

The Week That Was (July 4, 2009) brought to you by SEPP

Best wishes to all on US Independence Day. The American Revolution was mainly a response to unjust and repressive taxation; there was no way to vote Parliament and George III out of office.

Quote of the Week:

"The largest corporate welfare program ever enacted in the history of the United States"

Ronald Bailey (Reason magazine), commenting on the Waxman-Markey bill

THIS WEEK

After an eventful week there've been a lot of reverberations. As the EPA is trying to defend their handling of an internal scientific critique of the Endangerment Finding, more Gore-y (pun intended) details are emerging. We don't know yet how high the "muzzling" of Drs **Alan Carlin** and **John Davidson** will reach – and whether it will involve EPA administrator **Lisa Jackson**. The most encouraging feature is CEI's call for an Open Hearing on the science relied on by EPA. Stay tuned. . .

On the Waxman-Markey bill (aka as Taxman-Malarky and Waxman-turkey), people are beginning to read the text (which most who voted for it never did). It's horribly intrusive and truly frightening. As the bill goes to the Senate committee chaired by Barbara Boxer, it will face more scrutiny and is unlikely to remain in its current form. In any case, it is unlikely to survive a vote of the full Senate.

Summary of H.R. 2454 <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h111-2454&tab=summary>
 WSJ story <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124610499176664899.html#printMode>

With Something for Everyone, Climate Bill Passed

By John M. Broder NYT <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/01/us/politics/01climate.html?th&emc=th>

The energy bill that passed in the House was loaded with hundreds of special-interest favors, as environmentalists lamented that its aims had been diminished.... it grew fat with compromises, carve-outs, concessions and out-and-out gifts intended to win the votes of wavering lawmakers and the support of powerful industries.

In a profile in the current issue of the New Yorker magazine, activist James Hansen has some choice words for any group that supports the Climate Bill tax being shoved down America's collective throat.

<http://www.climatechangefraud.com/home/33-enviro-extremists/4392-james-hansen-says-organizations-supporting-waxman-markey-bill-guilty-of-stupidity>

SEPP Science Editorial #20-2009 (7/4/09)

Geo-Engineering (Part 2)

Once one accepts that the human contribution to climate change is minimal, there is really no necessity for geo-engineering. The only exception that I can think of would be to overcome the onset of a major ice age. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to study various schemes and try to arrive at realistic cost estimates. Here we would like to look at 'air capture' of carbon dioxide as a way of ameliorating or overcoming anthropogenic CO₂ emissions.

At first glance, air capture would seem to be impractical and extremely costly. It may well be, but one needs to research the subject more closely. The general idea was first expounded by Lackner, K. S., Grimes, P., and Ziock, H. J. (2001); **Capturing carbon dioxide from air**; in *Proceedings of the First National Conference on Carbon Sequestration*, Washington, DC. A recent Ph.D. thesis at Carnegie Mellon University has produced a detailed examination of an engineering scheme to effect air capture and provided some credible cost estimates. http://wpweb2.tepper.cmu.edu/ceic/theses/JoshuaH_Stolaroff_PhD_Thesis_2006.pdf These range widely, from about \$80 to \$230 for a ton of carbon sequestered. The author expresses the hope that these costs might be reduced in practice.

One can suggest various ways of lowering the cost. Since CO₂ is globally distributed, one can place the sequestering units at the most favorable locations. These might be where winds are strong and steady, where cheap energy is available to recycle the sequestering chemical agents, and where there exist ready commercial uses for CO₂. One possibility that comes to mind is to co-locate the units with a wind-turbine installation. This combination might provide cheap power, since winds are strong and steady, but does not require great reliability in power supply.

In the next editorial we will discuss a proposal to overcome the occurrence of a future ice age. Such a glaciation is almost certain to happen relatively soon and would constitute a true disaster for most of mankind.

1. The Carbonated Congress -- WSJ

2. The EPA Silences a Climate Skeptic – Kim Strassel

3. Climate Crisis Yet Another Flagrant Con – Paul Driessen

4. No climate debate? Yes, there is – Jeff Jacoby

5. Scientists Duel with Letters on Global Warming – Cal Beisner

6. Letter to ‘Physics & Society’ – Wally Manheimer

7. Due Diligence on Global Warming Science in Australia – Bob Carter et al

8. The stimulus bill #2 -- Tom Burch

9. Garden of Piggish Delights [very long but worth reading] -- NRO

"My choice early in life was either to be a piano player in a whorehouse or a politician. And to tell the truth, there's hardly any difference." – President Harry S. Truman

NEWS YOU CAN USE

Five climate studies that don't live up to their hype. Let's hear it for Popular Mechanics!!

<http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/earth/4323558.html>

A perceptive analysis by Alan Reynolds: Fuel Standards Are Killing GM

A higher gas tax is a better way to get green cars on the road.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124649332091983175.html#mod=djemEditorialPage>

<<http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0.25197.25724257-7583.00.html>>

Brendan O'Neill, editor of *Spiked*, writes: Governments across the world are promoting green ideology and economics on the back of the recession. President Barack Obama has spoken of a "green revolution" and spending \$US150 billion to create five million "green-collar" jobs. As a result, the race is on among green-leaning businesses to snap up new government contracts and among not-so-green businesses to improve their green-industrial credentials in the hope of reaping government cash.

Yet the international evidence suggests the attempt to create green jobs will hamper economic recovery. Obama cited Spain as a country where green jobs have improved economic matters. In fact, according to a study by a professor of economics at Juan Carlos University in Madrid, for every green job created by the Spanish government in recent years, an average of 2.2 other jobs were destroyed to make way for it.

Furthermore, green jobs tend not to be permanent; in Spain, only 1 in 10 green jobs exists for a significant period.

H/t to CCNet

Brazil opposes "carbon intensity" proposals that measure emissions per dollar of GDP because these favor bigger economies and risk allowing continued increases in global emissions as economies grow.

FULL STORY at <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/feedarticle/8589174>>

Benny Peiser, CCNet EDITOR'S NOTE: *It would appear that President Obama's climate policies run the serious risk of alienating international allies in the developing world, democratic nations (such as India, Brazil, South Africa, etc) that may even turn into potential adversaries if the West's foolish strategy of green protectionism were to take hold. It would be a historical tragedy if future climate conflicts and trade wars were triggered by Western climate hysteria...*

UNDER THE BOTTOM LINE

The company whose collapse precipitated the credit crunch, Lehman Brothers, enthusiastically embraced the idea of carbon trading, which is held up by all members of the green-industrial complex as the way forward. In its 2007 report, The Business of Climate Change: Challenges and Opportunities, Lehman expressed hope that it might become a "prime brokerage for (carbon) emissions permits", meaning it aspired to make money not only from speculating in mortgages but also from trading in thin air.



1. THE CARBONATED CONGRESS.

Orszag nails it: The 'largest corporate welfare program' ever.

The Wall Street Journal, REVIEW & OUTLOOK, JULY 3, 2009

President Obama is calling the climate bill that the House passed last week an "extraordinary" achievement, and so it is. The 1,200-page wonder manages the supreme feat of being both hugely expensive while doing almost nothing to reduce carbon emissions.

The Washington press corps is playing the bill's 219-212 passage as a political triumph, even though one of five Democrats voted against it. The real story is what Speaker Nancy Pelosi, House baron Henry Waxman and the President himself had to concede to secure even that eyelash margin among the House's liberal majority. Not even Tom DeLay would have imagined the extravaganza of logrolling, vote-buying, outright corporate bribes, side deals, subsidies and policy loopholes. Every green goal, even taken on its own terms, was watered down or given up for the sake of political rents.

Begin with the supposed point of the exercise -- i.e., creating an artificial scarcity of carbon in the name of climate change. The House trimmed Mr. Obama's favored 25% reduction by 2020 to 17% in order to win over Democrats leery of imposing a huge upfront tax on their constituents; then they raised the reduction to 83% in the out-years to placate the greens. Even that 17% is not binding, since it would be largely reached with so-called offsets, through which some businesses subsidize others to make emissions reductions that probably would have happened anyway.

Even if the law works as intended, over the next decade or two real U.S. greenhouse emissions might be reduced by 2% compared to business as usual. However, consumers would still face higher prices for electric power, transportation and most goods and services as this inefficient and indirect tax flowed down the energy chain.

The sound bite is that this policy would only cost households "a postage stamp a day." But that's true only as long as the program doesn't really cut emissions. The goal here is to tell voters they'll pay nothing in order to get the cap-and-tax bureaucracy in place -- even though the whole idea is to raise prices to change American behavior. At the same time -- wink, wink -- Democrats tell the greens they can tighten the emissions vise gradually over time.

Meanwhile, Congress had to bribe every business or interest that could afford a competent lobbyist. Carbon permits are valuable, yet the House says only 28% of the allowances would be auctioned off; the rest would be given away. In March, White House budget director Peter Orszag told Congress that "If you didn't auction the permit, it would represent the largest corporate welfare program that has ever been enacted in the history of the United States."

Naturally, Democrats did exactly that. To avoid windfall profits, they then chose to control prices, asking state regulators to require utilities to use the free permits to insulate ratepayers from price increases. (This also obviates the antarbon incentives, but never mind.) Auctions would reduce political favoritism

and interference, as well as provide revenue to cut taxes to offset higher energy costs. But auctions don't buy votes.

Then there was the peace treaty signed with Agriculture Chairman Colin Peterson, which banned the EPA from studying the carbon produced by corn ethanol and transferred farm emissions to the Ag Department, which mainly exists to defend farm subsidies. Not to mention the 310-page trade amendment that was introduced at 3:09 a.m. When Congress voted on the bill later that day, the House clerk didn't even have an official copy.

The revisions were demanded by coal-dependent Rust Belt Democrats to require tariffs on goods from countries that don't also reduce their emissions. Democrats were thus admitting that the critics are right that this new energy tax would send U.S. jobs overseas. But instead of voting no, their price for voting yes is to impose another tax on imports from China and India, among others. So a Smoot-Hawley green tariff is now official Democratic policy.

Mr. Obama's lobbyists first acquiesced to this tariff change to get the bill passed. Afterwards, the President said he disliked "sending any protectionist signals" amid a world recession, but he refused to say whether this protectionism was enough to veto the bill. Then in a Saturday victory lap, he talked about green jobs and a new clean-energy economy, but he made no reference to cap and trade -- no doubt because he knows that energy taxes are unpopular and that the bill faces an even tougher slog in the Senate.

Mr. Obama wants something tangible to take to the U.N. climate confab in Denmark in December, but the more important issue is what this exercise says about his approach to governance. The President seems to believe that the Carter and Clinton Presidencies failed by fighting too much with Democrats in Congress. So his solution is to abdicate his agenda to Congress -- first the stimulus, now cap and trade, and soon health care. We wish he had told us he was running to be Prime Minister.

2. THE EPA SILENCES A CLIMATE SKEPTIC

The professional penalty for offering a contrary view to elites like Al Gore is a smear campaign.

By KIMBERLEY A. STRASSEL, WSJ

Wherever Jim Hansen is right now -- whatever speech the "censored" NASA scientist is giving -- perhaps he'll find time to mention the plight of Alan Carlin. Though don't count on it.

Mr. Hansen, as everyone in this solar system knows, is the director of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies. Starting in 2004, he launched a campaign against the Bush administration, claiming it was censoring his global-warming thoughts and fiddling with the science. It was all a bit of a hoot, given Mr. Hansen was already a world-famous devotee of the theory of man-made global warming, a reputation earned with some 1,400 speeches he'd given, many while working for Mr. Bush. But it gave Democrats a fun talking point, one the Obama team later picked up.

So much so that one of President Barack Obama's first acts was a memo to agencies demanding new transparency in government, and science. The nominee to head the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Lisa Jackson, joined in, exclaiming, "As administrator, I will ensure EPA's efforts to address the environmental crises of today are rooted in three fundamental values: science-based policies and program, adherence to the rule of law, and overwhelming transparency." In case anyone missed the point, Mr. Obama took another shot at his predecessors in April, vowing that "the days of science taking a backseat to ideology are over."

Except, that is, when it comes to Mr. Carlin, a senior analyst in the EPA's National Center for Environmental Economics and a 35-year veteran of the agency. In March, the Obama EPA prepared to engage the global-warming debate in an astounding new way, by issuing an "endangerment" finding on carbon. It establishes that carbon is a pollutant, and thereby gives the EPA the authority to regulate it -- even if Congress doesn't act.

Around this time, Mr. Carlin and a colleague presented a 98-page analysis arguing the agency should take another look, as the science behind man-made global warming is inconclusive at best. The analysis noted that global temperatures were on a downward trend. It pointed out problems with climate models. It highlighted new research that contradicts apocalyptic scenarios. "We believe our concerns and reservations are sufficiently important to warrant a serious review of the science by EPA," the report read.

The response to Mr. Carlin was an email from his boss, Al McGartland, forbidding him from "any direct communication" with anyone outside of his office with regard to his analysis. When Mr. Carlin tried again to disseminate his analysis, Mr. McGartland decreed: "The administrator and the administration have decided to move forward on endangerment, and your comments do not help the legal or policy case for this

decision. . . . I can only see one impact of your comments given where we are in the process, and that would be a very negative impact on our office."

Mr. McGartland blasted yet another email: "With the endangerment finding nearly final, you need to move on to other issues and subjects. I don't want you to spend any additional EPA time on climate change. No papers, no research etc, at least until we see what EPA is going to do with Climate." Ideology? Nope, not here. Just us science folk. Honest.

The emails were unearthed by the *Competitive Enterprise Institute*. Republican officials are calling for an investigation; House Energy Committee ranking member Joe Barton sent a letter with pointed questions to Mrs. Jackson, which she's yet to answer. The EPA has issued defensive statements, claiming Mr. Carlin wasn't ignored. But there is no getting around that the Obama administration has flouted its own promises of transparency.

The Bush administration's great sin, for the record, was daring to issue reports that laid out the administration's official position on global warming. That the reports did not contain the most doomsday predictions led to howls that the Bush politicals were suppressing and ignoring career scientists.

The Carlin dustup falls into a murkier category. Unlike annual reports, the Obama EPA's endangerment finding is a policy act. As such, EPA is required to make public those agency documents that pertain to the decision, to allow for public comment. Court rulings say rulemaking records must include both "the evidence relied upon and the evidence discarded." In refusing to allow Mr. Carlin's study to be circulated, the agency essentially hid it from the docket.

Unable to defend the EPA's actions, the climate-change crew -- led by anonymous EPA officials -- is doing what it does best: trashing Mr. Carlin as a "denier." He is, we are told, "only" an economist (he in fact holds a degree in physics from CalTech). It wasn't his "job" to look at this issue (he in fact works in an office tasked with "informing important policy decisions with sound economics and other sciences.") His study was full of sham science. (The majority of it in fact references peer-reviewed studies.) Where's Mr. Hansen and his defense of scientific freedom when you really need him?

Mr. Carlin is instead an explanation for why the science debate is little reported in this country. The professional penalty for offering a contrary view to elites like Al Gore is a smear campaign. The global-warming crowd likes to deride skeptics as the equivalent of the Catholic Church refusing to accept the Copernican theory. The irony is that, today, it is those who dare critique the new religion of human-induced climate change who face the Inquisition.

3. CLIMATE CRISIS YET ANOTHER FLAGRANT CON

By PAUL DRIESSEN, Investors Business Daily, June 30, 2009

<http://www.ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=331253421781662#>

A 1,500-page bill to tax, regulate and penalize all U.S. hydrocarbon energy use to "save the planet" from climate Armageddon has passed the House 219-212 despite the fact that not one member read it. The Senate promises an August vote.

But average global temperatures peaked in 1998 and since have fallen slightly, even as carbon dioxide levels continued climbing. Thousands of scientists say CO₂ has little effect on planetary temperatures, and there is no climate crisis. The legislation would cost millions of jobs and trillions of dollars, for a hypothetical 0.1 degree F reduction in global temperatures.

The administration responded to these inconvenient truths by issuing another "report" by government scientists carefully selected to include only climate crisis believers. It then hired an activist media firm that specializes in environmental campaigns, to hype meaningless computer-generated Hollywood disaster scenarios:

Catastrophic sea levels, floods in lower Manhattan, California beaches permanently submerged. Ferocious hurricanes. Droughts. Food shortages, epidemic diseases, a quadrupling of heat-wave deaths. Aged sewer systems convulsing from massive storm runoff. Polar bears disappearing from the Arctic. It may be the most flagrant attempted con job in U.S. history.

If successful, Congress, activists, courts and bureaucrats will gain control over almost every aspect of American life. Government will confiscate hard-earned dollars, convert them to payoffs for activists and

companies that get on the climate-crisis bandwagon, consign uncooperative companies to oblivion, impose eco-tariffs on imports, restrict access to energy, and inflict soaring costs on families, industry and transportation.

The sham "report" conflates and confuses human activities and emissions with powerful natural forces that have caused major and minor climate changes and weather anomalies since the dawn of time. It relies on conjecture, conformist thinking and conspicuous elimination of contrary, skeptical, realist scientists and studies that do not support climate cataclysm conjecture.

The authors "largely ignored" critical comments to earlier drafts and made the final version "even more alarmist," says Joseph D'Aleo, first director of meteorology at the Weather Channel and ex-chairman of the American Meteorological Society's Weather Analysis and Forecasting Committee.

The report "misrepresents my own work," says University of Colorado environmental studies professor Roger Pielke, Jr. It makes claims that aren't supported by citations provided, relies on analyses that were never peer reviewed, ignores peer-reviewed studies that reach opposite conclusions from those proclaimed by the report, and cites papers that don't support conclusions.

The report also relies heavily on surface temperature data from monitoring stations located next to parking lots and air conditioning exhaust ports — falsely skewing temperature records upward. It relies on long chains of assumptions and speculation, but provides little supporting evidence.

An even more egregious miscarriage of science is its reliance on worst-case scenarios conjured up by computer models. These climate models have never been validated by actual observations, notes Prof. Robert Carter of the Marine Geophysical Laboratory at Australia's James Cook University. "Modeling results are interesting — but worthless for setting public policy," Carter says. But that's exactly how they're used.

Sure, it's conceivable that Antarctica could melt, causing sea levels to rise 20 feet, as Al Gore and the government con-artists suggest. Greenhouse gases would merely have to increase average annual Antarctic temperatures from —50 F today to +40 F for a few centuries to melt 200,000 cubic miles of South Pole icecaps. That may be as likely as having the planet overrun by T-rexes cloned from DNA in fossilized mosquitoes. But it's conceivable. And in the realm of global warming politics, that's all that matters.

As one activist group put it: "The task . . . is not to persuade by rational argument." It is "to work in a more shrewd and contemporary way, using subtle techniques of engagement. The 'facts' need to be treated as being so taken-for-granted that they need not be spoken." The strategy is to treat "climate-friendly activity as a brand that can be sold. This is the route to mass behavior change."

If the congressional, administration and activist conspirators behind this deceit were in the private sector — peddling bogus drugs, rather than bogus science — they'd be convicted of fraud. Instead, they'll probably get bonus checks. It's time to tell Congress: No more con jobs and tax hikes.

Driessen is senior policy adviser for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and Congress of Racial Equality.

4. NO CLIMATE DEBATE? YES, THERE IS

by Jeff Jacoby The Boston Globe July 1, 2009

<http://www.jeffjacobys.com/5782/no-climate-debate-yes-there-is>

IN HIS weekly address on Saturday, President Obama saluted the House of Representatives for passing Waxman-Markey, the gargantuan energy-rationing bill that would amount to the largest tax increase in the nation's history. It would do so by making virtually everything that depends on energy -- which is virtually everything -- more expensive.

The president didn't describe the legislation in those terms on Saturday, but he made no bones about it last year. In an interview with the San Francisco Chronicle in January 2008, he calmly explained how cap-and-trade -- the carbon-dioxide rationing scheme that is at the heart of Waxman-Markey -- would work:

"Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket . . . because I'm capping greenhouse gases, coal power plants, natural gas, you name it. . . . Whatever the plants were, whatever the industry was, they would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money, and they will pass that [cost] on to consumers."

In the same interview, Obama suggested that his energy policy would require the ruin of the coal industry. "If somebody wants to build a coal-fired plant, they can," he told the Chronicle. "It's just that it will bankrupt them, because they are going to be charged a huge sum for all that greenhouse gas that's being emitted."

The justification for inflicting all this financial misery, of course, is the onrushing catastrophe of human-induced global warming -- a catastrophe that can be prevented only if we abandon the carbon-based fuels on which most of the prosperity and productivity of modern life depend. But what if that looming catastrophe isn't real? What if climate change has little or nothing to do with human activity? What if enacting cap-and-trade means incurring excruciating costs in exchange for infinitesimal benefits?

Hush, says Obama. Don't ask such questions. And don't listen to anyone who does. "There is no longer a debate about whether carbon pollution is placing our planet in jeopardy," he declared in his Saturday remarks. "It's happening."

No debate? The president, like Humphrey Bogart, must have been misinformed. The debate over global warming is more robust than it has been in years, and not only in America. "In April, the Polish Academy of Sciences published a document challenging man-made global warming," Kimberly Strassel noted in The Wall Street Journal the other day. "In France, President Nicolas Sarkozy wants to tap Claude Allegre to lead the country's new ministry of industry and innovation. Twenty years ago Allegre was among the first to trill about man-made global warming, but the geochemist has since recanted. . . . Norway's Ivar Gjaever, Nobel Prize winner for physics, decries it as the 'new religion.'"

Closer to home, the noted physicist Hal Lewis (emeritus at the University of California, Santa Barbara) emails me a copy of a statement he and several fellow scientists, including physicists Will Happer and Robert Austin of Princeton, Laurence Gould of the University of Hartford, and climate scientist Richard Lindzen of MIT, have sent to Congress. "The sky is not falling," they write. Far from warming, "the Earth has been cooling for 10 years" -- a trend that "was not predicted by the alarmists' computer models."

Fortune magazine recently profiled veteran climatologist John Christy, a lead author of the 2001 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report and co-author of the American Geophysical Union's 2003 statement on climate change. With his green credentials, Fortune observed, Christy is the warm-mongers' "worst nightmare -- an accomplished climate scientist with no ties to Big Oil who has produced reams and reams of data that undermine arguments that the earth's atmosphere is warming at an unusual rate and question whether the remedies being talked about in Congress will actually do any good."

No one who cares about the environment or the nation's economic well-being should take it on faith that climate change is a crisis, or that drastic changes to the economy are essential to "save the planet." Hundreds of scientists reject the alarmist narrative. For non-experts, a steadily-widening shelf of excellent books surveys the data in laymen's terms and exposes the weaknesses in the doomsday scenario -- among others, Climate Confusion by Roy W. Spencer, Climate of Fear by Thomas Gale Moore, Taken by Storm, by Christopher Essex and Ross McKittrick, and Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years, by S. Fred Singer and Dennis Avery.

If the case for a war on carbon dioxide were unassailable, no one would have to warn against debating it. The 212 House members who voted against Waxman-Markey last week plainly don't believe the matter is settled. They're right.

5. SCIENTISTS DUEL WITH LETTERS ON GLOBAL WARMING

E. Calvin Beisner, National Spokesman, Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation, July 1, 2009

On June 19, the Woods Hole Research Center released an [open letter](#) from scientists to the President and

members of Congress calling for "strong leadership" to avert "a rapidly developing global climatic catastrophe." The letter called for passage of the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill then pending in the House, now passed and moving to the Senate.

But on July 1 another group of scientists released [a letter in direct response](#), questioning the independence of the Woods Hole group because of ties with presidential science advisor John Holdren, "the same science advisor who has given us predictions of 'almost certain' thermonuclear war or eco-catastrophe by the year 2000, and many other forecasts of doom that somehow never seem to arrive on time."

Signed by physics professors Robert Austin and William Happer of Princeton, Laurence Gould of the U of Hartford, Harold Lewis of the University of California, Santa Barbara, meteorology professor Richard Lindzen of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and U of VA environmental sciences professor and atmospheric physicist Fred Singer, the [letter](#) adds:

- Earth has been cooling for ten years;
- the present cooling was not predicted by the alarmists' computer models;
- legislation supported by the Woods Hole Letter "would cripple the US economy, putting us at a disadvantage compared to our competitors."

"For such drastic action," it continued, "it is only prudent to demand genuine proof that it is needed, not guesswork, and not false claims" that the evidence is clear and the debate is over.

The new letter concluded by warning, "Finally, climate alarmism pays well. Many alarmists are profiting from their activism. There are billions of dollars floating around for the taking, and being taken."

<http://climatedepot.com/a/1745/Scientists-Write-Open-Letter-to-Congress-You-Are-Being-Deceived-About-Global-Warming--Earth-has-been-cooling-for-ten-years>

Scientists Write Open Letter to Congress: 'You Are Being Deceived About Global Warming' -- 'Earth has been cooling for ten years' '*Present cooling was NOT predicted by the alarmists' computer models, and has come as an embarrassment to them*'

6. LETTER TO 'PHYSICS & SOCIETY' (AMERICAN PHYSICAL SOCIETY) July 2009

<http://www.aps.org/units/fps/newsletters/200907/letters.cfm>

In the January 2009 edition of *Physics & Society*, Robert Levine wrote a thoughtful letter objecting to the statement on climate change adopted by the APS Council on November 18, 2007. As an APS member I also strongly object to this statement. It is written below:

Emissions of greenhouse gases from human activities are changing the atmosphere in ways that affect the Earth's climate. Greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide as well as methane, nitrous oxide and other gases. They are emitted from fossil fuel combustion and a range of industrial and agricultural processes.

The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring. If no mitigating actions are taken, significant disruptions in the Earth's physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases beginning now.

Because the complexity of the climate makes accurate prediction difficult, the APS urges an enhanced effort to understand the effects of human activity on the Earth's climate, and to provide the technological options for meeting the climate challenge in the near and longer terms. The APS also urges governments, universities, national laboratories and its membership to support policies and actions that will reduce the emission of greenhouse gases.

It is mostly the second paragraph that I object to. Certainly for the past ten years, the assertion is demonstrably false; the earth's average temperature has remained about constant after a 30-year period during which the average temperature increased by about three quarters of a degree Fahrenheit. Secondly, the disruptions APS considers 'likely' are based almost entirely on models, simulations, and speculations, but are nearly devoid of any experimental justification. Can the APS really point to any existing trend, occurring today, which extrapolates to the sort of doom and gloom the second paragraph implies? The population of polar bears is increasing. Glaciers have been receding for at least the past 200 years. Ice in Greenland and the Antarctic is melting in some places and thickening in others. Humans are getting healthier, lifespan is increasing, and social systems persist (at least in the democracies). In fact, over the millennia of human civilization, warm periods have been beneficial, cold periods, harmful. Shouldn't we physicists consider today's empirical evidence as well as projections?

The paragraph then goes on to say "we must reduce the emission of greenhouse gases beginning now." Does the APS seriously believe that we can just give up carbon the way a smoker can just give up cigarettes? Civilization takes energy and lots of it. Right now, we get 85% of our energy from carbon-based sources. What does the APS propose to replace it with: solar panels, windmills, nuclear reactors? Can it make the case that this is scientifically and technically possible? Unquestionably, to eliminate carbon fuels and not replace them with equivalent energy is to end civilization as we know it. The APS statement completely ignores this vital truth.

As a middle ground between the APS statement and other statements that deny manmade contributions to global warming and climate change, I propose this statement:

The issue of increased CO₂ in the atmosphere and its effect on climate is an issue of increasing concern. A great deal of this CO₂ comes from energy production. As physicists we realize that 85% of the world's energy comes from carbon-based fuel. We recognize that there is no economical substitute for this fuel on the scale required, and most likely will not be one for decades. While the APS certainly advocates conservation and improved efficiency, we recognize that as the world develops, it will need more energy, not less. We recognize the inextricable link between affordable energy and human well-being, good health, education and a clean environment. Finally we recognize that eliminating carbon-based fuel before a replacement fuel is ready on the required scale, at about the same price, constitutes at least as grave a threat to human civilization as global warming.

As physicists we understand the greenhouse effect. However, we also know that the earth's climate is extremely complicated and there is much more to it than the greenhouse effect. Other scientists understand this better than we do. The American Meteorological Society has come out with two statements of concern, in 2003 and 2007. Each statement emphasizes risks of increasing CO₂ accumulation in the atmosphere, but each also mentions that there are great uncertainties. Each points out that much more is needed in theory, simulation and measurement. The 2007 statement even mentions that there could be benefits to global warming, and points out that while ice is melting in some parts of Greenland and Antarctica, it is thickening in other parts.

In 2005 the presidents of the Academies of Science of 11 countries jointly signed a letter expressing concern over CO₂ accumulation in the atmosphere and global warming. However, they emphasized adaptation as well as prevention. Also, unlike the more dire predictions, they foresee a sea level rise of 10-90 cm during the 21st century.

As regards the science of global warming, APS supports the 2003 and 2007 statements of the American Meteorological Society and the statement of the 11 academy presidents.

I hope that Robert Levine's letter, and this letter stimulate much-needed discussion in the APS as to what our appropriate role in this issue should be. Most of all, I hope the APS puts out a new statement more scientifically defensible and more balanced in its conclusions and recommendations.

Wallace Manheimer (retired from U.S. Naval Research laboratory)

7. DUE DILIGENCE ON GLOBAL WARMING SCIENCE IN AUSTRALIA

By Prof. Bob Carter, David Evans, Stewart Franks, Bill Kininmonth

You will have heard on the news over the last 3 weeks of the activities of Senator Steve Fielding in Australia. He is an independent cross-bench senator who holds a casting vote over the passage of the Australian ETS (Emission Trading Scheme, termed the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme).

After attending the Heartland-3 climate conference in Washington in early June this year, he returned to Australia and asked Climate Minister Penny Wong three simple questions about climate change. The Minister replied, first in a meeting at which her Chief Scientist (Penny Sackett) and departmental science adviser (Will Steffen) presented a briefing paper, and secondly in writing.

Senator Fielding then asked his advisory scientists Bob Carter, David Evans, Stewart Franks and Bill Kininmonth to perform an audit of the Minister's replies to his questions. Copies of Senator Fielding's original questions, Minister Wong's written reply, and other papers relevant to the matter are available for download from: <<http://joannenova.com.au/global-warming/the-wong-fielding-meeting-on-global-warming-documents/>>

And Senator Fielding's summary of the results of his discussions with Minister Wong can be found here: http://www.stevefielding.com.au/climate_change/.

The Due Diligence Paper has been released publicly by Senator Fielding's office today (July 3). It shows, first, that the Minister and her Department have largely been unable to answer the questions that they were asked. And, second, that the Australian Department of Climate Change has little capacity to assess the science of global warming in an expert, knowledgeable and independent way.

We believe that this is the first time recently that a member of a western parliament has released a public document that makes an independent science assessment of the danger of human-caused global warming (as promulgated by the IPCC), thereby demonstrating (i) the lack of empirical evidence that carbon dioxide emissions are damaging to the environment, and (ii) that ETS are unnecessary.

However, though raising the issue in parliamentary context may be new, our general conclusions are most certainly not. For many other qualified scientists have reached them too; for example, the two independent assessments that have been provided recently by Craig Idso and Fred Singer (NIPCC) <http://www.nipccreport.org/>, and Alan Carlin (EPA): <<http://cei.org/news-release/2009/06/25/cei-releases-global-warming-study-censored-epa>>

Given the large costs and the industrial and social disruption that established ETS are already causing - for example in Europe -- and which will be added to greatly should similar bills pass parliament in Canada, Australia, N.Z., USA and elsewhere -- we ask for your help in giving our Due Diligence document wide promulgation.

The major conclusions of the science audit team were:

- Global temperatures have remained steady since 1998, despite a 5% increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide
- No strong evidence exists that human carbon dioxide emissions are causing, or are likely to cause, dangerous warming on top of natural trends
- No scientific consensus exists

"The '*Independent Due Diligence Report*' highlights a number questions which needed to be answered before Australia should think about voting on an emission trading scheme," Senator Fielding said.

The full '*Independent Due Diligence Report*' can be seen at http://www.stevefielding.com.au/climate_change/

Due Diligence on Minister Wong's Climate Answers

Prof. Bob Carter, David Evans, Stewart Franks & Bill Kininmonth

Minister Wong's responses to Senator Fielding's climate questions have provided the opportunity for an independent audit of Australia's scientific justification for proceeding with emissions trading legislation.

Time constraints necessitated that our audit be selective. Nonetheless, we provide in the attached report a preliminary due diligence assessment of the Minister's response, and therefore of the IPCC advice upon which the government has shaped its climate legislation.

Senator Fielding's summary of the results of his discussions with Minister Wong can be found here: http://www.stevefielding.com.au/climate_change/. And a full set of relevant documents are posted here: <http://joannenova.com.au/global-warming/the-wong-fielding-meeting-on-global-warming-documents/>.

Our conclusion is that, in responding to the questions posed by Senator Fielding, the Minister has failed to provide any evidence that human carbon dioxide emissions are causing dangerous global warming.

Beyond that, it is evident that the whole IPCC case for dangerous warming is irredeemably flawed, because it rests on speculative computer modelling and lacks empirical support in fundamental areas.

We recommend, therefore, that a commission of enquiry be convened in Australia to hear the arguments for and against a dangerous human influence on climate in a strictly evidence-based setting.

Our conclusions regarding a lack of evidence for dangerous human-caused warming are similar to those contained in two other recent, independent reviews: (i) the comprehensive report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), and (ii) an internal audit report by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). These documents can be accessed at:

<http://www.nipccreport.org/>

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/06/27/released-the-censored-epa-document-final-report>

Our conclusions are:

- (i) *that whilst recent increases in greenhouse gases play a minor radiative role in global climate, no strong evidence exists that human carbon dioxide emissions are causing, or are likely to cause, dangerous global warming;*
- (ii) *that it is unwise for government environmental policy to be set based upon monopoly advice, and especially so when that monopoly is represented by an international political (not scientific) agency; and*
- (iii) *that the results of implementing emissions trading legislation will be so costly, troublingly regressive, socially divisive and environmentally ineffective that Parliament should defer consideration of the CPRS bill and institute a fully independent Royal Commission of enquiry into the evidence for and against a dangerous human influence on climate.*

We add, with respect to (iii), that the scientific community is now so polarised on the controversial issue of dangerous global warming that proper due diligence on the matter can only be achieved where competent scientific witnesses are cross-examined under oath and under strict rules of evidence.

8. THE STIMULUS BILL #2:

Rep. Kaptur gets \$3.5 billion sweetener in climate bill

By Tom Burch <thomasburch@comcast.net>

When House Democratic leaders were rounding up votes Friday for the massive climate-change bill, they paid special attention to their colleagues from Ohio who remained stubbornly undecided. They finally secured the vote of one Ohioan, veteran Democratic Rep. Marcy Kaptur of Toledo, the old-fashioned way. They gave her what she wanted - a new federal power authority, similar to Washington state's Bonneville Power Administration, stocked with up to \$3.5 billion in taxpayer money available for lending to renewable energy and economic development projects in Ohio and other Midwestern states.

House Energy and Commerce Chairman Henry A. Waxman, California Democrat, included the Kaptur project in a 310-page amendment to the legislation unveiled at 3 a.m. Friday, just hours before the bill was to be debated on the House floor.

Miss Kaptur trumpeted her handiwork on her congressional Web site. She said the new federal authority would bring new economic development to Ohio and the struggling Great Lakes region. "When she saw this coming down the pike, she saw an opportunity to attach something she's kicked around for a long time," Mr. Fought said. The inclusion of the program in the legislation, he added, "made it possible for her to entertain voting for the bill."

In other words, a law is GOOD and should be supported - as long as others pay the penalties that go hand-in-hand with punitive-type laws and as long as others, not you or your constituents, bear the brunt of

the cost of oppressive laws that undermine the overall national economy.

Ladies and gentlemen, I give you our next Nobel Prize winner. What citizenship!!!

Civics Lesson: Course Instruction, Discussion and Problem:

A - 2008 US population: 304,000,000

B - Cost of buying vote of Rep Marcy Kaptur (D-Ohio) for support of cap-and-trade bill:
\$3,500,000,000

C - Payer Agent: Barack Obama, Nancy Pelosi

D - Payer: 59% of those US taxpayers who actually do pay taxes

E -- American taxpayers (including those of family units) actually paying into the US Tax System and
supporting Federal expenditures = 183,000,000

F Cost of buying the vote of Rep Kaptur to support cap-and-trade bill to a 4-person, taxpaying American
family = \$76

Discussion of W-M

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/community/groups/index.html?plckForumPage=ForumDiscussion&plckDiscussionId=Cat%3aa70e3396-6663-4a8d-ba19-e44939d3c44fForum%3a5543a34c-af92-4736-b81b-4aad0ab02e2eDiscussion%3a30250043-99ed-48a0-b24c-2449bd204893>

Enron's Ken Lay would have been proud of Waxman-Markey: by Rob Bradley

<http://masterresource.org/?p=3479>

W-M bill will hit the poor. An important analysis in Roll Call (July 1) by Robert Zubrin

<http://www.rollcall.com/news/36393-1.html>

9. GARDEN OF PIGGISH DELIGHTS:

Waxman-Markey is part power-grab, part enviro-fantasy. Here are 50 reasons to stop it.

<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=YTc1MmVhMGYxY2UzNzAwMTJlODBjZig2NDJjNmM2MWE=>

By Stephen Spruiell & Kevin Williamson, National Review Online, July 02, 2009.

The stimulus bill was the legislative equivalent of the famous cantina scene from Star Wars, an eye-popping collection of the freakish and exotic, gathered for dubious purposes. The Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill, known as ACES (the American Clean Energy and Security Act), is more like the third panel in Hieronymus Bosch's Garden of Earthly Delights — a hellscape that disturbs the sleep of anybody who contemplates it carefully.

Two main things to understand about Waxman-Markey: First, it will not reduce greenhouse-gas emissions, at least not at any point in the near future. The inclusion of carbon offsets, which can be manufactured out of thin air and political imagination, will eliminate most of the demands that the legislation puts on industry, though in doing so it will manage to drive up the prices consumers pay for every product that requires energy for its manufacture — which is to say, for everything. Second, it represents a worse abuse of the public trust and purse than the stimulus and the bailouts put together. Waxman-Markey creates a permanent new regime in which environmental romanticism and corporate welfare are mixed together to form political poison. From comic bureaucratic power grabs (check out the section of the bill on candelabras) to the creation of new welfare programs for Democratic constituencies to, above all, massive giveaways for every financial, industrial, and political lobby imaginable, this bill would permanently deform American politics and economic life.

The House of Representatives, famously, did not read this bill before passing it, which is testament to either Nancy Pelosi's managerial incompetency or her political wile, or possibly both. If you take the time to read the legislation, you'll discover four major themes: special-interest giveaways, regulatory mandates unrelated to climate change, fanciful technological programs worthy of The Jetsons, and assorted left-wing wish fulfillment. We cannot cover every swirl and brushstroke of this masterpiece of misgovernance, but here's a breakdown of its 50 most outrageous features.

SPECIAL-INTEREST SOPS

1. The big doozy: Eighty-five percent of the carbon permits will not be sold at auction — they will be given away to utility companies, petroleum interests, refineries, and a coterie of politically connected businesses. If you're wondering why Big Business supports cap-and-trade, that's why. Free money for business, but higher energy prices for you.

2. The sale of carbon permits will enrich the Wall Street investment bankers whose money put Obama in the White House. Top of the list: Goldman Sachs, which is invested in carbon-offset development and carbon permissions. CNN reports:

Less than two weeks after the investment bank announced it would be laying off 10 percent of its staff, ***Goldman Sachs confirmed that it has taken a minority stake in Utah-based carbon offset project developer Blue Source LLC. . . . “Interest in the pre-compliance carbon market in the U.S. is growing rapidly,” said Leslie Biddle, Head of Commodity Sales at Goldman, “and we are excited to be able to offer our clients immediate access to a diverse selection of emission reductions to manage their carbon risk.”

3. With its rich menu of corporate subsidies and special set-asides for politically connected industries, Waxman-Markey has inspired a new corporate interest group, USCAP, the United States Climate Action Partnership — the group largely responsible for the fact that carbon permits are being given away like candy at Christmas rather than auctioned. And who is lined up to receive a piece of the massive wealth transfer that Waxman-Markey will mandate? Canada Free Press lists:

Alcoa, American International Group (AIG) which withdrew after accepting government bailout money, Boston Scientific Corporation, BP America Inc., Caterpillar Inc., Chrysler LLC (which continues to lobby with taxpayer dollars), ConocoPhillips, Deere & Company, The Dow Chemical Company, Duke Energy,

DuPont, Environmental Defense, Exelon Corporation, Ford Motor Company, FPL Group, Inc., General Electric, General Motors Corp. (now owned by the Obama administration), Johnson & Johnson, Marsh, Inc., National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, The Nature Conservancy, NRG Energy, Inc., Pepsico, Pew Center on Global Climate Change, PG&E Corporation, PNM Resources, Rio Tinto, Shell, Siemens Corporation, World Resources Institute, Xerox Corporation.

One major group of recipients of the free money being given to industry in the form of carbon permits are the electric utilities, represented in Washington by the Edison Electric Institute. Along with the coal and steel businesses, the utilities are positioned to receive a huge portion of the carbon permits — some of which will be disguised as measures for consumers — and have become one of the nation's highest-spending lobbies, working to ensure that their interests are served by cap-and-trade.

4. To the extent that the allowances actually generate government revenue, that money is going to be used for fraud-inviting projects of dubious environmental or economic value. Example: Some allowance money will be used to "build capacity to reduce deforestation in developing countries experiencing deforestation, including preparing developing countries to participate in international markets for international offset credits for reduced emissions from deforestation." What are the chances of that being abused?

5. In addition to the permits, the bill also allows for the creation of "offsets" — the medieval-style indulgences of the carbon-footprint world. In fact, nearly all of Waxman-Markey's carbon-reduction targets can be met with offsets alone through 2050, meaning decades before any actual reduction of greenhouse gases is required. That means huge new expenses for small businesses and consumers in return for basically zero environmental improvement. And how does one earn an offset to sell? Get a farm and cash in through such methods as, and we quote, "improved manure management," "reduced tillage/no-tillage," or "afforestation of marginal farmlands." Translation: Plant some trees around the house and claim some extra credits on the land the government may already be paying you not to farm. And do a better job of handling your B.S." but you'll never do as good a job on that one as the authors of Waxman-Markey.

6. Because the cap-and-trade regime will disadvantage domestic refineries vis-À-vis foreign competitors, such as India's powerhouse Reliance Industries, Waxman-Markey is attempting to buy them off with free permits — 2 percent of the national total will go to domestic refineries, at no cost.

7. Agribusiness is exempted from cap-and-trade controls, but the farm lobby will be given permits to sell and to profit from anyway. All carrot, no stick — precisely what this powerful industry lobby is accustomed to receiving from Washington.

8. Waxman-Markey strips the EPA of its oversight role when it comes to managing the offsets associated with American farms. At the behest of Cargill and other big players in the farm lobby, oversight will be entrusted to the USDA — basically a wholly owned subsidiary of the agriculture cartel, one of America's most rapacious special-interest groups, which already is stuffed with subsidies and sops.

9. Waxman-Markey directs the EPA to ignore the real environmental impact of ethanol and other biofuels. The gigantic subsidies lavished on the farm lobby through the ethanol program encourage farmers to clear forest land to plant corn — a net environmental loss that the use of ethanol does nothing to offset. An earlier version of the legislation that would have accounted for land-use changes was altered at the farm lobby's demand. Now, the EPA will be forbidden to rain the same pain on the ethanol gang that it's going to rain on the rest of the economy — a minimum of five years (ahem) "study" is required before a ruling on whether ethanol should be treated the same as any other fuel, and the EPA, USDA, and Congress all must agree to act before Big Corn reaps what Waxman-Markey sows.

10. Rural electrical cooperatives are demanding that the offsets be awarded in proportion to historic emissions, and they probably will prevail. This means that high-polluting generators, such as the coal-fired plants typical of electric co-ops' members, will be rewarded because they pollute more, while cleaner producers, such as those using nuclear and hydroelectric power, will be penalized.

11. The farm lobby will be rewarded for practices that do little or nothing to reduce greenhouse gases. One such practice is “no till” planting, in which farmers forego plowing and plant seeds directly into the soil. Two peer-reviewed scientific papers suggest that no-till either does nothing to decrease carbon dioxide or actually increases the level of greenhouse-gas emissions by upping emissions of nitrous oxide — a much more powerful greenhouse gas. Now it’s not clear that no-till will reduce greenhouse gases, but the practice does make weed-control more difficult, meaning that it supports the market for herbicides such as Monsanto’s RoundUp. Guess who’s spending millions lobbying for no-till?

12. Waxman-Markey provides an excuse for trade protectionism. The bill will give the Obama administration broad new powers to enact tariffs on imports from jurisdictions that have not had the poor sense to enact similar legislation, meaning that it invites both politically driven trade protectionism and retaliatory measures from abroad in the service of an empty green dream. As the New York Times puts it:

A House committee working on sweeping energy legislation seems determined to make sure that the United States will tax China and other carbon polluters, potentially disrupting an already-sensitive climate change debate in Congress. The Ways and Means Committee’s proposed bill language would virtually require that the president impose an import tariff on any country that fails to clamp down on greenhouse gas emissions. Directed primarily at China, the United States’ biggest manufacturing competitor, the provisions aim to protect cement, steel and other energy-intensive industries that expect to face higher costs under a federal emissions cap.

13. Waxman-Markey channels billions of dollars into subsidies for “international clean technology deployment for emerging markets.” David H. McCormick of the Treasury Department recently gave a speech on the establishment of an \$8 billion fund for that purpose; those who showed up to get the specs on this new gravy train included Sequoia Capital, the United Steelworkers Union, the Clinton Climate Initiative, Ernst & Young, Duke Energy, SunPower, Honeywell, Shell, ConocoPhillips, Credit Suisse, Chrysalix Energy Venture Capital, and Goldman Sachs. If you’re wondering who’s going to make real money off of Waxman-Markey, this list would be a pretty good place to start.

14. Naturally, Big Labor gets its piece of the pie, too. Projects receiving grants and financing under Waxman-Markey provisions will be required to implement Davis-Bacon union-wage rules, making it hard for non-union firms to compete and ensuring that these “investments” pay out inflated union wages. And it’s not just the big research-and-development contracts, since Waxman-Markey forces union-wage rules all the way down to the plumbing-repair and light-bulb-changing level.

NON-CAP MANDATES

15. The renewable electricity standard is the big one here. This would require utilities to supply 20 percent of their power from renewable energy sources (or “increased efficiency”) by 2020. The Senate was unable to pass a smaller mandate in 2007, because favored sources of renewable energy (wind power, for instance) just don’t work in certain regions of the country, and regional blocs can wield a great deal of power in the Senate. These blocs may be less powerful this time around, because the Democrats within them will be under a great deal of pressure to pass this bill. The renewable standard would force utilities to rely increasingly on expensive sources of energy like wind and solar — expensive because they are capital-intensive and must be located far away from urban areas, necessitating long transmission lines. You can thank Congress for adding yet another charge to your monthly utility bill.

16. The bill would create a system of renewable electricity credits similar to the carbon offsets mentioned above — utilities that cannot meet the standard could purchase credits from other utilities. One way or another, however, the cost is getting passed along to you.

17. The renewable standard excludes sources of power like nuclear and coal gasification, and perhaps that’s to be understood. Even though these sources are cleaner than traditional coal-burning plants, they violate a number of green taboos. What’s less understandable is the way “qualified hydropower” is narrowly defined to exclude hydropower from Canada. Again, the thing to remember is that Congress is less concerned with greening the environment and more concerned with greening the pockets of parochial interests.

18. The legislation calls for the establishment of a Carbon Storage Research Corporation (CSRC) to steer \$1 billion annually into the development of carbon-capture technologies. The CSRC would be funded via assessments on utility companies. Hear that? It's the sound of another charge being added to your bill. Evidence suggests that subsidizing research into carbon-capture technology is either futile (in the case of traditional coal-powered plants) or unnecessary (the technology for sequestering emissions from gasification plants already exists).
19. The promotion of carbon capture will require a host of new regulations — the bill calls on the EPA to create a permitting process for geologic sequestration (burying captured carbon emissions in the ground), regulations to keep the buried carbon from escaping into the air, and regulations to keep it from escaping into the water supply. All we need now are carbon guards to throw the carbon into solitary confinement if it gets too rowdy in the prison yard.
20. The bill imposes performance standards on new coal-fired power plants to encourage the adoption of carbon-capture technology. Ratepayers would pay more for electricity because of the efficiency losses associated with carbon capture.
21. The bill regulates every light fixture under the sun. Actually, the sun might be the only light source that isn't regulated specifically in this legislation. There are rules governing fluorescent lamps, incandescent lamps, intermediate base lamps, candelabra base lamps, outdoor luminaires, portable light fixtures — you get the idea. The government actually started down this road by regulating light bulbs in the 2005 energy bill. This bill merely tightens the regulations, which means the unintended consequences produced by the 2005 bill — more expensive light bulbs that burn out quicker — will probably get worse.
22. The bill extends its reach to cover appliances as well. Clothes washers and dishwashers, portable electric spas, showerheads, faucets, televisions — all these and more are covered specifically in the bill. You thought we were kidding when we said this bill represents the federal government's attempt to expand its regulatory reach to cover everything. We weren't.
23. Appliances will be required to come with "carbon output" labels, and retailers will get bonus payments for marketing those that are certified "best-in-class." The bill sets up a payment schedule to reward the manufacturers of these "best-in-class" products: \$75 for each dishwasher, \$250 for each clothes washer, and so on. So go out and splurge on that new super-energy-efficient refrigerator — under this bill, you already made a \$200 down payment.
24. The bill requires the EPA to establish environmental standards for residences, meaning a federally dictated one-size-fits-all policy for greening every home in America. When you're retrofitting your home according to EPA guidelines, it will come as little comfort to know that the government is reimbursing you for your troubles, especially if you're doing the work around April 15.
25. The bill would affect commercial properties, too. In fact, all buildings would be governed by a "national energy efficiency building code" that would require 50 percent reductions in energy use in all buildings by 2018, followed by 5 percent reductions in energy use every three years after that through 2030. No one disputes that these changes will be costly, but Waxman-Markey supporters argue that they will pay for themselves through lower energy bills. This argument holds up only if we assume that energy prices will stay flat or fall over time. But the aforementioned carbon caps instituted elsewhere in this legislation make that prospect highly unlikely. Businesses and homeowners will pay twice â€” once to retrofit their roosts and again when the energy bill arrives..
26. The bill instructs the EPA to regulate greenhouse-gas emissions from mobile sources such as cars, trucks, buses, dirt bikes, snowmobiles, boats, planes, and trains.
27. It instructs the EPA to cap and reduce greenhouse-gas emissions from non-mobile sources as well.. These two items would be bigger news if the Supreme Court hadn't already cleared the way for the EPA to regulate greenhouse-gas emissions. President Obama will probably move forward on this front even if

Congress fails to pass the cap-and-trade bill. He has already announced a strict national fuel-efficiency standard for cars, and the implications for other sources of greenhouse-gas emissions are not good.

28. The bill calls on the EPA to establish a federal greenhouse-gas registry. Businesses would be required to collect and submit data on their emissions to the EPA, creating yet another compliance cost for them to pass on to their customers.

29. The bill undermines federalism by prohibiting states from creating their own cap-and-trade programs. Nearly half of all U.S. states have already taken some sort of action to cap greenhouse-gas emissions by forming regional compacts and implementing their own emission standards. Understandably, these states support a federal cap so that they are not at an economic disadvantage to states that do not cap emissions. If these states want to hamstring their own economies in the pursuit of green goals, that should be their business. States that don't see any reason to do so should not be forced to share in their folly.

GREEN DREAMS

30. Utility companies are directed to start laying the groundwork for a glorious future in which everyone drives a plug-in car. The legislation directs them to start planning for the deployment of electrical charging stations along roadways, in parking garages, and at gas stations, as well as "such other elements as the State determines necessary to support plug-in electric-drive vehicles." (States are directed to consider whether the costs of planning or the implementation of these plans merit reimbursement. Either way, you wind up with the bill.)

31. The secretary of energy is required to establish a large-scale vehicle electrification program and to provide "such sums as may be necessary" for the manufacture of plug-in electric-drive vehicles, including another \$25 billion for "advanced technology vehicle" loans. As if Detroit hadn't gotten its hands on enough taxpayer money.

32. The bill directs the secretary of energy to promulgate regulations requiring that each automaker's fleet be comprised of a minimum percentage of vehicles that run on ethanol or biodiesel.

33. It includes loan guarantees for the construction of ethanol pipelines. Nearly every energy bill in the last five years has included loan guarantees for the construction of ethanol pipelines. Apparently, would-be builders of this vital infrastructure are still having problems getting financing.

34. Congress passed (and Obama signed) a "cash for clunkers" program as part of the war appropriations bill this month. Under the program, you get a rebate for trading in a used car for one that gets slightly higher mileage. The Waxman-Markey bill takes this concept and applies it to appliances, electric motors — basically anything that can be traded in for a more energy-efficient version. These types of programs generally fail cost-benefit analyses spectacularly because more energy goes into the production of the new appliances than would have been used if the old ones had just run their course.

35. The bill includes \$15 billion in grants and loans to encourage the manufacture of wind turbines, solar energy, biofuel production, and other sources of renewable energy that have benefited from decades of such largesse already. Another \$15 billion is not going to make these energy sources cost-competitive. Only carbon rationing can achieve that. One suspects the Democrats know this; that's why they are pushing a carbon-rationing bill. The \$15 billion is just another sop to the green-energy lobby to help grease the skids.

36. The bill establishes within the EPA a SmartWay Transport Program, which would provide grants and loans to freight carriers that meet environmental goals.

37. The bill requires the secretary of energy to establish a program to make monetary awards to utilities that find innovative ways of using thermal energy, as if utilities needed an extra incentive to discover a new, cheap energy source.

38. It includes another \$1.5 billion for the Hollings Manufacturing Partnership Program. This program pops up repeatedly in discussions of programs that both liberals and conservatives think should be eliminated. It

is corporate welfare, pure and simple.

39. It includes \$65 million for research into high-efficiency gas turbines, another gift to the corporate world with little environmental benefit.

40. It includes \$7.5 million to establish a National Bioenergy Partnership to promote biofuels. Economic barriers to the commercial viability of biofuel as an energy source have proven to be so insurmountable that even with all of the federal mandates and subsidies already thrown their way, the ethanol companies lined up with everyone else for a federal bailout when the financial crisis hit. The last thing consumers need is another full-time, federally subsidized lobbying arm for that industry.

VARIOUS LEFT-WING WISH FULFILLMENT

41. One of Obama's most reliable constituencies, college administrators, will be given billions of dollars to play with through the creation of eight "Clean Energy Innovation Centers," university-based consortia charged with a mission to "leverage the expertise and resources of the university and private research communities, industry, venture capital, national laboratories, and other participants in energy innovation to support cross-disciplinary research and development in areas not being served by the private sector in order to develop and transfer innovative clean energy technologies into the marketplace." Meaning that the famous business acumen of the federal government will be applied to the energy industry.

42. Another Obama constituency, the community-organizing gang — i.e., ACORN — will be eligible to receive billions in funding as the bill "authorizes the Secretary [of Energy] to make grants to community development organizations to provide financing to businesses and projects that improve energy efficiency." Think federally subsidized consultants paid \$55 an hour to tell businesses to turn down their AC in the summer.

43. Waxman-Markey also enables Obama to indulge his persistent desire to use the tax code to transfer wealth from people who pay taxes to people who don't — i.e., from likely Republican voters to likely Obama voters. The bill "amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow certain low income taxpayers a refundable energy tax credit to compensate such taxpayers for reductions in their purchasing power, as identified and calculated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), resulting from regulation of GHGs (greenhouse gases)."

44. Not only will Waxman-Markey slip more redistribution into the tax code, it will establish a new monthly welfare check. It will create an "Energy Refund Program" that will "give low-income households a monthly cash energy refund equal to the estimated loss in purchasing power resulting from this Act."

45. Another new class of government dependents will be created by Waxman-Markey: Americans put out of work by Waxman-Markey. The bill establishes a program to distribute "climate-change adjustment assistance to adversely affected workers."

46. Waxman-Markey will create yet another raft of government dependents, but of a different sort — bureaucrats. The bill creates: a new United States Global Change Research Program, a National Climate Change Adaptation Program, a National Climate Service, Natural Resources Climate Change Adaptation Strategy office at the White House, and an International Climate Change Adaptation Program at the State Department.

47. And since everybody else is getting a check, Bambi gets one, too, in the form of money for "domestic wildlife and natural resource adaptation."

48. States also get in on the action. The legislation allows each state to set up a State Energy and Environment Development (SEED) account into which the federal government can deposit emission allowances. States can then sell these allowances and use the proceeds to support clean-energy programs. They must set aside a certain amount of the money to fund federal mandates, but they are given broad discretion to use the rest by making loans, grants, and other forms of support available to favored constituencies. It's federalism, of a sort — the wrong sort.

49. And, of course, everything includes a health-care component, even cap-and-trade. Waxman-Markey requires the Department of Health and Human Services to develop a “strategic action plan to assist health professionals in preparing for and responding to the impacts of climate change.”

50. Waxman-Markey dumps money into questionable “partnerships” and grants to study “emerging careers” in “renewable energy, energy efficiency, and climate change mitigation.” The first career to emerge, of course, will be managing grants to study emerging careers.

That's our Top 50. We could go on. And on.

When Nancy Pelosi was advising congressmen to back this beast, she said they should not worry about the words of the bill they had not read, but think about four others: “jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs.” The legislation offers Pelosi perverse vindication: Waxman-Markey will create a lot of jobs for Wall Street sharps, Big Business rent-seekers, ACORN hucksters, utility-company lobbyists, grant-writers at left-wing organizations, college administrators, light-bulb-policing bureaucrats, and an army of parasitic hangers-on. It’s up to the Senate to stop it.

Stephen Spruiell is a staff reporter for National Review Online. Kevin Williamson is a deputy managing editor of National Review.