthcare, cap-and-trade laws, and new taxes and regulations on banks and energy companies. There are better ways to return America to prosperity and safeguard civil rights. Among them: develop our nation's abundant energy resources, set aside cap-tax-and-trade legislation, ease existing regulatory burdens, and postpone or cancel costly new regulations, like the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) "endangerment" rules.

Restricting American energy production

Oil companies have developed amazing high-tech tools to explore and produce from formations that previously were too complex, too deep, too impermeable or too far offshore to tap: low-impact seismic capabilities; computerized 3-D seismic and wellbore profiling, to analyze formations and plan and track drilling, production and enhanced recovery programs; directional drilling systems that can hit meters-wide targets five miles away; fracturing and extraction technologies to recover trillions of cubic feet of natural gas from shale formations miles beneath the surface; and *in situ* techniques for extracting black gold from oil shale formations, via drilling and thermal processes, instead of underground or open pit mining.[15] Similar advances in exploration, mining and reclamation make more coal and uranium accessible.

Once again, U.S. recoverable oil and gas reserve estimates have shot upward, and reports of imminent depletion have again been retracted, as has been done repeatedly since the U.S. Geological Survey first predicted the demise of American oil reserves in 1920. Famed petroleum geologist Wallace Pratt has again been vindicated. Oil, he noted, "is first found in the minds of men"—and women—who envision where it will be found and devise the technologies needed to reach and develop the deposits.

Decades worth of oil, natural gas, coal and uranium are once again within reach—along with many thousands of jobs and trillions of dollars in government revenues. Unfortunately, what the right hand findeth, the left hand too often taketh away. Almost as quickly as technologies and discoveries are announced, national environmentalist groups, local activists, bureaucrats, courts and politicians proclaim their opposition, based on potential to speculative risks to air quality, groundwater, endangered species or Earth's climate, or on resistance to energy projects and facilities in their back yards.

U.S. recoverable oil and gas reserve estimates have shot upward, and reports of eminent depletion have been retracted, as has been done repeatedly since 1920.

In early 2009, Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar canceled 77 oil and gas leases that had gone through seven years of studies, negotiations, and land use planning. The canceled leases represented a third of a Utah land parcel estimated to contain enough oil to fuel 3 million cars and enough natural gas to heat 14 million homes for 15 years. His rationale: drilling rigs might be "visible" from national parks over a mile away. Global warming, not petroleum development, he declared, was to be the top priority for every Department of the Interior agency.[16]

A 2008 Department of the Interior (DOI) inventory of federal energy resources found that 163 million acres of public lands are off limits to oil and gas leasing. The land withdrawals make 62% of the oil and 41% of the natural gas in our nation's onshore public lands unavailable. Another 65 million acres are severely restricted, affecting an additional 30% of U.S. onshore federal oil and 49% of our gas.[17]

In other words, an area the size of Texas and Oklahoma, 92% of our onshore publicly owned oil potential, 90% of our onshore natural gas prospects, and all the

jobs and revenues associated with developing those vital resources are *off limits* to the American families that own them. Offshore the situation is similar. The vast majority of Alaskan and Lower 48 public lands and resources outside the Gulf of Mexico are unavailable for leasing and drilling, even off states that are in dire need of jobs and revenues. Moreover, the offshore areas that remain available in the Gulf are increasingly in super deep waters, where costs are exorbitant and only monster fields can be produced economically.[18]

These withdrawals impose huge economic impacts. An ICF International study calculated that developing America's off-limits oil and natural gas resources could generate more than $1.7 trillion in government revenues, create thousands of new jobs, and enhance national security by offsetting nearly a fifth of the oil that the United States currently imports. Developing all U.S. oil and gas resources on federal lands could generate more than $4 trillion in bonuses, rents, royalties, and taxes, ICF concluded.[19]

The United States also has 600 coal-based electrical generating facilities, which produce nearly half of all U.S. electricity, and nearly 262 billion tons of recoverable coal reserves (a 235-year supply at 2008 rates of use). Utilizing these resources in state-of-the-art, low-pollution facilities could produce 100 gigawatts of new generation capacity, 4 trillion cubic feet per day of natural gas, 2.5 million barrels of oil daily and 1.4 million new jobs—with a total net present value of almost $3 trillion, according to industry and government analysts.[20]

America's 104 nuclear power plants generate 20% of the nation's electricity, while emitting no carbon dioxide or pollutants. Three reactors at the Palo Verde Nuclear Power Station near Phoenix, Arizona alone provide the equivalent of six Hoover Dams in electrical power, from less than 140 acres of facilities on a 4,000-acre site, and utilizing city wastewater to cool the reactors.[21]

America also has vast stretches of wind-swept plains and sun-baked deserts—perfect for renewable energy, many say, though these potential electricity riches require lengthy new transmission lines to reach distant cities.

However, coal deposits and coal-fired power plants, uranium mining and nuclear power plants, shale gas and oil shale projects, new transmission lines, and even America's best wind, solar and geothermal sites face similar opposition.

- Florida's Seminole Generating Station Unit 3 project was cancelled in late 2009, because of opposition by the Sierra Club, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Governor Charlie Crist, primarily over global warming issues. The $4.5-billion project would have been the nation's cleanest coal-fired power facility, generating low-cost electricity and creating 1,000 permanent jobs in Putnam County. The clean-burning but now-cancelled Big Stone II coal-fired facility in South Dakota would have brought jobs, affordable electricity and new transmission lines for wind farms.[22]

- New Interior Department and EPA regulations will make it more difficult for companies to get permits for oil and gas projects on federal lands, and Secretary Salazar has supported further delays over the Massachusetts Cape Wind Project on aesthetic grounds.[23]

- Local opposition, proposed federal hydraulic fracturing legislation and other actions threaten to derail drilling in shale deposits, to produce fuel for natural-gas-fired power plants that can replace coal-burning facilities or back up intermittent wind and solar projects.

The United States needs to confront its energy realities and make some tough choices, says Jason Grumet, president of the Bipartisan Policy Center, which supports giving the federal government more authority to move renewable energy and transmission projects forward, in the face of state or local opposition. "You have to ask yourself: At what point do priority national interests need to override local goals?"

It's an excellent question, not just for wind and solar farms and related transmission lines—but for all energy projects. Not just for local opponents—but for national environmental pressure groups that oppose onshore and offshore, Arctic and continental, hydrocarbon and hydroelectric, nuclear and renewable projects, whether they are supported or opposed by local citizens or a majority of Americans. For all this opposition amounts to an unjust taking of energy that rightfully belongs to all Americans.

Many Americans recognize the need for abundant, reliable energy for cars, homes, jobs, and a way to end the recession and avoid tax increases. They want cheap energy, and they want it now. But a vocal, activist minority doesn't want energy *development* and constantly rails against the often exaggerated or purely speculative risks associated with drilling, producing, importing and using energy.

At this point, it is not the American people, but "anti-energy zealots" who are in charge of our public lands and resources, say CORE chairman Roy Innis and former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, in an article they wrote for *Investor's Business Daily*. The United States doesn't face a resource-based energy shortage; we face a politically induced shortage.[24]

"These energy takings force Americans to pay more for energy that is artificially scarce," says Innis. "Their economic progress is held back. They lose the jobs that energy development would create. They lose billions of dollars in royalties and taxes. Energy saved through painstaking conservation and alternative energy efforts is offset by declining domestic production, and America ends up importing still more foreign oil"—$265 billion in 2009, amid a recession—and sending still more jobs overseas.[25]

Benefits of hydrocarbon fuels

Revenue, national security and reduced pressure to increase taxes or cut vital government services are important considerations. However, the benefits of hydrocarbon energy are much broader than even that.

Twenty-five states generate 50 to 98% of their electricity with coal; eight more depend on coal for 35 to 49% of their electricity. Nearly all the rest get their electricity primarily from natural gas, hydroelectric, nuclear, biomass (mostly wood wastes and garbage) and geothermal sources. All utilize hydrocarbon fuels for nearly all of their transportation and shipping needs. Overall, wind and solar power provide less than 0.5% of all the energy consumed in the United States.[26]

This mixture is likely to change in the future, as technologies advance as dramatically as they did between 1900 and 2000. But for now hydrocarbons represent energy and economic reality.

Missouri offers insights that apply to nearly every state, especially those that depend heavily on coal for electricity. The Show Me State relies on coal to generate 81% of its electricity. Natural gas generates 3% and 9% is from nuclear power.

As a result, Missouri consumers and businesses pay an average of seven cents per kilowatt hour, compared to 14 cents per kWh in California, New York and New Jersey, which get less than 15% of their electricity from coal. That means Missouri families can better afford to heat and cool their homes—and schools and hospitals can more easily operate under tightened budgets. It means factories can afford to make and sell products in competition with foreign companies —and employ workers who support their families.

The Unites States doesn't face a resource-based energy shortage; we face a politically-induced shortage.

Missouri's reliable, affordable, mostly coal-based electricity creates hundreds of thousands of high-paying jobs, which provide health insurance, rent and mortgage money, nutrition, clothing, college tuition and retirement benefits for countless families. Those companies and their employees also pay the taxes that support federal, state and local governments and government services. They also make contributions to numerous churches, synagogues and charities.

Because of low-cost energy, Emerson Electric and Graybar, for example, can make and distribute electrical equipment. Sigma-Aldrich and Solutia make chemicals and chemical products for cars, hospitals and other industries. Furniture Brands, Kellwood, Mallinckrodt, and Leggett & Platt can manufacture furniture, clothing, health care products and camping gear.

Anheuser-Busch, Earthgrains and Interstate Bakeries can make a host of familiar beverage and food products, producing and emitting prodigious amounts of carbon dioxide in the process. Ralston Purina makes pet foods, while Monsanto's labs churn out new generations of seeds for the farmers who supply brewers and bakers and pet food makers—under numerous climate conditions, hot and cool, wet and dry. Thousands of smaller Missouri companies provide countless additional goods, services and jobs.

Finally, Peabody Energy, Ameren and Kansas City Power & Light provide the fuels and energy that keep

the lights on, the machinery operating and the paychecks coming at all these other companies.

Affordable coal and nuclear-based electricity supports 1 million jobs in Virginia's manufacturing sector alone, generates $170 billion in annual economic output, and provides over $6 billion a year in state and local tax revenues, notes Virginia Manufacturers Association president and CEO Brett Vassey. Moreover, he adds, the commonwealth accounts for a mere 0.44% of global carbon dioxide emissions. Thus, "even if Virginia eliminated all of its CO2 emissions, China's emissions growth alone would replace all of Virginia's in just 77 days."[27]

Until we can replace fossil fuels with nuclear power or practical renewable energy, hydrocarbons will remain the most essential resource for human civilization.

The situation is undoubtedly similar in the vast majority of states, especially in America's industrial and manufacturing heartland, which is heavily reliant on coal, oil and natural gas.

Hydrocarbon fuels keep people warm (and alive) on freezing nights, and comfortable during summer heat waves, like the 2003 scorcher that killed 15,000 elderly French citizens who didn't have air-conditioning.

Due in large part to coal-based electricity, CT scans, x-rays, colonoscopies and other examinations detect cancer, heart disease and other health threats, saving many lives every year. Doctors perform life-saving and enhancing surgeries, because they have lights, lasers, computers, and sterile operating rooms. Preemie wards and life-support systems carry people through critical illnesses.

Children and adults get vaccinations that are created in modern laboratories, many using hydrocarbon molecules, and kept viable because of dependable refrigeration. Millions avoid deadly intestinal bacteria, due to refrigerators and freezers that preserve food, and to water that is sterilized and piped, thanks to carbon-based electricity.

Reliable, affordable carbon-based energy also enables people to live and work in safer houses and buildings, receive and respond to timely evacuation warnings, and adapt, survive and even thrive in the face of storms and climate change, whether human or natural in origin. It means homeless shelters, food kitchens and other government programs can care for the less fortunate.

Simply put, reliable, affordable energy—85% of it from hydrocarbons in America today—is the key to creating and preserving jobs, families and communities; improving opportunities and living standards; revitalizing blighted neighborhoods; further reducing pollution and promoting environmental stewardship; bringing health, prosperity and environmental quality to impoverished nations; and pursuing justice for people of every creed, color and social status.

We need all the energy we can get, from every available resource, not just to meet projected demand here in the United States, but to ensure that developing nations can modernize and improve the health and living standards of their people. Until we can replace fossil fuels with nuclear power or practical renewable energy, hydrocarbons will remain the most essential resource for human civilization. Without hydrocarbon energy, civilization, living standards, rights and justice will roll steadily backward.

Global warming: A critical moral issue

Climate activists downplay the incalculable benefits of hydrocarbons. They insist that manmade carbon dioxide emissions are causing higher temperatures, floods and droughts, melting icecaps, rising seas, stronger, more frequent tornadoes and hurricanes, and even colder, snowier winters. They claim that these disasters will most grievously affect the least fortunate among us: minority Americans and impoverished families in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Greenhouse gas emissions, they say, must be dramatically curtailed.

"Global warming is an immediate crisis," Al Gore frequently asserts. "It is not a political issue. It is a moral issue. It affects the survival of human civilization."[28]

Carbon dioxide is a "dangerous pollutant," the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency declares. "Greenhouse gases (GHGs) threaten the public health and welfare of the American people."[29]

"The consequences of global climate change, disastrous trends of environmental degradation, and our nation's perilous dependence on fossil fuels are being felt in communities here in the United States and around the world, especially in communities of color," Congres-

sional Black Caucus Chairwoman Barbara Lee (D-CA) claimed, in announcing a joint CBC-EPA "Environmental Justice Tour."[30]

Global warming, global cooling and climate change are certainly "real," and have been throughout Earth's history. Carbon dioxide and methane are undeniably greenhouse gases that trap heat and warm the planet. Human hydrocarbon use has certainly contributed to increased atmospheric concentrations of these gases. Earth's average annual temperature clearly increased between 1975 and 1998 (before stabilizing and even declining slightly since 1998). And severe floods, droughts, hurricanes, and tornadoes have battered communities across the globe.

However, there is still no consensus and no credible evidence that human CO2 emissions significantly affect global temperature, weather or climate, or will cause disastrous climate changes in the foreseeable future. Nor can it be demonstrated that humans have somehow replaced the clearly natural forces that caused often abrupt and titanic climate changes in the past—or that slashing greenhouse gas emissions will enable us to control planetary temperature and climate in the future. It is abundantly clear that Earth's climate is complex, dynamic, chaotic, and largely unpredictable.

Moreover, CO2 is not a "dangerous pollutant." A mother does not poison her child by breathing on her baby, and carbon dioxide from oceans, termite mounds, farm animals, wildfires, or an African family's cooking fire is no different chemically, and no more dangerous, than CO2 from burning fossil fuels. In fact, carbon dioxide is a vital plant nutrient, without which all life on Earth would cease. Plants grow better with more carbon dioxide in the air, even under drought conditions, and a moderately warmer planet will expand arable farmlands and growing seasons, further increasing crop yields.

These facts should be incorporated into any Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), EPA or congressional analysis. Instead, they have rarely even been mentioned. Nevertheless, there can be little doubt that *global warming is a critical moral issue.*

All people, especially America's and the world's least fortunate families, are gravely threatened not by climate change, but *by policies implemented in the name of* ***preventing*** *climate change.* Any actions that make energy less accessible, reliable or affordable—especially in the absence of clear and convincing proof that we face an imminent manmade climate crisis—are immoral and must be rejected.

Governments act immorally if they fund only research designed to prove that humans are causing catastrophic climate change, especially if those researchers stigmatize, ignore, or exclude contradictory research that points to natural causes, or to only moderate temperature, weather, and climate changes. Ethical scientific research seeks to determine what (human and natural) forces drive climate cycles and changes, to forecast future changes, and assess how communities can best adapt to those changes.

Our ancestors responded to ice ages, little ice ages, Roman and Medieval warm periods, and dust bowls, by adapting to them: enjoying the agricultural bounties and prosperity brought by the warmer periods, and modifying their houses, heating systems, clothing, and farming practices during droughts and cooler periods. Our far more advanced technologies, housing, and energy systems make us infinitely better able to adapt to whatever climate changes and weather events nature, or man, might visit upon us in the future.

But adaptation requires a vibrant economy, the ability to innovate—and abundant, reliable, affordable energy, to warm and cool homes and other structures, and support construction, adaptation, and economic vitality. Indeed, merely maintaining and improving living standards, clawing our way out of the economic recession, putting people back to work, and enabling more Americans to achieve their dreams—all require dependable, affordable energy. Half a world away, energy, biotechnology, and insecticides enable the poorest people on Earth to enjoy the blessings many of us sometimes take for granted, while responding to droughts, excessive rainfall, heat waves and cold snaps, as well as insect-borne diseases.

There is still no consensus and no credible evidence that human CO2 emissions significantly affect global temperature, weather or climate, or will cause disastrous climate changes in the foreseeable future.

And yet, many of the same government agencies, environmental pressure groups, corporations, and wealthy

foundations that express deep concern about anthropogenic climate disasters also strenuously oppose hydrocarbon energy that supports the technologies of successful adaptation.

- Some politicians and climate activists are willing to cut budgets for preventing diseases that Al Gore and IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri erroneously blame on global warming, so that they can spend more on one-sided manmade climate change research or "mitigation." But as Bill Gates has pointed out: "If just 1% of the $100-billion goal [informally agreed to in Copenhagen as climate change mitigation, adaptation and compensation aid for Third World countries] came from vaccine funding, 700,000 more children could die [every year] from preventable diseases."

Climate bills would impose a cap-and-trade system requiring the United States to reduce carbon emissions 83% below 2005 levels, by 2050. The last time our nation's CO2 emissions were that low was 1908.

- Pressure groups like Greenpeace, Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council, and World Wildlife Fund oppose biotech crops that can increase yields, improve drought resistance, and fight insects without pesticides, to help farmers deal with the consequences of global warming or cooling. They claim malaria rates are increasing because of global warming, but oppose insecticides and chemical insect repellent sprays that would reduce malaria disease and death rates far better than bed nets and artemisinin-based drugs. They battle not just hydrocarbon use, but also hydroelectric and nuclear power generation, in countries where 75 to 95% of the people still do not have electricity.

- Many politicians and Big Grain interests promote corn-based ethanol that drives up both fuel and food costs, on the assumption that humans are causing a climate disaster, even though these biofuel policies are forcing Third World families to choose between heating and eating, clothing and rent.

- Cap-tax-and-trade, endangerment, and other government actions would hit already reeling companies, employees, and families hard. Poor people, minorities, and the elderly in developed nations would be particularly hard hit, for little or no environmental gain. Poor families in the world's most impoverished countries would be devastated.

Global warming is clearly a moral issue. These policies are irresponsible, unjust and immoral, for the ultimate effect of anti-hydrocarbon, anti-technology ideologies is to force Earth's poorest families to pay an unconscionable price—and often the ultimate price. They advance manmade climate chaos hypotheses that are based on speculation, flimsy evidence, and computer models that cannot even profile current climates accurately or replicate past climates, much less predict climate changes even one to five years in the future. They prevent poor families from gaining access to technologies that would improve, enrich, and safeguard countless lives.

Put another way, the risks from global warming are at best highly speculative. But the risks from alarmist global warming policies are real, substantial, and often fatal.

Impacts of global warming policies

Energy efficiency and conservation, environmental stewardship, and development of supplements and alternatives to hydrocarbon energy are essential components of any responsible personal, corporate or public policy. However, proposed global warming policies go much further.

The fundamental purpose of global warming legislation and regulation is to curtail greenhouse gas emissions by driving up the cost of hydrocarbon energy, making it less accessible and affordable, and controlling manufacturing, economic growth, living standards, transportation, and consumption habits. President Obama has said that, under cap-and-trade, energy costs will "necessarily skyrocket."[32] Congressional proponents of global warming legislation have made similar statements.

Under normal economics, shortages lead to price in-

creases, which stimulate greater production, which in turn bring prices back down. Price swings in oil and natural gas are good examples. Under climate change economics, by contrast, government deliberately creates major energy shortages and prevents expanded production, thus driving prices steadily upward, permanently.

The House and Senate climate bills would impose a complex cap-tax-and-trade system and require the United States to reduce its carbon dioxide emissions 83% below 2005 levels, by 2050. What few people realize is that the last time our nation's CO2 emissions were that low was *1908*!

And that's before accounting for the far smaller population levels and the antique manufacturing, transportation, and electrification systems of that era. Once those factors are taken into account, 2050 carbon dioxide emissions would have to equal what the United States emitted just after the *Civil War*, in the face of still higher population levels, technologies, and energy demands 40 years from now.

Consider what that portends for you, your family, your constituents, clients and customers, your state, the United States, and our world. Think about the role of energy in your life, the importance of electricity for your home and office, local schools and hospitals, and the most important employers in your region. Ponder how you would slash your carbon footprint 17% over the next ten years, and 83% over the next 40 years, and how all these other energy users will do likewise. It won't be easy.

Consider the Biblical command: "Justice, justice shall you pursue." It is a lofty, inspirational goal. But it requires a critical first step:

Think it through carefully. Don't inadvertently make things worse. Remember the law of unintended consequences, the tyranny of good intentions, the danger of being well-intended but poorly informed. Recall the Golden Rule and its corollary: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Do not do unto others as you would not have them do unto you.

Environmental or economic justice is supposed to be about creating jobs and improving the quality of life for poor and minority communities. The hard reality is, we cannot drive up energy costs and curtail energy use, without adversely impacting businesses, industries, jobs, families, opportunities, civil rights, and the pursuit of ecological-social-economic justice.

In its essence, cap-and-trade is a huge, and hugely regressive, tax on energy use. In fact, the Waxman-Markey (HR 2454) House climate bill and its Kerry-Boxer Senate counterpart represent the *largest tax increase and wealth transfer in U.S. history.* Senator Ben Cardin (D-MD) has aptly called cap-and-trade "the most significant revenue-generating proposal of our time."

The impacts and implications of this legislation are profound. All Americans would feel intense pain, for little environmental gain, if these bills become law.

The legislation would impose especially heavy burdens on states that depend heavily on coal for electricity generation. It would affect all citizens, but hit seniors, blue-collar workers, and poor and minority families especially hard. It would ultimately transfer trillions of dollars from energy users to financial institutions and the government, and then to industries, companies, organizations, and activities favored and chosen by the government. Personal "carbon ration cards" would not be out of the question.

Pending global warming bills would cost 1 to 4 million jobs, raise electricity rates 90-130% and gasoline prices 60-140% after adjusting for inflation.

An April 2009 Lauer Johnson Research poll found 78% of respondents believe even a $600 per year increase in utility bills would be a "hardship." A Wilson Research Strategies poll of black Americans found that 76% are unwilling to pay more than an additional $50 per year for electricity, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.[34] Analysts emphasize that the actual impact would be much higher.

Waxman-Markey would add not just $50 or $600 a year, but *$1,500* to *$3,000* to the average family's annual energy bill. The legislation would raise energy costs by $350 billion to $400 billion or more per year, according to studies by the Brookings Institution, CRA International, Congressional Budget Office, Heritage Center for Data Analysis, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), and other experts. Pending global warming bills would also cost 1 million to 4 million

jobs, mostly in the manufacturing sector, and raise electricity rates 90 to 130% and gasoline prices 60 to 140% after adjusting for inflation, these experts say.[35]

Farms, factories, businesses, hospitals, and schools would be hit with extra energy costs ten, 20 or 100 times this per-family amount—to power machinery, operate tractors and trucks; heat, light and air condition barns, offices, stores and operating rooms; refrigerate foods and medicines; transport raw materials and finished products; and support all the other operations that require affordable, reliable energy.

Businesses would have little choice but to pass those costs on to consumers. That means the average family would have to pay a cumulative additional *$4,000 or more every year* in higher heating, cooling, cooking, transportation, food, clothing, school, medical and other expenses. Families would be compelled to pay these skyrocketing energy, food and commodity prices by trimming or slashing their vacation, college, retirement, medical, food, clothing, sports, and home and car repair budgets.

Schools would have to find millions more for buses, heating, and lighting. That would mean higher taxes—or reduced music, sports, language, and special education programs.

The average American household spends 5% of its budget on fuel. Families at the bottom of the economic scale spend up to half of their incomes on gasoline, heating and cooling. They would be hard hit by the $1/gallon gas tax increase that cap-and-trade would bring.

Hospitals would have to charge more for diagnostics, treatments, surgeries, and rehabilitation. Churches and charities would see contributions plummet, just as more jobless families seek food and shelter.

In 2007, 1.7 million tractor-trailer drivers logged 145 billion vehicle miles and spent an average $34,560 on 28.5 billion gallons of fuel—to transport food and consumer goods of every description, and earn an average of $43,545 in net revenue. The skyrocketing fuel taxes contemplated by the House and Senate climate bills would wipe out a hefty portion of that net income.[36]

Americans currently spend $1.2 trillion annually on gasoline and motor oil. For many, gasoline is a mandatory expense, a prerequisite for working and paying the bills.

Overall, Waxman-Markey would impose a multi-year *$2 trillion* tax on gasoline and a *$1.3 trillion* tax on diesel fuel. For farmers and ranchers alone, that translates into $550 million in higher fuel costs in 2020 and $1.65 billion in 2050, says Sen. Kit Bond (R-MO). The Florida Farm Bureau Federation puts the cost for farmers even higher: $5 billion initially and $13 billion by 2050.[37]

State and local global warming initiatives would likely be equally expensive. Implementing the 2006 California cap-and-trade law "could easily exceed $100 billion" a year and raise the annual cost of living by $3,857 per household by 2020, according to a California State University study, commissioned by the California Small Business Roundtable.[38]

The average household spends 5% of its budget on fuel. But as Bishop Harry Jackson, Jr., pastor of Hope Christian Church in Maryland, points out, families at the bottom of the economic scale "spend up to half of their incomes on gasoline, heating and cooling." Poor families also have longer commutes to work. They will be especially hard hit by the $1-per-gallon gas tax increase that cap-tax-and-trade would bring.

"Skyrocketing energy prices also lead to job losses, increased pressure on families and family budgets, and thus increased tension, depression, family violence, crime, drug use, and suicide," notes Congress of Racial Equality spokesman Niger Innis.

Minority-owned firms are disproportionately new and small—and startup companies will face especially large obstacles. They typically have few employees and limited experience navigating the state and federal regulatory structure. Cap-and-trade would create a much more massive, intrusive, expensive regulatory system than they already confront.

Members of Congress have said they don't have the time or expertise to read, much less understand, the complex 1,400-page global warming bills. How then can a farmer, business or family be expected to read, comprehend and follow *14,000* pages of laws, regulations and carbon trading guidelines that are likely to be promulgated to implement cap-tax-and-trade?

Many communities depend on tourism as the mainstay of their economies, and environmental groups have often said states should replace mining, oil, timber and other extractive industries with tourism. Tourism, they argue, is "eco-friendly and sustainable." That depends on how you define those terms.

Tourism requires plentiful, affordable energy for cars, trains, buses, boats, airplanes, and hotels. And that requires taking resources out of the ground: extractive industries. It also requires a population that can afford to take vacations far from home. Prohibit drilling and mining, destroy jobs, strangle family budgets, boost travel costs—and people have no choice but to stay home.

Moreover, some environmental groups are now targeting air travel and tourism, because airplanes and cars emit greenhouse gases. They don't want people traveling except, it seems, to climate change meetings in Montreal, Bali and Copenhagen. European activists especially don't want people flying long distances to Africa, even when their tourist Euros would support destitute families that live on $5 a day.

Rising energy costs will further hurt typical American towns like Lamar, Missouri. When local furniture maker O'Sullivan Industries closed its doors two years ago, 700 workers were suddenly unemployed. In 2009, one in ten more Lamar jobs disappeared. Barton County (where Lamar is located) got just 22 jobs out of the stimulus program.[39]

State food stamp programs serve millions of people—like Lamar's unemployed. Cap-and-trade would drive up energy costs and postpone the day when workers have new jobs. In fact, it would mean thousands more factory workers will lose their jobs, thereby expanding welfare rolls and increasing the cost of government, while reducing state and federal tax revenues. How will states cope? How will welfare offices be able to help people, as their budget and resources contract?

State services are often chronically underfunded, and falling state revenues have exacerbated the problem. But if states tax, regulate and ration energy, they will drive up the cost of running factories, businesses, schools and hospitals, thereby forcing companies to reduce pay and benefits or lay off workers, increasing the number of people on welfare and unemployment, and further reducing overall tax revenue.

Contrary to press reports, heat-related deaths are not due to global warming. They result from poor families being unable to afford air-conditioning. Cold-related deaths are much more common, and are also largely due to energy affordability, especially for those on low and fixed incomes.

For poor, minority, and retired families that are already struggling to pay their energy bills, cap-and-trade rules, hydrocarbon restrictions, and renewable energy mandates could prove ruinous, and even deadly.

In the United Kingdom, punitive climate taxes, the closure of coal-fired power plants, and forced reliance on "green" energy have sent energy prices soaring and put 5.5 million households in "fuel poverty." The National Housing Federation reported that average annual energy bills climbed from $1,620 in 2005 to a predicted $2,250 by the end of 2009. People have been "shocked" by the enormity of their heating bills, and anger is rising over "insidious stealth taxes" that are hammering households at a time of rising unemployment, falling incomes and economic uncertainty, said the *Daily Mail*.[40]

Heat-related deaths are not due to global warming. They result from poor families being unable to afford air-conditioning. For families struggling to pay their energy bills, renewable energy mandates could prove ruinous, and even deadly.

In 2009, UK utility regulator Ofgem predicted that average household gas and electricity prices could double to $3,245 (£2,000) between 2005 and 2020, to pay for new nuclear, wind and wave power. By January 2010 it admitted that it had "severely underestimated" the cost of cutting carbon emissions, and the energy-switching company uSwitch calculated that household bills will rocket to $8,110 (£5,000) by 2020. Cash-strapped pensioners are burning hardback books to stay warm, because they cost far less than "carbon-priced" coal for small home heaters. (As one wag put it, Al Gore's book may finally serve a useful purpose.) Energy-intensive industries expect their costs to rise even more dramatically.[41]

In October 2009, Britain's TaxPayers' Alliance concluded that the European Union Emissions Trading

Scheme cost British and European consumers over $100 billion between January 2005 and December 2008. Consumers suffered, while energy and financial companies made windfall profits, the TPA says. In related news, large swathes of "badly insulated, ugly" 1960s and 70s-era commercial buildings in UK cities may need to be demolished to meet new carbon emission standards. That means more unnecessary demolition and construction, to meet what British citizens increasingly see as unnecessary carbon reduction mandates.[42]

Worst of all, according to the National Housing Federation, 25,000 more people *died* during the 2007-2008 winter than during the summer. Most were elderly people, who had circulatory or respiratory problems, and couldn't afford adequate heat. The lethal cycle is being repeated again this year.[43]

It's little wonder that only 15% of Brits now worry about manmade catastrophic climate change, despite the UK government's 2009 $11-million ad campaign, intended to alarm people about "awful heat waves" and "terrible floods" caused by a nightmarish black "CO2 monster," created by parents who are "keeping houses warm, and driving cars" to take kids to school and soccer practice.[44] Citizens are far more concerned about the intrusive, punitive policies being implemented in the name of preventing planetary warming, as the case for human-caused warming disasters grows weaker almost by the day.

"Every aspect of our lives must be subjected to an inventory of how we are taking responsibility" for reducing carbon emissions, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi told students at Beijing University in June 2009.

These experiences suggest that predictions of U.S. energy cost spikes under Waxman-Markey and similar legislation may likewise have been underestimated. Nearly every aspect of American energy, economics, life, and society would be subjected to government review and control, if global warming laws and regulations are implemented. The effects would be pervasive, intrusive, punitive, and expensive.

"Every aspect of our lives must be subjected to an inventory of how we are taking responsibility" for reducing carbon emissions, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi told students at Beijing University in June 2009.

Families, businesses, hospitals, schools, airlines, hotels, and countless other energy users would be compelled to itemize and explain their emissions, and outline how they intend to reduce their "carbon footprints." For example, farmers, food processors and retailers would be required to calculate methane and carbon dioxide impacts of dairy and farming operations—considering such complexities as milk production during the animals' lifetime, and beef and leather production after they are slaughtered; fuel, grazing habits, forage, fertilizer, bovine belching and other parameters; and emissions, offsets and carbon absorption factors. Analysis and compliance costs would be passed on to consumers, but (good news?) numerous new "green" jobs would be created for statisticians, accountants, lawyers, and bureaucrats.[45]

Concerns about a global warming crisis are also driving tougher fuel efficiency standards for cars and light trucks. The rules will add some $1,300 to the price of a new car, making them less affordable for lower income families. More important, they will result in vehicles that are lighter, less crash-worthy, and thus more likely to cause serious injury and death in accidents.[46]

Global warming concerns have also persuaded the Securities and Exchange Commission to wade into the fray, and say companies should disclose how their emissions might affect the climate. However, the SEC didn't stop there. It also said companies should assess and disclose how climate change could affect their business, and climate change laws, regulations and treaties might impact their operations.

The SEC decision could thus prompt companies to discuss the questionable case for manmade climate catastrophe, or analyze how energy and climate laws could drive up costs, force layoffs or result in jobs being outsourced to other countries. It could also be used by social responsibility activists to force CEOs who lobby for cap-tax-and-trade bills to disclose the economic risks, environmental impacts and civil rights effects of that legislation on customers, employees and minority communities.[47]

EPA endangerment ruling

President Obama used his first State of the Union address to prod the Senate to enact comprehensive climate change, "clean" energy and "green" jobs legislation. Two months previously, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency officially declared that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases "endanger human health and welfare," paving the way for strict emission standards on motor vehicles and stationary sources via regulation, even in the absence of legislative action by Congress.

The "endangerment" ruling was issued just prior to the international global warming conference in frigid Copenhagen, so that the American delegation could point to it as evidence that the United States is "serious about reducing emissions." Critics say the ruling gives the Administration leverage to pressure Congress into enacting cap-tax-and-trade legislation, to avoid subjecting states, industries and consumers to even more onerous and arbitrary actions by unaccountable EPA bureaucrats.

The decision allows EPA to use the *Clean Air Act* to regulate CO2/GHG emissions, and to require emitters of as little as 250 tons per year (tpy) to install new technologies or otherwise curb their emissions, beginning in 2012. However, the agency says it will limit its permit requirements to facilities that emit more than 25,000tpy, and thereby focus (initially) on major emitters like power plants, factories, refineries, steel mills, cement makers, and automobile manufacturers. EPA wants to avoid the economic impacts and public outcry that would come from imposing emission limits on small businesses and facilities like apartment buildings, hospitals, schools, farms, malls, and even restaurants, dry cleaners, bakeries, and churches—which would easily exceed a 250tpy limit.

Some legal experts say this "tailoring rule" improperly rewrites the *Clean Air Act*, as the act requires EPA to set 250tpy as the threshold for "dangerous" pollutants, and the agency's authority to set a higher limit for carbon dioxide is thus questionable. The higher limitation may thus be challenged in court by activist groups that want all emitters covered, so as to delay energy projects and restrict growth.[48]

Business and free market groups say both the EPA rulemaking and cap-and-trade laws create top-down command-and-control regimes that will choke off growth, by adding new costs and mandates to virtually every construction, manufacturing and renovation project in America. They contend that the rulings would saddle U.S. industries and power generators with costs not faced by Chinese, Indian and other overseas competitors—driving jobs and businesses out of the United States.

They also argue that, by arbitrarily selecting a 25,000tpy limit, EPA is essentially admitting that its rules would have a devastating impact on U.S. business and economy. The agency therefore seeks to limit the damage to "big polluters," at least initially.[49]

Some states and environmental groups are already filing lawsuits against energy, manufacturing and utility companies, to enforce the 250tpy limit, pressure businesses into dropping their opposition to cap-tax-and-trade, or persuade Congress to enact climate legislation. "My hope," said Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal, "is that the court case [against American Electric Power and other utility companies] will provide a powerful incentive for polluters to be reasonable, and come to the table, and seek affordable and reasonable reductions" in CO2 emissions under cap-and-trade.[50] Don Vito Corleone and movie producer Jack Woltz would understand.

The National Association of Manufacturers points out that neither the EPA action nor cap-and-trade legislation would significantly combat climate change (even if carbon dioxide does drive climate change), because greenhouse emissions from developing countries would continue to increase significantly. But the emission reduction mandates would certainly "come at a huge cost to the economy." The EPA decision "will trigger costly and time-consuming permitting requirements for tens of thousands of previously unregulated small businesses under the *Clean Air Act*," argued Competitive Enterprise Institute senior fellow Marlo Lewis. "A more potent anti-stimulus package would be hard to imagine."[51]

The EPA decision will trigger costly and time-consuming permitting requirements for tens of thousands of previously unregulated small businesses under the *Clean Air Act*.

The 60 Plus Association stated that the EPA decision

"would trigger a growing cascade of regulations on virtually all sources" of greenhouse gases. "There is clear and substantial scientific, medical, and economic evidence that regulations contemplated by EPA would adversely affect the cost and availability of energy, and thus access to jobs, family incomes, life and health insurance, food, modern living standards, and other components of human health and welfare," it argued in comments to EPA. "Poor, minority and elderly families would be impacted most severely of all."[52]

Telling Africans they can't have electricity and economic development—except what can be produced with some wind turbines or little solar panels on huts—is immoral.

The EPA ruling will have the same harmful effects as cap-tax-and-trade—much worse if lawsuits result in greenhouse gas emission limits being set at 250 tons per year, as the *Clean Air Act* requires. Both the EPA endangerment decision and the cap-and-trade bills demonstrate Washington's inclination is to ignore citizens, states, public opinion, and constituent priorities—the most important of which is getting the economy back on track, getting people back to work, getting the housing and manufacturing markets functioning again—not strangling these priorities with layers of new red tape. People also want government to do more to promote real opportunity, civil rights and justice for underprivileged families and communities.[53]

Of course, even if both cap-tax-and-trade legislation and endangerment rules are rejected or postponed, small emitters in at least 36 states would still be required to slash their emissions, unless state (and in some cases local) laws are also changed. Repealing those laws should be a high priority for legislators who are concerned about ending the recession, creating jobs and securing justice.

The biggest threat to Africa?

As severe as the impacts from global warming policies are likely to be for American and European businesses and families, they are far worse for the poorest nations on our planet.

"Life in Africa is often nasty, impoverished and short," says human rights activist and Congress of Racial Equality Uganda coordinator Fiona Kobusingye-Boynes.

"AIDS kills 2.2 million Africans every year, according to World Health Organization studies. Lung infections cause 1.4 million deaths, malaria 1 million more, intestinal diseases 700,000. Diseases that could be prevented with simple vaccines kill an additional 600,000 annually, while war, malnutrition and life in filthy slums send countless more parents and children to early graves. And yet, day after day, Africans are told the biggest threat we face is—global warming," she writes.[54]

Worldwide, almost three billion people rely solely on manure and firewood for cooking, and 1.6 million die every year from burns and smoke-related diseases, the World Bank and WHO report. Mothers and daughters spend hours every day collecting firewood, instead of attending school. They risk back injuries from heavy loads, broken bones from falls, and rape by sexual predators lurking in wooded areas.

"Al Gore uses more electricity in a week than 28 million Ugandans together use in a year. And those anti-electricity policies are keeping us impoverished," Kobusingye-Boynes continues. In fact, over 90% of Sub-Saharan Africa's 800 million people still do not have electricity, lights or refrigeration—or have electrical power only a few hours a week.

"Not having electricity means millions of Africans don't have refrigerators to preserve food and medicine. Outside wealthy parts of our big cities, people don't have lights, computers, modern hospitals and schools, air conditioning or offices, factories and shops to make things and create good jobs.

"Not having electricity also means disease and death. It means millions die from lung infections, because they have to cook and heat with open fires; from intestinal diseases caused by spoiled food and unsafe drinking water; from malaria, TB, cholera, measles and other diseases that we could prevent or treat if we had proper medical facilities.

"Telling Africans they can't have electricity and economic development—except what can be produced with some wind turbines or little solar panels on huts—is immoral," Kobusingye-Boynes declares. "It is a crime against humanity." It perpetuates the disease and death that stalk African villages and families.[55]

Energy, economic and health conditions in many parts of Asia and Latin America are only marginally better than in Africa. Using climate change fears to justify anti-development, anti-energy campaigns in these regions is equally immoral and unjust. And yet the United Nations sponsors frequent conferences, inviting only alarmist speakers, who repeat unsubstantiated claims that diseases, droughts, floods and rising seas are caused or amplified by global warming. They persuade poor countries to support global climate treaties—and even agree to limit their energy use and economic development—in exchange for billions of dollars in promised climate change reparation, adaptation and mitigation payments.

Assuming the payments ever are made, the money will likely come from funds that otherwise might be available for real disasters, like the Haiti earthquake, and programs to combat infectious and insect-borne diseases, malnutrition, dysentery, and rampant poverty. Most of the payments will end up in the overseas bank accounts of kleptocrats who rule these poor countries, leaving little to address climate disasters that exist only in alarmist press releases or "Sim World" computer scenarios.

As Danish environmentalist Bjorn Lomborg frequently points out, the world's poor don't worry much about seas rising 20 feet as Al Gore predicts, or even 20 inches as the IPCC predicts. They worry about getting malaria—and not being able to work for weeks on end, or getting brain damaged or killed by the disease; about sewage systems that contaminate the water they drink, the acute diarrhea they get as a result, and not having even $3.00 to visit a clinic.[56]

The world's poor worry about not having electricity to power a refrigerator that would keep their food from spoiling, and about not having enough food to put in that refrigerator. They worry that food is often priced out of reach, because rich country biofuel mandates have driven the price of wheat and maize (corn) through the roof of their thatched and insect-infested huts.

There is simply no justification for telling Earth's poorest people that they must reduce their emissions, or not build coal-fired power plants, because rich-country activists are now worried about climate change. The right of poor nations to generate electricity—to grow, prosper, and improve people's health and living standards, to ensure justice and domestic tranquility—trumps any concerns that rich nations might have. The most important human right of all is the right to life. It must remain sacrosanct.

Kobusingye-Boynes is right. Poor countries "need to stop listening to global warming witch doctors, who get rich telling us to keep living 'indigenous,' impoverished lives. We need trade, manufacturing, electricity, and transportation fuels to power modern industrial economies. We need to do what China and India are doing —develop—and trade more with them. That is how we will get the jobs, prosperity, health and environmental quality we deserve."

In short, poor countries should not do what rich countries are saying or doing now that they are rich. They should do what rich countries did to become rich.

Renewable alternatives to fossil fuels

Wind and solar power will play an increasingly important role in our energy mix, as technologies improve and costs come down. Indeed, many argue that "clean energy" and "green jobs" are the only "eco-friendly" and "sustainable" path forward. However, legislators should carefully weigh the pros and cons, costs and benefits of these renewable technologies as supplements or alternatives to conventional energy.

Spain spent $3.7 billion on wind energy in 2007, creating 50,000 jobs installing wind turbines. However, the pricey renewable electricity forced companies to lay off workers–wind energy subsidies destroyed 2.2 regular jobs for each green job they created.

America's oil and natural gas industries support more than 9 million American jobs and contribute well over $1 trillion to the economy, PricewaterhouseCoopers has calculated.[57] Coal likewise generates vast job and economic benefits. Many of them would become endangered species under cap-and-trade. If recent European experience is any indication, most will not be replaced with so-called "green jobs."

Spain spent $3.7 billion on wind energy during 2007, according to King Juan Carlos University econom-

ics professor Gabriel Calzada. The program reportedly created or saved 50,000 jobs. However, most of them were installing wind turbines, and each "green" job cost $754,000 in subsidies. Moreover, because the pricey "renewable" electricity forced companies to lay off workers to stay in business, the wind energy subsidies *destroyed* 2.2 regular jobs for each green job they created.[58]

The green energy jobs take money from taxpayers and energy consumers, and give it to companies selected by politicians or bureaucrats on the basis of lobbying and assumptions that subsidies, tax breaks and renewable energy standards are needed to prevent environmental disasters. By contrast, though they receive some limited subsidies, oil, natural gas, and coal actually *generate* significant revenue. America's untapped hydrocarbon resources could reap literally trillions in lease bonus, rent, royalty, and tax revenues for state and federal coffers—to help pay for military, social, health, energy and environmental programs.

Electricity generated by wind or solar facilities costs two to nine times the price of coal-generated electricity. In Oregon, Gov. Ted Kulongoski's plan to lure green energy companies with taxpayer subsidies resulted in a program that cost *40 times more* than lawmakers had been promised it would.[59]

Wind systems only work 35% of the time on average, compared to 95% for coal and nuclear power.

Moreover, wind systems only work 35% of the time on average; 25% of the time in many locations; and 10% of the time on freezing Midwestern winter nights and sweltering Texas summer afternoons—compared to 95% for coal and nuclear power. Solar facilities likewise operate only part of the time. They thus require gas-fired backup generators ("peaking units") running on spinning reserve 24/7/365, for instantaneous power every time the wind stops blowing, adding to the cost, fuel use and pollution.

The high price of wind-based electricity, its low reliability or "capacity factor" and the global economic recession forced Spain to curtail its subsidies. That meant over 10,000 of the wind power jobs were terminated in 2008, and further subsidy reductions have put the remaining 40,000 green jobs at risk. Great Britain and Germany face similar problems with their "green" wind power industries.[60]

Indeed, the very concept of "green" jobs is elastic and elusive. In many cases it merely redefines existing jobs—for PR reasons or because existing workers are doing something now deemed ecological—without expanding the overall employment base. It frequently includes direct and indirect employment associated with retrofitting buildings, installing insulation, solar panels and wind turbines, constructing transmission lines from wind, solar or geothermal sites, or producing 15 billion gallons of ethanol from corn grown on 40,000,000 of acres of farmland (an area almost the size of Missouri). In other reports, "green-collar jobs" include accountants, lawyers, salesmen, repairmen, farmers, truck drivers, landscapers, bureaucrats, and lobbyists associated with these activities, even temporarily.[61]

Whether wind and solar power are "sustainable" or "eco-friendly" is equally subject to definition and debate. It is well known that wind turbine blades kill numerous birds and bats every year.[62] Their noise and visual impacts have also generated opposition to proposed onshore and offshore installations. But many find the land and resource impacts of turbines even more troubling.

Interior Secretary Salazar and others say the United States could generate 20% of its electricity with wind power within another 10 to 20 years. However, Sen. Lamar Alexander (R-TN) argues that this would require 186,000 turbines and 19,000 new miles of high-voltage transmission lines. Translated into lands and resources, that means:

- 18,000,000 acres of farm, scenic and habitat land—half of Illinois, and
- 270,000,000 tons of concrete, steel, copper, fiberglass, and rare earth minerals—the equivalent of 180,000,000 Toyota Priuses.[63]

That is far more land and raw materials than required to generate equivalent amounts of (more reliable) electricity with coal, natural gas or nuclear power. In fact, wind power's infrastructure requires five to ten times the steel and concrete than does nuclear, reports Berke-

ley engineer Per Petersen. And to generate sufficient electricity for New York City, the entire state of Connecticut would have to be covered with wind turbines—with the wind blowing as hard and consistently in Hartford as it does near Lamar, Colorado, Rockefeller University environmental sciences professor Jesse Ausubel has calculated.[64]

Because of intense environmental opposition to mining and drilling, it is unlikely that those raw materials will be found and extracted from deposits here in America. Instead, they will be mined, milled, smelted, and fabricated into turbines, blades, and towers in China, India, and other foreign countries under *their* pollution control rules and technologies. They would then be shipped to the United States, where a relatively few green collar workers will transport, assemble and install the turbines, and build thousand-mile long transmission lines, to connect Midwestern and Great Plains wind farms to major urban centers.

In fact, that is already happening. Using $1.5 billion in federal stimulus funds, the U.S. Renewable Energy Group is erecting 240 gargantuan 3-megawatt wind turbines on a Washington, D.C.-sized area in West Texas. The project will create 2,800 temporary jobs. About 2,400 will be in China; only 400 will be American workers—mostly truckers, installers, supervisors, lawyers, accountants, and regulators.[65]

It's the same for solar. Meeting even 5% of America's electricity needs with photovoltaic panels would mean blanketing thousands of *square miles* with expensive solar arrays across Southwestern desert habitats. The new $106-million, 140-acre solar array at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada produces 30 gigawatt hours of electricity per year, compared to 26,780 Gwh of electricity from the $13.2-billion Palo Verde Nuclear Power Station near Phoenix (constant 2009 dollars).

While the three reactors at Palo Verde were 124 times more expensive than the Nellis solar array, they generate 893 times more electricity—and do so 90% of the time, year after year, versus 30% of the time for the Nellis array, and on less land. Nellis electricity is 15 times more expensive than Palo Verde's. And generating the nuclear power station's annual electrical output via Nellis technology would require solar arrays across some 390,000 acres of land—an area ten times larger than Washington, D.C.[66]

Not surprisingly, concern about visual, habitat and wildlife impacts has prompted renewable energy advocate Sen. Diane Feinstein (D-CA) to introduce legislation banning the construction of large solar arrays in much of the Mojave Desert, one of America's best areas for steady, high-intensity sunlight. Others have raised concerns about expanded eminent domain use to build transmission lines across private lands, to carry electricity from solar (and wind) facilities to consumers in distant cities.[67]

A shift to hybrid and electric cars may help reduce pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and foreign oil imports. However, recharging the cars will put greater strain on already stressed generation facilities and power grids, possibly leading to brownouts and blackouts, especially if grids are strained by growing demand for cheap off-peak electricity. A concurrent shift to wind and solar electricity will compound the generation and power grid problems, and increase electricity and driving costs significantly.

The economics and environmental costs of biofuels are likewise problematic. Congress has mandated that ethanol production must reach 30 billion gallons by 2020, four times the 2008 amount—which required corn grown on an area the size of Indiana, plus vast amounts of water, fertilizer, fuel, and insecticides—to produce a fuel that has less energy than a gallon of gasoline, and emits CO2 during processing, shipping and use. Nevertheless, the ethanol industry receives $3 billion annually for ethanol and benefits further from import tariffs that keep Brazilian ethanol out of the United States.

These policies have diverted food crops to gas tanks, and resulted in a nearly 200% increase in corn for bakery goods, livestock feed, famine aid, and other needs. They also mean the price of corn and corn syrup will remain artificially high, and consumers will pay more for cereals, soft drinks, and other goods.[68]

The policies may also result in more carbon dioxide emissions than gasoline. A gallon of ethanol contains only 61% of the energy in a gallon of gasoline, and driving the same distance with EtOH results in carbon dioxide emissions of about one pound per gallon more than with gasoline, energy analyst Seldon Graham estimates. Replacing the U.S. gasoline consumption of 138 billion gallons annually with ethanol biofuel—as government energy policy seeks to do—would add about 138 bil-

lion pounds of carbon dioxide annually (69 million tons) above current levels.[69]

Even more exasperating, in spite of all the pain that cap-tax-and-trade, endangerment and renewable energy policies will bring to families, farmers, truckers, businesses and communities—there would be *no measurable gain* for our environment or climate.

China is building a new coal-fired power plant every week and putting millions of new cars on its growing network of highways. India is close behind. Both are trying to reduce poverty, modernize their nations, improve human health, and ensure that every family, school and hospital has electricity. Neither will accept legally binding emission targets, though both will gradually reduce emissions. By 2020, China and India together will be emitting almost *three times* as much carbon dioxide as the United States.

Using the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's own computer models, and assuming that carbon dioxide is the primary cause of global warming, climatologist "Chip" Knappenberger calculated: even an 83% reduction in U.S. carbon dioxide emissions would result in global temperatures rising just *0.1 degrees F* less by 2050 than not cutting our CO2 emissions at all.[70]

Probably most people would agree with UCLA professor Neil Morley, who says "we should pay the true costs for fossil-fuel energy sources, including all associated environmental costs."

Even an 83% reduction in U.S. carbon dioxide emissions would result in global temperatures rising just 0.1 degrees less by 2050, than not cutting our CO2 emissions at all.

But the same standard should apply to wind, solar, and ethanol power. Their land, water, raw material, resource extraction, bird and wildlife impacts, visual, and environmental costs should also be considered and paid for. The financing, raw material, and fuel costs of peaking units (backup generators) should likewise be factored in. And the accuracy of climate change and environmental costs attributed to fossil fuels—and used to justify pricey renewable energy—should be evaluated carefully and honestly.

Even with increased energy conservation and efficiency, America will need more energy in the coming decades. If the revolution in energy technologies between 1900 and 2000 is any guide, we will witness monumental changes over the next 20 to 50 years, with thorium and other advanced nuclear reactors being just one component. Wind, solar and as yet undiscovered technologies will also be part of that mix.

However, if change is driven primarily by government mandates and subsidies, or to solve exaggerated or illusory environmental problems, the policies will exact a heavy toll on energy-dependent businesses, employers, families, and government services. They will also force America to depend far more on expensive, unreliable energy, and will impose unacceptable costs on job creation, opportunity, personal liberties, and living standards civil rights for poor and minority families.

Who benefits? Transfers of wealth and power

"Global warming is a more insidious and longer-term danger than Hitlerism," a Scottish environmentalist asserted. "It could be far more deadly. Ultimately, it might extinguish humanity itself."

We have "only 50 days to save the planet," British Prime Minister Gordon Brown insists. Unless we make "very deep" cuts in CO2 emissions very soon, UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change chairman Rajendra Pachauri has pronounced, "humanity may not survive."

These hyperbolical disaster claims are being used to justify demands that Congress and EPA act quickly in Washington. That the world agree to a new climate treaty to replace the Kyoto Protocol. That literally trillions of dollars be spent battling global warming over the next 40 years. And that global politicians, activists, and regulators be given significant control over the world's energy and economic decisions.

This is not monetary manna. The money would be taken by government edict from energy consumers, workers, businesses and families, and transferred to carbon traders and companies with the best lobbyists. It would be made unavailable for programs that would actually increase prosperity, improve living standards, and reduce real, immediate, life-or-death threats to human health and welfare.

Who will benefit from these transfers of power and

wealth? A growing "climate-industrial-government-activist-scientist complex" has a huge stake in demonstrating that the planet faces a manmade global warming disaster, and governments must pay billions of dollars annually to solve the problem. Some 2,400 lobbyists are currently working on energy and climate issues in Washington, many of them serving corporate and activist members of the US Climate Action Partnership. USCAP members argue that "clean energy policies" will create major opportunities for the economy. They clearly believe the potential payoffs in taxpayer and consumer "investment" money make the lobbying expenses worth every dime.[71]

The United States government alone provided over 79 billion dollars during fiscal years 1989 to 2009 on climate change science and technology research, foreign aid, subsidies, and tax breaks. It continues to spend over $7 billion annually, divided about evenly between climate-related technologies and climate research focused primarily on proving and quantifying human causes of climate and weather changes. Canada, the European Union, and other governments also contributed tens of billions over the 20-year period.[72]

Penn State University Professor Michael Mann, author of the infamous "hockey stick" temperature graph and one of the scientists implicated in the "Climategate" email scandal, has received some $11 million in government grants. In 2009, he received $2.4 million from the National Science Foundation's $3-billion share of "stimulus" money. Grants like these ensure long-term research and job security, fame, exotic travel, and major influence on national and international energy and science policy for thousands of scientists, bureaucrats, and activists.[73]

General Electric "spent $7.55 million lobbying in the second quarter" of 2009, to secure stimulus and renewable energy dollars from U.S. taxpayers. It also helps customers "design projects and apply for government money, with the expectation that those customers would then buy GE equipment."

GE and CEO Jeffrey Immelt are major players in USCAP, and Immelt was a leading corporate voice supporting the $787 billion stimulus bill. In October 2009, President Obama announced $3.4 billion in stimulus grants for power-grid projects; about one-third of the funding recipients are GE customers. GE hopes to bring in as much as $192 billion over the next three years from projects funded by governments around the globe, including electricity grid modernization and renewable energy generation.[74]

John Rowe, CEO of nuclear power plant operator Exelon, calculates that Waxman-Markey would "add $700 to $750 million to the company's annual revenue for every $10 per metric ton increase in the price of CO2 allowances. A $15 to $18 per metric ton carbon price would thus imply positive earnings of up to $1.30 per share"—and increased revenues of as much as $1.4 billion per year for the company.[75]

As the biggest emitter of carbon dioxide in the United States, American Electric Power hopes to retire 25% of its coal-burning power plants and install advanced carbon capture and storage (CCS) equipment on the remaining units. CEO Mike Morris thinks AEP can double what it charges for electricity (from 4 to 8 cents per kWh) and get federal subsidies to improve its carbon sequestration technologies. However, AEP thus far has been able to capture only 2% of its CO2 emissions, and even a proposed $335 million in Department of Energy funding would increase that to only 18 percent.

A growing backlash in Germany suggests that local citizens and environmentalists are likely to oppose the burial of power plant carbon dioxide emissions in underground chambers deep beneath their backyards. "We are not guinea pigs," they say. And electric power to operate CCS equipment, pipeline it and store it underground will likely increase power plant fuel requirements and costs by up to one-third.[76]

Reinsurers calculate their premiums on the basis of risk. Thus computer models, news stories and IPCC reports asserting an increase in the frequency or severity of natural disasters can translate into higher insurance rates and additional profits, as new policies are negotiated. "We see, in our databases, significant evidence for a correlation between climate change and the increase in natural disasters," says Ernst Rauch, director of German reinsurer Munich Re's "Corporate Climate Centre." Unlike scientists, the insurance industry has to act today and cannot wait until all doubts have been addressed, he adds.

Rauch says his company is "extremely satisfied" with conclusions presented in the 2007 IPCC report. "This is hardly surprising," observes an ABC News journalist,

who points out that "a 2005 publication by Munich Re served as one of the sources for the IPCC's cautionary predictions" about the growing frequency and severity of storms.

Of course, a reinsurer's report is hardly "expert scientific analysis." Moreover, scientists who wrote the most exhaustive studies yet on the purported link between greenhouse gas emissions and hurricane and tornado frequency say there is no evidence to support the hypothesis. They also note that increasingly costly property destruction from natural disasters primarily reflects the expanded construction of more expensive homes and other buildings in areas impacted by tornadoes and hurricanes.[77]

Al Gore makes millions of dollars annually from his speeches, investments, and green energy and carbon trading firm, Generation Investment Management. He claims he puts his own money and profits into climate action nonprofits, but critics say these nonprofits are "functionally propaganda arms that benefit his for-profit investments."[78]

Senator Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY) envisions a new "boon" for New York. Financial experts, she says, have concluded that "carbon permits could quickly become the world's largest commodities market, growing to as much as $3 trillion by 2020"—a substantial sum that will have to be paid by hydrocarbon-using families and businesses. The senator wants to create a new "internationally integrated" carbon-emissions permit system and "carbon commodity derivatives market." She intends to "help New York seize this opportunity," based on "its superior and substantial financial talent and expertise."[79]

Transmission companies envision climate change programs as a source of subsidies to fix aging lines and upgrade to a smart grid, while utilizing eminent domain powers to put new renewable power lines across private lands. Bureaucrats and environmental pressure groups see smart grids as a way to "peer into homes and businesses, then automatically lower thermostats or adjust power use, depending on demand and prearranged agreements," thereby dictating energy use for American families and businesses.[80]

Even by Washington standards, this is a lot of money and power—and these costly policies and programs are being promoted even as climate science, falling global temperatures, and seemingly endless scandals generate new doubts about global warming disaster claims.

This transfer of money and power raises critical questions about jobs, stewardship, affordable energy, economic opportunity, and justice and human rights for people who are simply trying to improve their lot in life. Perhaps regulating and upending economies and lives—or even transferring trillions of dollars from energy consumers to companies and scientists selected by politicians and bureaucrats—might be acceptable if we truly faced a planetary emergency, brought on by mankind's use of hydrocarbon fuels.

However, there is no consensus about the science of global warming and climate change. The IPCC and EPA face a metastasizing scandal over climate temperature data, models, reports, and peer reviews. And many scientists say it is increasingly clear that no planetary emergency is bearing down on us.

Climate science reconsidered

Few would deny that Earth warmed somewhat during the twentieth century, or that humans can influence weather and climate at a local and perhaps even regional level. However, there is yet no evidence that a 0.02% increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide (from 250ppm to 450ppm, equal to 20 cents out of $1,000) will result in planetary catastrophes remotely approaching clearly natural climate disasters like the Dust Bowl, Little Ice Age and Pleistocene Ice Ages.

Carbon dioxide is essential for life on Earth, and neither EPA nor IPCC pronouncements can transform it into a "dangerous pollutant." There is no convincing evidence that changes in atmospheric CO2 levels mirror human activities or cause climate change. Moreover, the entire body of climate change science—far from being "settled" or a matter of "near unanimous consensus"—is roiling with dissent, despite ongoing, systematic efforts by some to squelch debate and promote fear of catastrophic climate change.

Thousands of climate scientists have signed letters and statements like the Heidelberg Appeal and Leipzig Declaration, faulting IPCC analyses and claims that the world faces an imminent manmade global warming disaster. The United States Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Minority staff prepared a report detailing the views of nearly 700 climatologists who disagree with manmade climate chaos hypotheses. A

2008 Japan Geoscience Union symposium found that 90% of participants no longer believe the IPCC reports. And over 31,000 experts with bachelors, masters, and PhD degrees in climate and other natural sciences have signed the Oregon Petition, affirming that they see "no convincing evidence that human release of … greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate."[81]

Numerous recent peer-reviewed scientific papers challenge the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's headline-grabbing views, including the nearly 900-page compendium, *Climate Change Reconsidered*.[82] The scientists preparing these documents vigorously disagree with assertions of an impending manmade climate apocalypse and make the following points.

- Disaster scenarios forecast for 50 or 100 years hence are the product of speculation, assumptions and unreliable computer models. They are not supported, and indeed are largely contradicted, by actual data and observations on historic and current global temperatures, ice caps, sea levels, polar bears, tropical diseases, weather and storm patterns, and other matters.

- Models routinely develop dire scenarios of impending climate disasters. However, the soundness, validity and predictive value of models depend on the assumptions, data and overall knowledge that goes into them. If historic and recent temperature data are uncertain, we don't understand the positive and negative feedbacks of cloud cover and precipitation, we know little about oceanic current cycles and how oceans trap CO2 and heat, and models focus on carbon dioxide and largely ignore changes in solar energy output—then the models and scenarios are worthless. Their output may seem realistic and get promoted as such, but they are no more real than the raptors in "Jurassic Park."

- Earth history clearly demonstrates that our planet's climate can change frequently, suddenly, dramatically and at times disastrously. The Ice Ages, interglacial periods, Roman and Medieval Warm Periods, Little Ice Age and Dust Bowl are but a few examples of major changes. Many other climate changes have brought less severe periods of warming, cooling and storm patterns.

Disaster scenarios forecast for 50 or 100 years hence are the product of speculation, assumptions and computer models. They are not supported by historic and current data and observations.

- Carbon dioxide is a minor player in climate change compared to water vapor and clearly natural forces and influences that drive shifts in our planet's complex, chaotic and unpredictable weather patterns and climate. Those forces include continental movements and volcanoes, and changes or periodic shifts in ocean currents and jet streams, water vapor and cloud cover, evaporation and precipitation, planetary alignments and the shape of the Earth's orbit, the tilt and wobble of Earth's axis, and solar energy output and cosmic ray levels.

- The predicted correlation between rising CO2 and rising temperatures simply is not there. Instead, these other complex, interrelated natural forces are now causing stable or declining average global temperatures, even as atmospheric carbon dioxide levels continue to rise. Some scientists say that, as the sun's energy output and magnetic field reach record lows for the modern era, increased cosmic rays reach Earth's lower atmosphere over the oceans and ionize particles of moisture to form clouds—and greater cloud cover then causes sunlight to be reflected away, further cooling the planet.

- Right now, the sun appears to be entering a less vigorous phase, as evidenced by a dramatic drop in sunspots, and average annual planetary temperatures have fallen slightly since the latest peak in 1998. If this cooling is prolonged, it would be far more threatening for humanity than moderate warming because it could worsen winters and reduce both growing seasons and arable farmland.

- The Northern Hemisphere is experiencing the coldest temperatures in decades. The National Snow and Ice Data Center showed more Arctic sea ice in April 2009 than in any April since 2003; October 2009 was the United States's third coldest October in 115 years of record keeping; December 2009 was one of the coldest in decades for Britain, Scotland and the United States; and massive cold waves and heavy snowfalls continue to batter North America, Europe, Russia, China and India.[83]

The critical point

These analyses and findings directly contradict studies, conclusions, alarmist predictions and policy prescriptions developed by the UN IPCC—and presented as the "official, consensus, universal" scientific statement on global warming and climate change. The IPCC views, in turn, form the principal basis and justification:

- for congressional "climate protection" bills, fossil fuel restrictions, and renewable energy mandates and subsidies;
- for the EPA endangerment decision and regulatory scheme;
- for every proposed global climate treaty;
- and for every demand that mankind must slash emissions, reduce living standards, put bureaucrats in charge of energy use, economies, industries and lives, and accept restrictions and intrusions on our freedoms, opportunities, free enterprise system, and civil and human rights.[84]

If the IPCC science is wrong—or far worse, if it is manipulated and fraudulent—then this unprecedented attempt to regulate lives and curtail civil rights is simply unjustifiable. Sadly, that appears to be the case.

The IPCC says the scientific topics it addresses "have been chosen for their significance to the IPCC task of assessing information relevant for understanding the risks of *human-induced* climate change."[85] This intentionally narrow charter has served to justify ignoring or actively excluding non-human, natural causes—and emphasizing only human causes, as "highly likely" sources of measured, perceived, speculated and exaggerated warming and associated "crises."[86]

It has also caused the IPCC and its allies to abandon what ought to be the central purpose of climate research: understanding *all* the causes of climate change, and improving our ability to predict future changes, and prepare for and adapt to those changes. Still worse, the narrow charter gave many researchers a vested interest in promoting and defending the "manmade global warming catastrophe" hypothesis, vilifying scientists who disagreed with them, and dismissing their findings and opinions.

Worst of all, a growing body of evidence suggests, the increasingly politicized academy of global warming catastrophe scientists actively and systematically manipulated data and computer models; lost or tossed raw (original) temperature data, so that it could not be examined by other scientists; utilized data and studies that they knew were unreliable; disregarded and excluded information that contradicted their predetermined results; hijacked the peer review process, to ensure that only friendly scientists examined their papers and "skeptical" research was excluded from scientific journals relied on by the IPCC and world governments; and willfully ignored and subverted Freedom of Information requests.

In short, it appears that these scientists and research institutions used billions of taxpayer dollars to manipulate the scientific record, and convince policymakers and legislators to "undertake a vast reordering of human behavior at almost unimaginable cost."[87]

The first evidence that something was amiss came from e-mails that a hacker or whistle-blowing insider put on a Web site for the world to see. Excerpts from just a few of the "Climategate" e-mails reveal an abuse of trust that is unscientific at best, and criminal at worst.[88]

British Climate Research Unit (CRU) chief Phil Jones to Penn State climatologist Michael Mann: *"If [Canadian researchers Ross McKitrick and Steve McIntyre] ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act in the UK, I think I'll delete the file rather than send it to anyone." Jones had previously told Australian scientist Warwick Hughes, "Why should I make the data available, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it?" (That's known as "the scientific method.") Jones subsequently "lost"*

all the raw temperature that had been entrusted to the CRU's care.

Jones to Mann: *"Can you delete any e-mails you may have had with Keith [Briffa] re AR4 [the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report and Briffa's suspect tree-ring data]. Keith will do likewise."*

Jones: *"I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report. Kevin [Trenberth, lead author of two IPCC reports] and I will keep them out somehow – even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!"*

Jones: *"I've just completed Mike [Mann's] trick of adding in the real temps to each series, to hide the decline [in average global temperatures] …." U.S. climate scientist Kevin Trenberth later groaned that alarmists still "can't account for the lack of warming and it is a travesty that we can't."*

Climate scientist Tom Wigley to Mann: *"If you think [*Geophysical Research Letters *editor James] Saiers is in the greenhouse skeptics camp, then, if we can find documentary evidence of this, we could go through official AGU channels to get him ousted." (Saiers was subsequently dismissed.)*

Anonymous CRU programmer, in notes appended to a segment of computer code: *the only way the models can produce "the proper result" is when programmers "apply a VERY ARTIFICIAL correction" [emphasis in original], use "low pass filtering at century and longer time scales," and "include a load of garbage."*

These e-mails prompted analysts to reexamine the IPCC reports, analyses, background studies and conclusions. They discovered numerous examples of questionable, speculative, unsubstantiated and even fabricated "research" that suggests a deliberate and systematic effort to buttress claims of an imminent global warming cataclysm, while excluding contrary evidence.

Reliable satellite temperature measurements only cover the last 30 years, and for the past 15 years (since 1995) show stable and then slightly declining temperatures, despite steadily rising CO2 levels. Alarmist climate scientists have thus focused their attention on *surface* temperature data. However, nearly half of the world's ground-based gauges are in the United States, and most of them are close to air conditioning exhausts, tarmac, blacktop and other urban heat sources, raising significant questions about their validity and value.[89]

Analysts discovered questionable, speculative, unsubstantiated and even fabricated research that suggests a deliberate and systematic effort to buttress claims on an imminent global warming cataclysm.

That major problem has been compounded by far more egregious actions.

- Britain's combined marine and land-based temperatures were "value-added" (aggregated, averaged and manipulated) by the East Anglia's Climate Research Unit—which then tossed or lost all the original raw data, so that no one could check its methodology, accuracy and honesty.

- The CRU excluded data from 40% of Russian territory, much of which showed no temperature increase for almost five decades. This cherry-picking of data made it appear that Russia had experienced a distinct warming trend, in response to rising CO2 levels. Similarly, scientist Keith Briffa selected just 12 tree-ring cores, to "prove" a dramatic recent temperature spike, while ignoring over 250 other Siberian cores that did not support his thesis.[90]

- NOAA's National Climate Data Center and NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies selected temperature data from only 36 Canadian monitoring stations, including just one from above the Arctic Circle—even though Canada operates 1,400 stations, 100 of them in the Arctic. The cherry-picked data were further altered to generate warming trends that may not exist in the full dataset.[91]

- In Australia, researchers "radically altered" data from temperature station Darwin Zero to create a pronounced warming trend, when the unadjusted data showed a slight cooling trend over the same period. They achieved this by arbitrarily adding 2 to 6 degrees Celsius to the raw data, at times justifying the added warmth by referring to data from stations 1,000km from the Darwin station.[92]

- Chinese temperature data purportedly demonstrated a recent warming trend that was not due to urban sprawl, relocated measurement stations or increased industrialization. However, there are no records from (or about) 49 of the 84 Chinese stations, including 40 of the 42 alleged rural stations, that the researchers supposedly analyzed for their study. Many of the other stations had in fact been moved during the study period. The scientists involved (Phil Jones and a Chinese-American colleague) say the relevant documents were lost, and deny that the data were simply invented.[93]

A 2007 IPCC Assessment Report excluded numerous peer-reviewed papers that dissented from or failed to support IPCC positions on dangerous climate change.

This temperature manipulation has been seriously compounded by other incidents that can charitably be called major breakdowns in the IPCC scientific process.

Himalayan glaciers

Perhaps most notably, the IPCC belatedly admitted that speculation was behind its frightening claim that Himalayan glaciers would "disappear by the year 2035," causing numerous communities in the region to be deprived of water. In reality, the disaster-of-the-century assertion in the 2007 IPCC *Assessment Report and Summary for PolicyMakers* was based—not on actual scientific research—but on a press release from the environmental pressure group World Wildlife Fund. The press release, in turn, was based on a non-peer-reviewed 1999 article in a popular science magazine, which was based on an e-mail interview statement by Indian glaciologist Syed Hasnain, who later admitted his prediction was pure speculation, then subsequently claimed he had been misquoted.[94]

Even more amazing, when the scandal broke, IPCC author Murari Lal said his team had included the claims in the 2007 documents—despite knowing its pedigree—because they thought highlighting it would "impact policy makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action" on global warming. The IPCC chairman, railroad engineer Rajendra Pachauri, also chimed in, saying those who were challenging the melting glaciers claim were "voodoo scientists," who happened to include India's most renowned glacier experts. They had just completed an exhaustive study that found no evidence of unusual temperature upturns in the Himalayas and said it would take 300 years for the glaciers to melt.[95]

Global glaciers

This bizarre episode was followed by the revelation that IPCC assertions about snow and ice disappearing from mountaintops all over the world likewise had no scientific basis. Instead, one of its principal sources turned out to have been an article published in a magazine for climbers and based solely on anecdotal statements by mountaineers about changes they said they had witnessed. The other was a geography student's master's degree dissertation, based on interviews with mountain guides who shared anecdotal stories and personal recollections about past and present snow and ice conditions.[96]

In fact, the 2007 IPCC Assessment Report had represented over 40 WWF submissions as peer-reviewed scientific papers, while excluding numerous papers that actually had been peer-reviewed but dissented from or failed to support IPCC positions on dangerous climate change.

Amazongate

At virtually the same time, the alarming IPCC claim that droughts caused by global warming could bring the demise of 40% of the Amazon rainforest also turned out to be smoke from a smoke-making machine. Once again, the "expert" source cited by the IPCC was the World Wildlife Fund. The WWF had provided "research" by two young activists, who based it on an article in the sci-

ence journal *Nature*; they in turn had neglected to mention that the article was not about rainfall, but about logging and forest burning by humans, and had nothing to do with climate change.[97]

African agriculture

Yields from rain-fed agriculture could plummet by up to 50% by 2020 in some African countries, proclaimed the IPCC's *Fourth Assessment Report*, its supposedly "gold standard" Synthesis Report, and even chairman Pachauri himself (who often said the yields "would" plummet), UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and dozens of mid-level UN officials. The farming Armageddon claim has been used to convince African villagers that global warming threatens their lives even more than the deadly diseases that have plagued them for millennia.

However, even the experts who wrote and signed off on the 2007 reports knew there was no substance to the claim. Their own models and simulations had found that any declines in grain production by 2020 were "within historical variations," and even the IPCC's worst-case computer model scenarios forecast only a 30% decline by 2080. Other studies had found that increasing rainfall and carbon dioxide levels were actually greening parts of the Sahara Desert, and other climate experts said they found no evidence to support the 2020 horror movie, though none discussed the benefits of drought-resistant biotech crops.

Where did the IPCC "demise of African agriculture" headline come from? The source was an obscure Moroccan academic, writing in a non-peer-reviewed article, about cereal crops in North Africa during drought years, and saying nothing about Sub-Saharan Africa. But because a 50% destruction by 2020 claim better suited the politics of Climategeddon, it became a flagship horror story of 2007.[98]

Of course, none of this scientific exaggeration, manipulation, fabrication or intimidation disproves the manmade global warming disaster thesis. It doesn't even demonstrate that the entire IPCC process or body of knowledge is erroneous or fraudulent. However, it does demonstrate unprecedented, systemic attitudes, falsifications and problems that need to be examined thoroughly—and rooted out—before IPCC or EPA findings can be allowed to justify draconian regulation of our economies and lives.

It is not simply that these errors and falsifications were carried out, developed by environmental activist groups, permitted or even fostered by the IPCC hierarchy, and hidden from view. The IPCC's false data, analyses, assumptions, and reports were fed into computer models that conjured up hundreds of terrifying disaster scenarios. They formed the basis for countless summaries, press releases, and news stories—and for congressional, EPA, SEC, Interior, EU and UN legislative, regulatory, treaty, subsidy, and spending proposals—as well as actions at the state and local level.[99]

They are being used to justify government actions that will destroy jobs, make government the primary arbiter of employment and energy decisions, roll back civil rights progress, shackle the hopes and dreams of hard-working poor and minority American families, keep Third World families mired in poverty, disease and despair—and perpetrate gross injustices on businesses and families all over the world.

A lucky few will become wealthy and powerful. Their lobbying and connections will enable them to corner markets for renewable energy technologies, subsidies, carbon offsets and emissions trading. Poor, minority, elderly, and blue collar families will be penalized severely.

If we are going to exact such penalties, we need far better proof of planetary disaster than we have now.

The most destitute people on the planet will face literally life-or-death risks.

If we are going to exact such penalties, we need far better proof of planetary disaster than we have now.

Conclusion

Energy is the Master Resource, the backbone for modern economies and civilization, the foundation for jobs, prosperity, civil rights and environmental justice. In the United States, 85% of all energy is hydrocarbon-based and half of all electricity is generated with coal. We tamper with these energy sources at our peril, and should do so only with solid evidence that tampering is absolutely essential.

Issues of justice and human rights are almost as

complex as Earth's climate and weather systems. They are certainly more complex than suggested by United Nations pronouncements or the Environmental Protection Agency/Congressional Black Caucus "Environmental Justice Tour"—which claim that global warming is the greatest threat facing Africa and America's minority families.

As 165 climate scientists noted in their open letter to UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon on the eve of the Copenhagen summit: "There is no sound reason to impose expensive and restrictive public policy decisions on the peoples of the Earth without first providing convincing evidence that human activities are causing dangerous climate change beyond that resulting from natural causes. Before any precipitate action is taken, we must have solid observational data that recent changes in climate differ substantially from changes observed in the past and are well in excess of normal variations caused by solar cycles, ocean currents, changes in the Earth's orbital parameters and other natural phenomena."[100]

We do not yet have that convincing evidence and solid observational data. We have no justification for taxing and rationing energy use, and unleashing adverse unintended consequences that will send shockwaves through our economy and society, and adversely affect our civil rights, freedoms, and pursuit of justice and happiness.

It is vital that we protect and manage our Earth and its resources as wise stewards. Do unto others, as we would have them do unto us. And meet the many growing needs of current and future generations, to improve, enrich and safeguard lives, in this nation and the world over.

We must carefully think through how we can achieve these goals, how we can make a difference in the lives of the less fortunate, and create a truly just society. We must not build a new Berlin Wall—a Climate Wall between underprivileged people and the modern, energy-rich world.

We cannot have justice without opportunity, or opportunity without energy. We cannot have justice by sharing scarcity and poverty more equally. We cannot help poor nations by penalizing rich nations for their technology and success, or help people achieve the American Dream if our economy is dictated by false science, expensive and unreliable renewable energy, and overtaxed, overpriced conventional energy.

How can concerned legislators better ensure justice and human rights?

Trust, but verify, all claims that we face a planetary climate crisis. Ensure that scientists and institutions engaged in climate research are honest, transparent and accountable—by seeking the input of climate disaster skeptics and other energy and climate experts, and launching investigations by independent analysts, legislative bodies or attorneys-general into questionable behavior, dubious science, potential misuse of taxpayer funding, and possible criminal fraud. Ensure that experts from all perspectives on these energy, economic and climate change debates receive sufficient funding to carry out their work, and provide honest, peer-reviewed studies and recommendations.

Safeguard state budgets
Oppose (further) funding for the Center for Climate Strategies and other climate activist groups, whose anti-hydrocarbon initiatives and renewable energy proposals are based on assumptions and assertions that fossil fuel use and carbon dioxide emissions are causing global warming disasters. Examine their funding and alliances, and demand that they provide solid, affirmative proof that the world faces an imminent manmade climate disaster—which their proposed actions would prevent—before moving forward on any of their demands.

Demand and ensure debate on all matters of climate science, economics and justice. Utilize legislative hearings, town hall meetings, radio and television, articles and other opportunities to compel global warming alarmists and dissenters to defend their methods, findings and recommendations.

Proceed cautiously and deliberately on all energy, climate and economic issues. Insist that no legislation or regulation is implemented or imposed before it and the science behind it are fully analyzed, vetted and debated by independent experts and knowledgeable legislators and staffs, who can evaluate scientific and economic claims, objections and likely unintended consequences of the proposals.

Develop conventional energy resources
Hydrocarbon, nuclear and hydroelectric resources provide 96% of the energy used in America today. They support millions of jobs and generate trillions of dollars of economic benefits and billions in government revenues; moreover our nation's vast untapped resources can be developed safely and responsibly, to generate future energy and jobs, while reducing our reliance on foreign sources. Renewable energy is also important, but it requires constant subsidies and vast lands and raw materials, while adversely affecting wildlife, habitats and other environmental values. Apply the same economic and environmental standards and regulations to all proposed energy generation facilities, whether hydrocarbon, nuclear, hydroelectric, geothermal, biofuel, wind or solar.

Challenge the EPA endangerment decision
Texas and Virginia have filed lawsuits challenging the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the scientific basis for its finding that carbon dioxide emissions endanger human health and welfare. Other states are likely to follow, because regulations, permitting processes and restrictions on emissions will severely impact manufacturing, transportation, employment, economies and revenues, especially in states that rely heavily on oil, coal, and natural gas. As Texas Attorney General Greg Abbot observed, "EPA outsourced the scientific basis for its greenhouse gas regulation to a scandal-plagued international organization that cannot be considered objective or trustworthy." Legislators should consider weighing in on this issue and recommending that their governors or attorneys general also challenge the EPA decision in court.

Most importantly,

Understand and defend the true meaning of justice and human rights: recognizing that there is still no affirmative evidence that we face a manmade global warming catastrophe, and that energy is the foundation for hope and opportunity for both American citizens and Earth's poorest people. There can be no opportunity or justice without abundant, reliable, affordable energy—or if restrictions and taxes on energy raise family and business costs to levels that are not sustainable.

By taking these simple steps, we can restore our Constitutional system, ensure sound science, pursue justice, and safeguard the hopes, dreams and human rights of all people. ■

Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow. Trained in geology, ecology and environmental law, he is an Eagle Scout, civil rights activist and conservationist; author of Eco-Imperialism: Green Power - Black Death*; editor of* Energy Keepers - Energy Killers: The new civil rights battle*, by Congress of Racial Equality national chairman Roy Innis; and regular commentator on energy, climate change, the environment, and corporate social responsibility and ethics.*

FOR FURTHER READING

Books and Expert Studies

Michael Barkley, *Environmental Stewardship in the Judeo-Christian Tradition: Jewish, Catholic and Protestant wisdom on the environment*, Grand Rapids, MI: Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty (2000).

Paul Driessen, *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power - Black Death*, Bellevue, WA: Free Enterprise Press (2003-2004).

Fagan, Brian, *The Little Ice Age: How climate made history 1300-1850*, New York: Basic Books (2000).

Roy Innis, *Energy Keepers • Energy Killers: The new civil rights battle*, Bellevue, WA: Merril Press (2008).

Richard S. Keen, *Skywatch West: The complete weather guide*, Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing (2004). A companion book, Skywatch East, focuses on the Eastern United States.

Nigel Lawson, *An Appeal to Reason: A cool look at global warming*, London: Overlook Duckworth, Peter Mayer Publishers (2007).

S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery, *Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 years*, New York: Roman & Littlefield Publishers (2007).

Lawrence Solomon, *The Deniers: The world-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud – and those who are too fearful to do so* (2008).

Roy W. Spencer, *Climate Confusion: How global warming hysteria leads to bad science, pandering politicians and misguided policies that hurt the poor*, New York: Encounter Books (2008).

Joanne Nova, *The Skeptic's Handbook: Strategies and tools for cutting through the red herrings and avoiding the traps about global warming* (2009). Available at http://joannenova.com.au/global-warming.

Useful Websites

http://www.AllPainNoGain.org
Impacts of cap-and-trade legislation

http://www.CFACT.org
Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow

http://www.ClimateDepot.com
Presenting multiple viewpoints on climate change issues

http://www.CO2science.org/
Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change

http://www.CongressOfRacialEquality.org
Congress of Racial Equality

http://www.CopenhagenConsensus.com
Bjorn Lomborg: assessment of global health and economic priorities

http://www.CornwallAlliance.org/
Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation

http://www.GlobalWarming.org
Information on global warming science and economics

http://www.TheGWPF.org
Global Warming Policy Foundation

http://icecap.us
International Climate and Environmental Change Assessment Project

http://www.ScienceAndPublicPolicy.org
Science-based policy on energy, climate and the environment

http://WattsUpWithThat.com/
News and commentary on science and climate change

http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2009/11/20/climate-cuttings-33
Catalog of Climategate emails

ENDNOTES

1 Roy Innis, "Jim Crow energy policies," Townhall.com, May 15, 2008. Innis is also the author of *Energy Keepers - Energy Killers: The new civil rights battle*, Bellevue, WA: Merril Press, 2007.

2 *Ibid.*

3 "Funny, it doesn't feel like a recovery," *Bloomberg BusinessWeek*, January 18, 2010, page 18; Frank Ahrens, "Black teen unemployment rises to nearly 50 percent," *Washington Post*, December 7, 2009.

4 "Economy gives Dems election jitters," *Washington Examiner* editorial, January 10, 2010.

5 Peter Coy, Michelle Conlin and Moira Herbst, "The disposable worker," *Bloomberg BusinessWeek*, January 18, 2010, page 32-39.

6 Ibid.

7 "Funny, it doesn't feel like a recovery," *Bloomberg BusinessWeek,* January 18, 2010.

8 George Will, Fiscal liberalism has tarnished California gold, *Washington Post*, January 8, 2010

9 Mitch Daniels, "The coming reset in state government," *Wall Street Journal*, September 4, 2009.

10 Ibid.

11 See *Wall Street Journal* editorial, "The political cover commission," January 21, 2010.

12 *Wall Street Journal* editorial, "The audacity of debt," December 16, 2009.

13 *Wall Street Journal* and Heritage Foundation, *The Link between Economic Opportunity and Prosperity, The 2010 Index of Economic Freedom*. The United States has fallen from the ranks of "free" economies to the ranks of the "mostly free," along with Belgium, Botswana, Chile, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

14 Scott Cendrowski, "What's ahead in the next decade," *Fortune*, January 18, 2010.

15 Ben Casselman, "Chevron engineers squeeze new oil from old wells," *Wall Street Journal*, October 9, 2009; Steve LeVine, "Exxon buys a green headache," *Bloomberg BusinessWeek*, December 28, 2009/January 4, 2010; Ben Casselman and Russell Gold, "Drilling tactic unleashes a trove of natural gas – and a backlash," *Wall Street Journal*, January 21, 2010.

16 Newt Gingrich and Roy Innis, "Destroying both jobs and energy security," *Investor's Business Daily*, March 4, 2009; Doc Hastings, "Pump up the economy," *Washington Times*, September 2, 2009; "Salazar to toughen US drilling rules," *Wall Street Journal*, January 6, 2009.

17 US Departments of Interior, Agriculture and Energy, *Inventory of Onshore Federal Oil and Natural Gas Resources and Restrictions on Their Development*, 2008; Gingrich and Innis, "Destroying both jobs and energy security," op. cit.

18 Ben Casselman and Guy Chazan, "Cramped on land, big oil bets at sea," *Wall Street Journal*, January 5, 2009.

19 ICF International, *Strengthening Our Economy: The untapped US oil and gas resources*, December 2008. A 2009 American Energy Alliance report estimates that drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf would generate $8 trillion in economic output and increased GDP, and $2.2 trillion in government receipts; see also Doc Hastings, "Pump up the economy," *Washington Times*, September 2, 2009.

20 National Mining Association, Fast Facts about Coal; National Coal Council, Coal: America's Energy Future; US Energy Information Administration, "Recoverable Coal Reserves at Producing Mines, Estimated Recoverable Reserves, and Demonstrated Reserve Base by Mining Method," Report No.: DOE/EIA 0584, September 18, 2009.

21 Arthur Robinson, "Easy Pickens: More reliable and affordable than wind," *Human Events*, August 19, 2008.

22 See Robert Peltier, "Top Plants: Seminole Generating Station, Palatka, Florida," *Power,* October 1, 2009; "Seminole 3 cancelled," SourceWatch.org, December 2009; Mark Steil, "Crucial power lines meant for Big Stone II still and option," Minnesota Public Radio, December 16, 2009.

23 Stephen Power, "Salazar to toughen US drilling rules," *Wall Street Journal*, January 6, 2010; "Nantucket wind ride," *Wall Street Journal* editorial, January 8, 2010.

24 Newt Gingrich and Roy Innis, "Destroying both jobs and energy security," *Investor's Business Daily*, March 4, 2009.

25 Roy Innis, "Jim Crow energy policies," Townhall.com, May 15, 2008.

26 Energy Information Administration, *Annual Energy Outlook 2009*; and "Low-Cost Electricity from Coal," March 2009.

27 Brett A. Vassey, President and CEO, Virginia Manufacturers Association, Testimony before US Senate Environment & Public Works Committee, on the "Clean Energy, Jobs and American Power Act," October 28, 2009.

28 See eg, Michael Powell, "Gore unveils global warming plan," *Washington Post,* September 19, 2006.

29 Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation, press release, "EPA: Greenhouse gases threaten public health and the environment. Science overwhelmingly shows greenhouse gas concentrations at unprecedented levels due to human activity," December 7, 2009.

30 Environmental Protection Agency press release, "EPA and Congressional Black Caucus announce joint Environmental Justice Tour," January 22, 2010. The EPA/CBC focus is on protecting "vulnerable" families and communities from climate change and rising energy prices; training more minorities for careers in "clean" energy; and promoting "environmental justice." Its Tour and guiding principles do not address issues raised in this paper, by CORE chairman Roy Innis, or in the Congress of Racial Equality's "Stop the War on the Poor" campaign.

31 Andrew Jack, "Gates fears pressure on health aid," *Financial Times*, January 25, 2010.

32 In a January 2008 interview with the *San Francisco Chronicle*, presidential candidate Obama said: "Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. Coal-power plants, you know, natural gas, you name it, whatever the plants were, whatever the industry was, they would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money. They will pass that money on to consumers."

33 See Gregg Marland, Tom Boden and Robert J. Andres, "National CO2 Emissions from Fossil-Fuel Burning, Cement Manufacture, and Gas Flaring: 1751-2004," Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, August 17, 2007.

34 Lauer Johnson Research, memorandum to National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, "Research findings on climate change, electricity usage and cost," April 20, 2009; *Louisiana Weekly*, "76% of Blacks want delay on climate legislation until economy recovers,"

July 6, 2009; Deneen Borelli, "Cap-and-trade is a ball and chain for poor Americans," *Washington Examiner*, September 20, 2009.

35 See eg, David Montgomery *et al.*, "Impact on the Economy of the *American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009* (H.R.2454)," prepared for the National Black Chamber of Commerce by CRA International, May 2009; Warwick McKibbin *et al.*, "Consequences of Cap and Trade," Brookings Institution, June 2009; Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), "Economic Impact of the Waxman-Markey American Clean Energy and Security Act," prepared for National Association of Manufacturers and American Council for Capital Formation, August 2009; Nicolas D. Loris, "CBO Grossly Underestimates Costs of Cap and Trade," The Heritage Foundation, June 22, 2009; Roy Innis and Paul Driessen, "Climate assumptions from another planet," *Investor's Business Daily*, October 15, 2009; Bryan Buckley and Sergey Mityakov of Clemson University, The Cost of Climate Regulation of American Households," prepared for the Marshall Institute, March 2009; Steven Hayward and Kenneth Green, "Waxman-Markey: An exercise in futility," American Enterprise Institute, July 2009.

See also William Beach, David Kreutzer, Karen Campbell and Ben Lieberman, "Son of Waxman-Markey: More politics makes for a more costly bill" (summarizing results of analysis of climate legislation approved by House Energy and Commerce Committee, prior to its narrow passage by the House of Representatives), May 18, 2009; Science and Public Policy Institute, "State Climate Profiles," examining climate change over time and impacts and costs of climate mitigation measures, 2008-2009, http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/state_climate_profiles.html

36 Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison and Senator Christopher S. Bond, "Democrats' hidden gas tax: Extra $1 per gallon at the pump will mean all pain, no gain," *The Washington Times*, October 21, 2009.

37 *Ibid.*; James Taylor, "120 agriculture groups oppose Waxman-Markey," *Environment & Climate News*, November 2009; James Taylor, "The cap-and-trade Handbook," Heartland Institute, January 12, 2010.

38 *Wall Street Journal* editorial, "California cap-and-trade revolt," January 11, 2010.

39 Matt Apuzzo and Justin Juozapavicius, "As jobs vanish, factory towns slow to see stimulus," *USA Today*, November 2, 2009.

40 David Derbyshire, "Millions face 'stealth tax' on heating bills to subsidise green energy," *Daily Mail*, February 12, 2009; UK Net Guide, "Millions making big sacrifices to pay utilities bills, new research confirms: Warnings of pensioners going hungry in order to heat their homes weren't over-the-top, after all," March 20, 2009.

41 "Watchdog rethinks consumer costs for green energy," *London Daily Mail*, January 3, 2010; "Pensioners burn books for warmth," *Metro News*, January 5, 2010.

42 Cath Everett, "UK buildings could be pulled down to meet carbon standards," BusinessGreen, January 25, 2010.

43 National Housing Federation, "Federation calls for energy market regulation, as quarter of population set to fall into fuel poverty," September 8, 2008.

44 Brendan O'Neill, "Panic, little ones, it's the carbon monster," *The Australian*, November 2, 2009.

45 Jeffrey Ball, "Hate Calculus? Try counting cow carbon," *Wall Street Journal*, September 18, 2009. The tendency toward mandates and behavior modification, in the name of preventing disastrous climate change, is as apparent at the local level as in Congress and the EPA. Peter Wilson, "Green police aren't just in Super Bowl ads," *American Thinker*, February 10, 2010, chronicles the activities of the Cambridge, MA, mayor and city council in pondering ordinances that would promote locally grown produce, ban apples from New Zealand, encourage businesses to hire local people who don't have to commute, mandate Vegan Mondays in restaurants, and require that cars be shared rather than privately owned. Stephanie Simon, "Even Boulder finds it isn't easy going green," *Wall Street Journal*, February 13-14, 2010, explains how this ultra-progressive Colorado city has seen its CO2 emissions rise 27% since 1990, compared to a 15% U.S. average. With voluntary actions "slow to show significant results," even when subsidized by special city taxes, Boulder leaders are now calling for increased regulation of light bulbs, insulation and other matters. Ironically, the city relies almost entirely on a coal-fired power plant for its electricity, plus a smattering of wind power, and there is growing resistance to the mandates among local voters.

46 Robert E. Grady, "Light cars are dangerous cars," *Wall Street Journal*, May 22, 2009.

47 US Securities and Exchange Commission, press release, "SEC issues interpretive guidance on disclosure related to business or legal developments regarding climate change," January 27, 2010; Robert F. Keane, "SEC issues guidance on climate change disclosure," *Investment Advisor*, January 28, 2010; Matt Cover, "SEC ruling requires companies to tell shareholders if climate laws are bad for business," CNSNews.com special, February 1, 2009.

48 See Foley & Lardner, "EPA proposes new 'tailoring' rule for greenhouse gases under Clean Air Act," October 5, 2009; Sidley Austin, "EPA proposes to limit expansion of Clean Air Act permit programs to cover only sources that emit 25,000 TPY of greenhouse gases," October 12, 2009.

49 See Jeffrey Ball and Charles Forelle, "Business fumes over EPA rule," *Wall Street Journal*, December 7, 2009;

50 *Wall Street Journal* editorial, "The new climate litigation," December 28, 2009.

51 National Association of Manufacturers press release, "NAM says EPA endangerment finding will hurt manufacturers' competitiveness," December 7, 2009; "Lawsuit and mixed reactions on EPA's endangerment finding," eNewsUSA, December 7, 2009; *Wall Street Journal* editorial, "Killing jobs, Obama-style," December 8. 2009. "At the December 2009 jobs summit, [President Obama] promised to keep working on plans to bankrupt the coal industry," the *Journal* observed. "When the price of coal goes through the roof, the number of jobs related to coal will go through the floor."

52 60 Plus Association, "Comments on proposed endangerment finding for greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act," June 22, 2009; 60 Plus Association, "Comments on EPA Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on regulating greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act, November 25, 2008.

53 Pew Research Center for People & the Press, "Public's priorities for 2010: Economy, jobs, terrorism," January 25, 2010. Economic, employment and terrorism concerns rated a "top priority" listing for at least 80% of the American public in Pew Research Center's first poll of 2010. Nothing else garnered a #1 ranking by more than 66% of the citizenry. Global warming again came in dead last (#21 of 21), receiving a "top priority" rank from just 28% of the public—down from 38% in 2007.

54 Fiona Kobusingye-Boynes, "Africa's real climate crisis," townhall.com.com, July 29, 2009; "Fiona Kobusingye's Africa," globalwarming-arclein.blogspot.com, July 30, 2009; Bram Posthumus, "Africa

and Copenhagen: Quite a mismatch," Radio Nederland Wereldomroep, http://www.rnw.nl/africa/article/copenhagen-and-africa-quite-mismatch.

55 *Ibid*.

56 Bjorn Lomborg, "Time for a smarter approach to global warming," *Wall Street Journal*, December 15, 2009.

57 PricewaterhouseCoopers, "The Economic Impacts of the Oil and Natural Gas Industry on the U.S. Economy: Employment, Labor Income and Value Added," prepared for American Petroleum Institute, September 2009.

58 Gabriel Calzada Alvarez, Raquel Merino Jara, et al., Study of the effects on employment of public aid to renewable energy sources, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, March 2009.

59 Henry Esteve, "State low-balled cost of green tax breaks," *The Oregonian*, October 31, 2009.

60 Gabriel Calzada Alvarez, *et al., op. cit*. See also Robert Bryce, "Let's get real about renewable energy," *Wall Street Journal*, March 6, 2009; Sharon Begley, "We can't get there from here," *Newsweek*, March 23, 2009.

61 See for example, Roger Bezdek, "Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency: Economic drivers for the 21st Century," 2007 (for the American Solar Energy Society). A colleague in the Czech Republic reports that its national power company is concerned that anticipated wind turbine approvals will greatly increase unexpected power surges into the electrical transmission grid, to the point that they threaten the very stability of the grid.

62 Whereas ExxonMobil was fined for the deaths of several hundred birds that had landed in open oil sludge barrels, wind energy developers have thus far received no citations, fines or penalties for the deaths of thousands of endangered raptors and tens of thousands of bats and other birds. See Robert Bryce, "Windmills are killing our birds," *Wall Street Journal*, September 8, 2009.

63 Lamar Alexander, "Energy 'Sprawl' and the Green Economy," *Wall Street Journal*, September 18, 2009; Robert Foote, "Wind energy input-output audit – Vestas wind turbines," bobfoote.angelfire.com; Iberdrola Renewables, "Big Horn Wind Power Project, overview and details of 200 MW project near Bickleton, WA," 2008.

64 Jesse H. Ausubel, "Renewable and nuclear heresies," *International Journal of Nuclear Governance, Economy and Ecology*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2007.

65 Rebecca Smith, "Chinese-made turbines will fill Texas wind farm," *Wall Street Journal*, October 30, 2010. China is fast becoming the world's primary source of wind turbines and solar panels—partly for own use, but principally to sell to Western countries whose wages, environmental restrictions and labor laws price their domestically manufactured turbines and panels out of the marketplace. Turbine maker Vestas has already left Britain, eliminating some 600 "green" jobs. See "China races to invest in green energy," Kit Gillet, *Washington Times*, December 11-12, 2009.

66 Arthur Robinson, "Bricks without straw," NewsWithViews.com and Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, June 22, 2009. Using $720,000 in stimulus money, the Denver Nature and Science Museum installed photovoltaic panels on its roof. The panels will reduce the museum's electricity bills by roughly 20% but will last only 25 years, whereas it will take 110 years to save enough on those bills to pay for the panels. See Todd Shepherd, Electric bills not on exhibit at Denver Museum of Nature and Science, Independence Institute, February 2009; Paul Driessen, "Taxpayer cash for clunker ideas," MensNewsDaily.com, August 28, 2009. See also Jeffrey Ball, "Renewable energy: meet the new NIMBYs," *Wall Street Journal*, September 4, 2009.

67 Rebecca Smith, "Green battle rages in desert: Mojave protection will would put prime solar-power sites off limits," *Wall Street Journal,* December 22, 2009; Jeffrey Ball, "Renewable energy: meet the new NIMBYs," *Wall Street Journal*, September 4, 2009; Ben Casselman, "Sierra Club's pro-gas dilemma," *Wall Street Journal*, December 21, 2009.

68 See *Wall Street Journal* editorial, "Ethanol's grocery bill," June 2, 2009; Stephen Dinan, "Ethanol policies fuel food-price rise," *Washington Times*, April 9, 2009; *Wall Street Journal* editorial, "Corn Power: Sen. Grassley snuffs out dissent on ethanol subsidies," August 5, 2009; C. Larry Pope, president of Smithfield Foods, letter to *Wall Street Journal* September 12-13, 2009; Edward Felker, "Forests vs. food study worries agriculture chief," *Washington Times*, December 29, 2009.

69 Seldon Graham, letter to James F. Wood, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy for Fossil Fuel, US Department of Energy, January 14, 2009.

70 Knappenberger, Chip, "Climate Impacts of Waxman-Markey (the IPCC-based arithmetic of no gain)," MasterResource free market energy blog, http://masterresource.org/?p=2355.

71 In an important February 16, 2010 development, ConocoPhillips, BP and Caterpillar announced that they are pulling out of the US-CAP. While saying the organization has been a pioneer in the climate change debates, they have clearly seen how "Climategate" has shaken the scientific foundation for drastic punitive action against hydrocarbons, and now recognize how badly cap-tax-and-trade, endangerment and other climate actions would hurt their businesses, investors, customers and the communities they serve.

72 Joanne Nova, "Climate Money and the Climate Industry: $79 billion so far – Trillions to come," published by the Science and Public Policy Institute, July 21, 2009. By comparison, ExxonMobil is frequently attacked for giving less than 1/3,400 of this U.S. government amount ($23 million) over the same period to scientists and public policy organizations that challenge global warming alarmism but also address malaria and other issues. See also Bjorn Lomborg, "The Climate-Industrial Complex," *Wall Street Journal*, May 22, 2009.

73 *Wall Street Journal* editorial, "Michael Mann's climate stimulus," January 20, 2010. Asked by Congress to examine Mann's "hockey stick" graph, George Mason University professor of statistics Dr. Edward Wegman concluded that Mann's analytical methods and claim that the 1990s were the "hottest decade in a millennium" cannot be supported. The Wegman commission's full report can be found at: http://www.climateaudit.org/pdf/others/07142006_Wegman_Report.pdf.

74 Elizabeth Williamson and Paul Glader, "General Electric pursues pot of government stimulus gold," *Wall Street Journal*, November 16, 2009.

75 Rebecca Smith, "For Exelon, carbon reductions solve problem, make money," *Wall Street Journal*, October 19, 2009; Bernstein Research, "Exelon: Meeting with management provides insights on CO2 regulation and NRG acquisition," June 10, 2009.

76 Rebecca Smith, "Big utility turns bullish on carbon capture, *Wall Street Journal*, December 9, 2009; Guy Chazan, "Locals try sinking plan to store CO2 underground," *Wall Street Journal*, October 6, 2009. Environmentalists are also opposed to using captured CO2 for

oil and gas tertiary recovery operations, as they oppose both of those fuels.

77 Gerald Traufetter, "Can climate forecasts still be trusted? Confidence melting away: Doubts grow in climate change debate," ABC News Internet Ventures, January 28, 2010. See also Philip Klotzbach, "Trends in global tropical cyclone activity over the past twenty years (1986-2005)," *Geophysical Research Letters*, Vol. 33, L10805, 2006; Ryan Maue, "Northern Hemisphere tropical cyclone activity," *Geophysical Research Letters*, Vol. 36, L05805, 2009. The 2007 IPCC report has also been implicated in the growing Climategate scandals over incriminating emails, allegedly falsified temperature records and computer models, and conclusions that are not supported by research cited by the IPCC. (See the next section, "Climate science reconsidered.")

78 Holman Jenkins, Jr., "The economic uses of Al Gore," *Wall Street Journal*, November 11, 2009.

79 Kirsten E. Gillibrand, "Cap-and-trade could be boon to New York," *Wall Street Journal*, October 22, 2009. it was the same Wall Street experts who made billions packaging and repackaging mortgage loans into securities, thus aiding and abetting another complex government-private enterprise that ultimately caused the housing, banking and stock market crisis that continues to imperil Fannie Mac, Freddie Mac, banks, housing and federal solvency.

80 H. Josef Hebert, Associated Press, "Smart grid buzz of power industry," *Washington Times*, June 7, 2009. "If you control carbon, you control life," MIT atmospheric scientist Richard Lindzen frequently points out—underscoring the pervasive impacts that cap-and-trade laws, endangerment rules and international climate treaties would have.

81 See for example, Peter Alford, "Japanese scientists cool on [manmade global warming] theories," *The Australian*, March 14, 2009; U.S. Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Minority Staff Report, *More Than 700 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims: Scientists Continue to Debunk "Consensus" in 2008 & 2009*, March 16, 2009 (update); The Oregon Petition Project, sponsored by the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine (www.oism.org) and launched by Dr. Frederick Seitz, past president of the US National Academy of Sciences and president emeritus of Rockefeller University.

82 *Climate Change Reconsidered: The Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change*, Science and Environmental Policy Project and Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, 2009 (http://www.NIPCCreport.org).

83 For background and discussion on these points, see *Climate Change Reconsidered* and the books and websites listed in the Appendix. "All four agencies that track the Earth's temperature—the Hadley Climate Research Unit in Britain, the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, the Christy group at the University of Alabama [Huntsville] and Remote Sensing Systems, Inc. in California—report that it cooled by about 0.7C in 2007. This is the fastest temperature change in the instrumental record, and it puts us back where we were in 1930." Australian geophysicist and astronaut Phil Chapman, "Sorry to ruin the fun, but an ice age cometh," *The Australian*, April 23, 2008.

84 As to "consensus," atmospheric scientist Richard Lindzen has noted: "Skepticism is essential to science; consensus is foreign…. Among other things, global warming is such a multifaceted issue that agreement on all or many aspects would be unreasonable."

85 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2007 – The Physical Science Basis*, Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, "Chapter 1: Historical Overview of Climate Change Science," page 95 [emphasis added]. Ironically, this is the report that, along with Al Gore and IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri, won the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize, for creating "an ever-broader informed consensus about the connection between human activities and global warming."

86 Dr. John Brignell has compiled an extensive list of phenomena and "crises" that have been attributed to global warming or climate change—literally from acne and aggressive weeds, to cannibalism, jellyfish invasions, Scottish spiders, tectonic plate movements and walrus stampedes. ("A complete list of things caused by global warming," Numberwatch.co.uk/warmlist, 2008 and updated frequently.) Some have suggested that the real issue is not manmade climate change, but Mann-made climate change.

87 Quoting Daniel Henninger, "Climategate: Science is dying," *Wall Street Journal*, December 3, 2009.

88 All the CRU emails were archived on a single backup server, making it easy for someone to find and release selected memos. The ones cited here and numerous other Climategate emails are summarized and linked to the complete email messages at http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2009/11/20/climate-cuttings-33.html.

See also Patrick J. Michaels, "How to manufacture a climate consensus," *Wall Street Journal*, December 18, 2009; Michael Barone, "Global warming consensus: Garbage in, garbage out," *Washington Examiner*, November 29, 2009; Paul Driessen, "Scaremongers don't need no stinking facts," *Investor's Business Daily*, December 14, 2009.

89 Anthony Watts, "Is the US surface temperature record reliable?" Heartland Institute, 2009 and www.SurfaceStations.org.

90 Ross McKitrick, "Defects in key climate data are uncovered," *National Post,* October 1, 2009.

91 Joseph D'Aleo and E. Michael Smith, "Climategate – American style," a segment of a climate change television series by Weather Channel founder John Coleman, on KUSI-TV, San Diego.

92 Willis Eschenbach, "The smoking gun at Darwin Zero," December 20, 2009, and subsequent discussions, posted on WattsUpWithThat.com and other websites. It appears that NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies (James Hansen's laboratory at Columbia University) played a lead role in "correcting" the Aussie temperature data.

93 Fred Pearce, "Strange case of moving weather posts and a scientist under siege," *The Guardian*, February 1, 2010; and "Leaked climate change emails scientist hid data flaws," *The Guardian*, February 2, 2010. Interestingly, Mr. Pearce and *The Guardian* for years were among Europe's shrillest voices in support of global warming disasters.

94 Jonathan Leake and Chris Hastings, "IPCC mislead world over Himalayan glacier meltdown," *The Times* (London), January 17, 2010; Gerald Traufetter, "Can climate forecasts still be trusted? Confidence melting away," ABC News Internet Ventures, January 28, 2010; F. William Engdahl, "Glacier Meltdown: Another Scientific Scandal Involving the IPCC Climate Research Group," *Global Research*, January 27, 2010. The Times reported that India's top glaciologists called Hasnain's claims about imminent glacial meltdown "inherently ludicrous."

95 David Rose, "Glacier scientist: I knew data hadn't been verified," *London Daily Mail*, January 24, 2010; Dominic Lawson, "So all those climate revelations were a dastardly foreign plot," *The Independent,* February 2, 2010. India also announced that it can no longer trust

the IPCC on these critical scientific, energy and economic issues, and is forming an "Indian IPCC" to provide additional or alternative analyses and recommendations.

96 Richard Gray and Rebecca Lefort, "IPCC Based Claims On Student Dissertation And Magazine Article," *The Sunday Telegraph*, January 31, 2010. See also Dean Nelson, "India to pull out of IPCC," *The Telegraph*, February 4, 2010.

97 Jonathan Leake, "UN climate panel shamed by bogus rainforest claim," *Sunday Times* (London), January 31, 2009. It has also been revealed that the IPCC incorrectly reported that over half of the Netherlands is below sea level, and thus at grave risk from rising sea levels caused by global warming. The correct figure is one-quarter of the Dutch nation, a figure that the IPCC could easily have obtained from the Dutch government. See Richard Gray and Ben Leach, "The never-ending scandal: New list of errors in IPCC report," *Sunday Telegraph*, February 7, 2010.

98 See Jonathan Leake, "Africagate: Top British scientist says UN panel is losing credibility," *The Sunday Times* (London), February 7, 2009; Richard North, "And now for Africagate," EUReferendum, February 7, 2010; Richard North, "A wolf in sheep's clothing," EUReferendum, February 10, 2010. And yet, despite the collapsing case for imminent disaster, the United Nations has recently announced the formation of a high-level panel to design and oversee a $100-billion annual fund for financing "climate mitigation and adaptation" in poor countries, with an emphasis on rising seas, weather extremes (floods and droughts) and renewable energy.

99 A number of state governments have adopted what critics call "prefab global warming prevention advice" developed by the Center for Climate Strategies, a Washington, D.C. climate activist group that uses taxpayer and foundation funds to lobby governors to accept their proposals for sharply reducing hydrocarbon use and emissions. See Paul Chesser, "Anti-warming scam at work in NY," *New York Post*, February 9, 2010. Others have argued: "The only place where CO2 causes temperature increase is in the doctored computer models of the CRU and IPCC. People involved in Climategate also controlled key chapters of the IPCC reports, including those on atmospheric composition; paleoclimate (reconstruction of past climate); computer models; and the Summary for PolicyMakers." Timothy F. Ball, "The climate scandal has diverted attention from the climate scandal," CanadaFreePress.com, December 1, 2009.

100 Syun-Ici Akasofu, Timothy F. Ball, Ahmed Boucenna, Robert M. Carter, *et al*., Open letter to UN Secretary-General, December 8, 2009, posted at www.CopenhagenClimateChallenge.org.

NOTES

NOTES

American Legislative Exchange Council

About the American Legislative Exchange Council

The American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) is the nation's largest nonpartisan, voluntary membership organization of state legislators. ALEC is unique in welcoming the private sector as an equal partner to work together with legislators in crafting the best state policy solutions for all Americans guided by the principles of free market, limited government, individual liberty, and federalism. ALEC is classified by the Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit and public policy and educational organization.

Recent Publications

Rich States, Poor States: ALEC-Laffer State Economic Competitiveness Index
By Arthur Laffer, Stephen Moore and Jonathan Williams

Report Card on American Education: A State-By-State Analysis, 15th Edition
By Andrew T. LeFevre

2010 State Legislators' Guide to Health Insurance Solutions
By J.P. Wieske and Christie Herrera

State Factor – Consumer Product Safety for States: Understanding the Federal Role

The State Legislators Guide to Prescription Drug Policy
By Christie Herrera

State Pension Funds Fall Off a Cliff
By Dr. Barry W. Paulson and Dr. Arthur P. Hall

American Legislative Exchange Council
1101 Vermont Ave., NW, 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005

Ph: (202) 466-3800
Fax: (202) 466-3801

www.alec.org

Design by **Drop Cap Design**
www.dropcapdesign.com