

People for the West -Tucson

PO Box 86868, Tucson, AZ 85754-6868

Newsletter, June, 2008

***Information and commentary on the environment, property rights,
and multiple use of federal lands.***

We are supported by your tax deductible donations

The Assumed Authority - The IPCC Examined

by Jonathan DuHamel

The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and its "2500 scientists" are oft cited as *The Authority* on climate change science. Yet, this group is a political organization rather than a scientific one. This was signaled by Sir John Houghton, first co-chair of the IPCC and lead editor of the first three Reports, "Unless we announce disasters no one will listen."

Considering that global warming hysteria is driving the most dangerous misdirection of effort and resources in human history, it is well to look more closely at the IPCC.

Dr. Timothy Ball, Chairman of the Natural Resources Stewardship Project, and former climatology professor at the University of Winnipeg, has written a series of articles on the IPCC (CanadaFreePress.com). He contends that UN structures were designed to prove human CO2 emissions were responsible for global warming, with the political purpose of causing the demise of industrialized nations. In the following, unless otherwise noted, quotes are from Ball's articles.

"Science creates theories based on assumptions that are then tested by other scientists performing as skeptics. The structure and mandate of the IPCC was in direct contradiction to this scientific method. They set out to prove the theory rather than disprove it."

"The IPCC made sure the focus was on human caused change and CO2 as the particular culprit. They'd already biased the research by using a very narrow definition of climate change in Article 1 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, a treaty produced at that infamous 'Earth Summit' in Rio in 1992. Climate Change was defined as 'a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over considerable time periods.'" This makes the human impact the primary purpose of the research and predetermines the results. Before one can assess the impact of human CO2 emissions, one must determine the range of natural variations.

"The IPCC is a political organization and yet it is the sole basis of the claim of a scientific consensus on climate change. Consensus is neither a scientific fact nor important in science, but it is very important in politics. There are 2500 members in the IPCC divided between 600 in Working Group I (WGI), who examine the actual climate science, and 1900 in working Groups II and III who study 'Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability' and 'Mitigation of Climate Change' respectively. Of the 600 in WGI, 308 were independent reviewers, but only 32 reviewers commented on more than three chapters and only five reviewers commented on all 11 chapters of the report. They accept without question the findings of WGI and assume warming due to humans is a certainty. In a circular argument typical of so much climate politics the work of the 1900 is listed as 'proof' of human caused global warming. Through this they established the IPCC as the only credible authority thus further isolating those who raised questions."

"The manipulation and politics didn't stop there. The Technical Reports of the three Working Groups are set aside and another group prepares the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM). A few scientists prepare a first draft, which is then reviewed by governments and a second draft is produced. Then a final report is hammered out as a compromise between the scientists and the individual government representatives. It is claimed the scientists set the final summary content, but in reality governments set the form. The SPM is then released at least three months before the science report. Most of the scientists involved in the technical or science report see the Summary for the first time when it is released to the public. The time between its release to the public and the release of the Technical Report is taken up with making sure [the Technical Report] aligns with what the politicians/scientists have concluded. Here is the instruction in the IPCC procedures. 'Changes ...made after acceptance by the Working Group or the Panel shall be those necessary to ensure consistency with the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) or the Overview Chapter.'

Yes, you read that correctly. This is like an Executive writing a summary and then having employees write a report that agrees with the summary."

The IPCC's much touted "2500 scientists" are actually mostly bureaucrats rather than scientists. MIT professor Richard Lindzen, former member of the IPCC said, "It is no small matter that routine weather service functionaries from New Zealand to Tanzania are referred to as 'the world's leading climate scientists.' It should come as no surprise that they will be determinedly supportive of the process." The IPCC's emphasis was on getting people from 100 countries to pad the numbers rather than on getting qualified scientists.

Lindzen summarizes the IPCC process: "It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say; uses language that means different things to scientists and laymen; exploits public ignorance over quantitative matters; exploits what scientists can agree on while ignoring disagreements to support the global warming agenda; and exaggerates scientific accuracy and certainty and the authority of undistinguished scientists."

Ball continues: "The Wall Street Journal of June 12th 1996 contained an article by Professor Fredrik Seitz, former chairman of the American Science Academy identifying interference with the process, to raise the scare level. He pointed the finger directly at IPCC co-chair Bert Bolin. This was the first major public scandal to strike the IPCC process and occurred over the Second Assessment Report. Not surprisingly it involved changes to the Technical Report to make it accommodate the statements and sentiments of the SPM.

"In 1995, to the consternation of many and as disclosed by Seitz, Chapter 8 lead author Benjamin Santer made changes to accommodate the SPM rule that says, 'Changes ...made after acceptance by the Working Group or the Panel shall be those necessary to ensure consistency with the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) or the Overview Chapter.' What became known as the 'Chapter 8 controversy' involved the most important part of all IPCC reports, namely, the evidence for implication of a human signal. Chapter 8 didn't have specific evidence or even strong indirect evidence. The original draft submitted by Santer said, 'Finally we have come to the most difficult question of all: When will the detection and unambiguous attribution of human-induced climate change occur? In the light of the very large signal and noise uncertainties discussed in the Chapter, it is not surprising that the best answer to this question is, We do not know.' So Santer was asked to change his comment. He made the change claiming it was not a significant change: 'The *body of statistical* evidence in Chapter 8, when examined in the context of our physical understanding of the climate system, now points toward a discernible human influence on global climate.' It is a very significant change. Also notice it is statistical evidence not actual evidence, but that is a subtlety the media and most of the public would miss. Compare it with the comment in the 1990 IPCC report before the political manipulating became dominant: '...it is not possible at this time to attribute all, or even a large part, of the observed global-mean warming to (an) enhanced greenhouse effect on the basis of the observational data currently available.' The issue hadn't changed in 5 years and that is still true today, but that wasn't what was needed."

Seitz wrote in reference to the 1995 report, "I have never before witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to this IPCC report."

The IPCC's Third Assessment Report of 2001, also had its problems. This was the report which contained the now infamous "Hockey Stick Graph." That graph showed global temperatures as relatively level for 1,000 years suddenly spiking in the last half of the 20th century, a very scary scenario. It failed to show the well-documented Medieval Warm period of 1,000 years ago nor the Little Ice Age. A few years later, independent researchers showed that both the data and the computer algorithms used to construct the graph were wrong. The Hockey Stick did not appear in the Fourth Assessment report of 2007.

Again from Ball's articles:

"While the Hockey Stick was exposed and rejected, it drew attention away from a more insidious piece of 'human signal' evidence in the 2001 IPCC. This was the claim by P.D. Jones, Director of the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia, that the global average annual temperature increased $0.6^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 0.2^{\circ}\text{C}$ in some 130 years. It was claimed the increase was beyond any natural increase with the strong implication it was caused by humans. The data is simply not adequate to make this conclusion. The first problem is the huge error factor of $\pm 0.2^{\circ}\text{C}$ or 66%, which essentially makes the number meaningless. Imagine a political poll saying it was accurate plus or minus 33%. Besides, there are so many problems with the global data many consider it impossible to calculate the global temperature. Some of the problems explain why."

"There are very few records of 130 years, indeed, few over 100 years."

"The number of these stations is not representative of the world; they were even less so as you go back in history. Most stations are still concentrated in eastern North America and Western Europe as the Global Historical Climate Network shows. This was even truer as you go back in time.

Then, whole continents were excluded or at best represented by a single station. There are virtually no measurements for the oceans, the forests, deserts, mountains or Polar Regions."

"Most of the older stations are the ones most affected by the Urban Heat Island Effect. This is an artificial increase in temperatures as a city expands around a weather station. There is considerable disagreement over how much adjustment is necessary."

"There are serious questions and proven limitations of many of the stations."

"Two US authorities, the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) produced different global annual averages for the year 2007. GISS claimed it was the second warmest year on record while NOAA said it was the seventh warmest year, both ostensibly using the same data."

"In 1999, the US National Research Council Report, expressed serious concern about the data: 'Deficiencies in the accuracy, quality and continuity of the records place serious limitations on the confidence that can be placed in the research results.' In response to the report, Kevin Trenberth [head of the Climate Analysis Section at the National Center for Atmospheric Research] said, 'It's very clear we do not have a climate observing system...This may be a shock to many people who assume that we do know adequately what's going on with the climate, but we don't.' It has not improved. In fact, there are fewer global weather stations now than in 1960."

Roger Pielke Sr (of Climate Science and the University of Colorado) tested the IPCC's 2007 Report, "To evaluate the IPCC's claim to be comprehensive, we cross-compared IPCC WG1 references on near-surface air temperature trends with the peer-reviewed citations that have been given in Climate Science." Pielke et al. found, "the IPCC WG1 Chapter 3 Report clearly cherry-picked information on the robustness of the land near-surface air temperature to bolster its advocacy of a particular perspective on the role of humans within the climate system. As a result, policymakers and the public have been given a false (or at best an incomplete) assessment of the multi-decadal global average near-surface air temperature trends."

The Fourth Assessment Report published by the IPCC in May, 2007, claimed they were 90% certain that human CO2 emissions were causing unprecedented warming. That statement was based on computer models which made the following assumption: as CO2 increased, it produced more atmospheric water vapor (a much more powerful greenhouse gas) which enhanced the warming effect. The IPCC models assumed a positive feedback. However, real-world data show that increased water vapor produces a negative feedback because more water vapor produces more clouds which reflect solar radiation back into space.

Greenhouse theory holds that the tropics should provide the most sensitive location for validation of the models. According to the model, temperature trends (rate of warming, not absolute temperature) should increase by 200-300% with altitude, peaking at around 10 kilometers – a characteristic "fingerprint" for green house warming. However, the data from weather balloons and satellites show the opposite result: no increasing temperature trend with altitude. **In other words, the model-predicted "fingerprint" of anthropogenic, greenhouse warming is absent in nature.**

This point is emphasized by Dr. John Christy, Professor of Atmospheric Science and Director of the Earth System Science Center at the University of Alabama in Huntsville (and IPCC Nobel laureate). "We have seen a rise in surface temperature, but whether or not that is due to CO2 is subject to debate. However, both satellite and radiosonde measurements show that rise in tropospheric temperature has been less than half of the surface temperature rise, not more as predicted...This is important because the quantity examined here, lower tropospheric temperature, ...represents most of the bulk mass of the atmosphere, and hence the climate system. The inability of climate models to achieve consistency on this scale is a serious shortcoming and suggests projections from such models be viewed with great skepticism."

The IPCC's "science" is crumbling under the weight of real-world data, and so is its supposed consensus. The Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine announced that more than 31,000 scientists have signed a petition rejecting claims of human-caused global warming. The purpose of the Petition Project is to demonstrate that the claim of "settled science" and an overwhelming "consensus" in favor of the hypothesis of human-caused global warming and consequent climate damage is wrong. No such consensus or settled science exists. As indicated by the petition text and signatory list, a very large number of American scientists reject this hypothesis.

The Petition states simply:

We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gasses is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth. '

Tucson Regional Water Planning

The Water Resources Research Center of the University of Arizona has just published a paper entitled "Tucson Regional Water Planning Perspectives Study." This paper is essentially a compilation of interviews of various stakeholders in the Tucson region on how we should go about planning water use and ensuring we have an adequate supply into the future.

"Interest in regional water planning in Tucson and surrounding communities has been increasing. Nearly all segments of the Tucson community – from governments to citizens to private water companies – have begun to call for a more comprehensive approach to long-range water planning. Gaining understanding of similarities, as well as differences, in what different

segments of the community would like to see emerge from a regional water resource planning process led the authors to undertake this study. The study is funded by The University of Arizona Technology Research Initiative Fund (TRIF) through the Water Resources Research Center. The study concept was developed prior to the joint regional process initiated by the City of Tucson and Pima County in February 2008 and is independent of that effort."

You may read the entire study here:

http://www.ag.arizona.edu/azwater/files/final_regional_perspectives_may_16_08_4.pdf

The WRRC main website is:

<http://www.ag.arizona.edu/azwater>

An Extreme Urban Surrogate of Projected Global Warming

Reference

Shen, W., Wu, J., Grimm, N.B. and Hope, D. 2008. Effects of urbanization-induced environmental changes on ecosystem functioning in the Phoenix metropolitan region, USA. *Ecosystems* 11: 138-155.

Background

Because urban environments are affected by urban heat islands, carbon dioxide domes, and high-level nitrogen deposition, the authors say that "to some extent they portend the future of the global ecosystem," and that they "provide a unique 'natural laboratory' to study potential ecosystem responses to anthropogenic environmental changes."

What was done

Shen et al. used a version of the Patch Arid Land Simulator-Functional Types process-based ecosystem model -- originally developed for the Chihuahuan Desert but modified to represent the *Larrea tridentata*-dominated ecosystem characteristic of the Sonoran Desert within which Phoenix is located -- to investigate impacts of previously documented city-to-desert gradients of atmospheric CO₂ concentration, air temperature (TA), and nitrogen deposition (Ndep) on aboveground net primary productivity and soil organic matter.

What was learned

In response to the mean maximum rural-to-urban increases in CO₂ (160 ppm), Ndep (24 kg per ha/year) and TA (4.0EC) characteristic of Phoenix, mean aboveground net primary productivity changes of +52.5, +42.7 and -7.8 g dry matter (DM) per m²/year were obtained, respectively, from the 76.3 g DM per m²/year characteristic of desert conditions, when each of the three factors was increased individually. And when all three parameters were increased together, the increase in above ground net primary productivity was found to be even greater than the sum of the three individual results: 108 vs.

87.4 g DM per m²/year, which numbers translate to respective percentage increases of 142% vs. 115%. In the case of soil organic matter, increases of 18.5, 12.3 and 1.2 g C per m²/year were obtained for mean maximum individual increases in CO₂, Ndep and TA, respectively, while the combined increase was 30.9 g C per m²/year.

What it means

Even in a desert region as hot as Phoenix, the types of CO₂, temperature and nitrogen deposition increases predicted for the years ahead portend huge increases in indigenous ecosystem productivity and soil organic matter buildup. (CO₂Science.org). '

The Debt We Owe to Atmospheric CO₂ Enrichment

In an intriguing paper recently published in *Global Change Biology*, Cunniff et al. (2008) note that "early agriculture was characterized by sets of primary domesticates or 'founder crops' that were adopted in several independent centers of origin," all at about the same time; and they say that "this synchronicity suggests the involvement of a global trigger." Further noting that Sage (1995) saw a causal link between this development and the rise in atmospheric CO₂ concentration that followed deglaciation (a jump from about 180 to 270 ppm), they hypothesized that the aerial fertilization effect caused by the rise in CO₂ combined with its transpiration-reducing effect led to a large increase in the water use efficiencies of the world's major C₄ founder crops, and that this development was the global trigger that launched the agricultural enterprise. Consequently, as a test of this hypothesis, they designed "a controlled environment experiment using five modern day representatives of wild C₄ crop progenitors, all 'founder crops' from a variety of independent centers."

The five crops employed in their study were *Setaria viridis* (L.) P. Beauv, *Panicum miliaceum* var. *ruderales* (Kitag.), *Pennisetum violaceum* (Lam.) Rich., *Sorghum arundinaceum* (Desv.), and *Zea mays* subsp. *parviglumis* H.H. Iltis & Doebley. They were grown individually in 6-cm x 6-cm x 6-cm pots filled with a 1:1 mix of washed sand and vermiculite for 40-50 days in growth chambers maintained at atmospheric CO₂ concentrations of 180, 280 and 380 ppm, characteristic of glacial, post-glacial and modern times, respectively. This work revealed that the "increase in CO₂ from glacial to postglacial levels [180 to 280 ppm] caused a significant gain in vegetative biomass of up to 40%," together with "a reduction in the transpiration rate via decreases in stomatal conductance of ~35%," which led to "a 70% increase in water use efficiency, and a much greater productivity potential in water-limited conditions."

In discussing their results, the five researchers concluded that "these key physiological changes could have greatly enhanced the productivity of wild crop progenitors after deglaciation ...improving the productivity and survival of these wild C₄ crop progenitors in early agricultural systems." And in this regard, they note that "the lowered water requirements of C₄ crop progenitors under increased CO₂ would have been particularly beneficial in the arid climatic regions where these plants were domesticated."

For comparative purposes, the researchers had also included one C₃ species in their study -- *Hordeum spontaneum* K. Koch -- and they report that it "showed a near-doubling in biomass compared with [the] 40% increase in the C₄ species under growth treatments equivalent to the postglacial CO₂ rise."

In light of these several findings, it can be appreciated that the civilizations of the past, which could not have existed without agriculture, were largely made possible by the increase in the air's CO₂ content that accompanied deglaciation, and that the peoples of the earth today are likewise indebted to this phenomenon, as well as the additional 100 ppm of CO₂ the atmosphere has subsequently acquired.

With an eye to the future, we have long contended that the ongoing rise in the air's CO₂ content will similarly play a pivotal role in enabling us to grow the food we will need to sustain our still-expanding global population in the year 2050 without usurping all of the planet's remaining freshwater resources and much of its untapped arable land, which latter actions would likely lead to our driving most of what yet remains of "wild nature" to extinction.

Rising CO₂ has served both us and the rest of the biosphere well in the past; and it will do the same in the future ... unless we turn and fight against it.

Sherwood, Keith and Craig Idso, CO₂Science.org

References

Cunniff, J., Osborne, C.P., Ripley, B.S., Charles, M. and Jones, G. 2008. Response of wild C₄ crop progenitors to subambient CO₂ highlights a possible role in the origin of agriculture. *Global Change Biology* 14: 576-587.

Sage, R.F. 1995. Was low atmospheric CO₂ during the Pleistocene a limiting factor for the origin of agriculture? *Global Change Biology* 1: 93-106. '

Blame Washington, Not Oil Companies

By Investor's Business Daily

Energy: Senate Democrats, dragging executives from five major U.S. oil companies before them for a second day, say they're alarmed by our "failed" oil markets. What they should be is ashamed.

After all, it's mostly the fault of the Congress that we're in this mess. True, the Big 5 announced profits of \$36 billion in the first quarter, as oil breached \$100 a barrel and just kept going. This prompted nothing but contempt from Illinois Sen. Richard Durbin this week: "Where is your corporate conscience?" he asked the oil executives, forced to sit and listen.

Others concluded that this must be a market problem. "We need to get prices under control," said Sen. Herb Kohl of Wisconsin. "We can only conclude that the oil markets have failed."

Well, markets have failed. But the failure is due to Congress' refusal to let oil companies drill on federal lands, thereby cutting sharply into our supply of crude as world demand grows and prices soar both here and abroad.

Congressional ignorance of basic laws of supply and demand is at once bizarre, breathtaking and frightening. For example, the American Thinker Web site this week took note of a speech delivered by New York Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer on May 13. In it, he urged the U.S. to force Saudi Arabia to pump a million barrels a day more of oil — which Schumer claimed would slash the price of crude by \$25 a barrel.

What Schumer didn't say was that 1 million barrels is exactly the amount of extra oil the U.S. would today be pumping if President Clinton hadn't vetoed drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in 1995. Despite this, Schumer still opposes drilling in ANWR.

As for those massive oil profits, Democrats want to slap Big Oil with a "windfall profits tax*." In fact, since 2002 the U.S. oil and natural gas industry has earned about 8.1 cents per dollar of sales — exactly the same as all U.S. manufacturing, excluding autos. Not much of a windfall.

To listen to Congress, you'd think oil companies don't pay taxes. Nothing could be further from the truth. In 2006 alone, according to the American Petroleum Institute, U.S. oil companies paid some \$138 billion in taxes to the IRS — and that doesn't include special oil severance, sales and use taxes companies also had to pay.

The total effective tax rate on oil is about 40%. This compares with a top income tax rate of 35% for all corporations. If anything, Big Oil is overtaxed.

A recent study by Ernst & Young notes that the same Big 5 oil companies that Congress harshly criticized this week earned \$662 billion from 1992 to 2006. A lot of money, to be sure. But keep in mind that they invested \$765 billion over the same stretch to bring us more oil from ever smaller pieces of the Earth's surface.

We are in the midst of a major global oil-supply crunch — one that can only be broken by Congress and other governmental bodies around the world taking concrete action.

A report released by the Department of the Interior notes that most of the oil and 40% of the natural gas under public lands in the U.S. is off-limits to drilling. That's about 19 billion barrels of oil and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas.

A separate report, this one from the International Energy Agency, warned of a looming global supply crunch resulting from the failure of governments — not private oil companies — to invest more or open up their lands for exploration and development.

One of the oil business's dirty secrets is that only 6% of all reserves are controlled by investor-owned oil companies such as those demonized by Congress. The rest are controlled by governments, one way or another. And 11 of the 15 largest oil companies are government-owned. Government is the problem, not "Big Oil."

That's why this ridiculous blaming of oil companies must stop, and why the companies must be allowed to get back into the business of pumping oil. Once this happens, we'll find that the markets that ignorant and demagogic politicians called "failed" will once again turn out plentiful energy at prices people can afford.

*Congressional Democrats want to impose a "wind profits tax on oil companies. Economics 101 says that when you tax something, you get less of it. This was demonstrated from 1980 to 1986, the last time the U.S. had a windfall profits tax on oil companies. According to the Congressional Research Service, "the (windfall profits tax) reduced domestic oil production from between 320 million barrels . . . and 1,268 million barrels."

At the time, the U.S. imported about 30% of its oil; today, we import about 60%. In part, that jump in oil dependency was due to the huge tax advantage we gave foreign oil companies in the 1980s — and to the continuing advantage we give them today by refusing to let our oil companies produce more crude from our own reserves. '

Bear Politics

The listing of the Polar Bear as "threatened" by the US Department of the Interior probably ranks in sheer stupidity right up there with the banning of DDT. Following are two opinions of the listing.

Reed Hopper, Principal Attorney, Pacific Legal Foundation:

Although Secretary Kempthorne stated he was compelled to list the polar bear as a "threatened" species because of the "inflexibility" of the Endangered Species Act, the opposite is true. Rather than compel the listing of a thriving species that is already protected, the Endangered Species Act prohibits such a listing.

Although some subpopulations have declined with increasing temperatures, the species overall has grown to the largest population levels in recorded history. Additionally, due to other laws, international treaties, and strict conservation measures, the polar bear is already among the most protected species in the world. No wonder Dale Hall, Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, testified in congress that the listing would provide "very little added protection." Secretary Kempthorne echoed that opinion while announcing his listing decision. According to the Secretary, the ESA will provide no greater protections than are already afforded the polar bear under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Secretary Kempthorne also pointed out that the listing would not address the very threat he cites for the listing in the first place: "[T]he listing will not stop global climate change or prevent any sea ice from melting."

It is also telling that the Canadian government, which oversees 14 of the 19 polar bear populations, has not listed the bear as "threatened" or "endangered." As for computer models of future events, on which the Secretary rests his case, they are by definition speculative and error prone as evidenced by one model that was criticized by researchers at Wharton and Harvard for "extrapolat[ing] nearly 100 years into the future on the basis of only five years data" which itself was of "doubtful validity."

Rather than compel the listing, based on these facts, the Act prohibited the listing. The Pacific Legal Foundation is going to sue the Feds.

Ian Murray, Competitive Enterprise Institute:

The decision announced yesterday by the Secretary of the Interior, to list the polar bear as "threatened," removes all doubt that the Endangered Species Act is broken and in need of urgent repair. It is the environmental movement that must take responsibility for breaking it.

A sensible discussion of the polar bear requires acknowledging a simple fact: that the polar bear is merely a proxy for something else. The environmental pressure groups like the Center for Biological Diversity that have petitioned for the listing acknowledge that their reason for doing so is concern over global warming. The more warming, they argue, the less sea ice; the less sea ice, the fewer polar bears. So their hope was that the Endangered Species Act will give the federal government power to curtail sources of global warming -- such as your car or air conditioning system.

Secretary Dirk Kempthorne attempted to frustrate this desire by erecting regulatory barriers, like a statement from the Director of the US Geological Survey that melting ice in specific areas could not be tied to specific sources of carbon emissions. These barriers have all the legislative strength of tissue paper. It will take but a few moments of a new Administration to blow them away.

After that, the first effects of the now-sacrosanct listing will probably be felt not in Alaska, where America's polar bears range, but in any state thinking of adding a coal-fired power plant to its energy infrastructure. The Act will be used by the new government to intervene -- and by activists to litigate -- against new construction in any controversial permitting process.

Once that precedent is set, the Act would be used to stop uncontroversial, even popular permit applications. Electricity supplies would be constrained. Blackouts and brownouts would proliferate. Were you to buy a plug-in electric car a few years from now, you may well find you have no electricity to power it.

The 1930s Experiment

by Jonathan DuHamel

Our politicians, whether through ignorance or hope of political gain, want to impose caps on CO2 emissions to ward off climate change.

But we have already conducted that experiment. During the depression of the 1930s, human CO2 emissions dropped by 30%, yet temperature and atmospheric CO2 continued to increase. When the solar regime changed in about 1940, temperatures dropped, but CO2 continued to rise. Even if you believe CO2 has some effect on temperature, this experiment shows that the insignificant human contribution has absolutely no effect. '

Miscellany

Ponds found to take up carbon like world's oceans - Research led by Iowa State University limnologist, or lake scientist, John Downing finds that ponds around the globe could absorb as much carbon as the world's oceans.

Professor Downing found that constructed ponds and lakes on farmland in the United States bury carbon at a much higher rate than expected; as much as 20-50 times the rate at which trees trap carbon. In addition, ponds were found to take up carbon at a higher rate than larger lakes.

"Aquatic ecosystems play a disproportionately large role in the global carbon budget," Downing said. "Despite being overlooked in the past, it's small bodies of water that are important because they take up carbon at a high rate and there are more of them than previously thought. The combined effect is that farm ponds could be burying as much carbon as the world's oceans, each year." (Iowa State University of Science and Technology)

The Challenge

The folks over at Junkscience.com have, since last August, offered an award to anyone who could prove humans are causing global warming. They have recently increased the award to \$500,000. The challenge says specifically that \$500,000 will be awarded to the first person to prove, in a scientific manner, that humans are causing harmful global warming. The winning entry will specifically reject both of the following two hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1

Manmade emissions of greenhouse gases do not discernibly, significantly and predictably cause increases in global surface and tropospheric temperatures along with associated stratospheric cooling.

Hypothesis 2

The benefits equal or exceed the costs of any increases in global temperature caused by manmade greenhouse gas emissions between the present time and the year 2100, when all global social, economic and environmental effects are considered. See details at:

<http://ultimateglobalwarmingchallenge.com>

So far, there have been no serious entries.

Several college professors at the U of A have claimed in local newspaper articles that the evidence for human induced global warming is "overwhelming." So why haven't they entered their proof?

Is it because there is actually no proof and all that professorial pontification is just hot air derived from computer games?

Come on profs, put up or shut up. Or are you merely professors in the art of puffing?

People for the West - Tucson, Inc.

PO Box 86868

Tucson, AZ 85754-6868

520 743-9415 pfw-tucson@cox.net

President & Editor Jonathan DuHamel

Vice President Dr. John Forrester

Associate Editor Lonni Lees

CONTRIBUTIONS ARE WELCOME AND TAX DEDUCTIBLE.

pfw-tucson@cox.net

People for the West - Tucson, Inc. is an Arizona tax-exempt, 501(c)(3) corporation.

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. section 107, any copyrighted material herein is distributed without profit or payment to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only.