



Liberty News

The Newsletter of the Libertarian Party
of Boulder County

Winter 2009
SPECIAL EDITION ON ENERGY AND
CLIMATE CHANGE

CLIMATESMART INCREASES DENIED BY VOTERS: THE LOCAL CLIMATE CHANGES ALONG WITH THE GLOBAL CLIMATE

Eva Kosinski

November is on its way out, and with it, some surprises (described as "shock" by the Boulder Daily Camera) for the advocates of the ClimateSmart program. As Boulder City pushed folks further and further away by restricting residential growth, County issues have become, not surprisingly if you spend any time thinking about it, less and less influenced by the previously overbearing (at least if you ask the folks in East County) residents of the City. Some of the culturally-correct views long held in Boulder's elitist circles about how we should view government, and how much the County should "encourage" environmental awareness, are not held outside the City limits, and now voters in the remainder of the County are starting to fight back against what they consider excessive control of their lives and choices.

ClimateSmart advocates were convinced that the program's operating monies would be doubled, in spite of an economy that has not brought jobs back, even to the levels they were before Oct. of 2008, let alone getting into plus territory, and where ARM loans to commercial entities are due in 2010, to cause another tremor to the creaky foundations of our economy. ClimateSmart's core

funding mechanism is municipal loans (in this case the County's not the City's), and even though such loans are generally guaranteed by the fact that in the past, government could always shake us to drain a few more coins from our pockets with taxes, we are protected from that by TABOR, so the County *has* to go to the voters, and in a tough economy, voters (at least those who rely on jobs for their livelihood) are not generous.

The view that our planet is on a collision course with extinction is a view widely held inside the City, where fears dictate that we do something, anything, to get our energy house in order, even to constructing a "SmartGrid" with computers (if hacked, a single point of failure) controlling what we get to use. If we need to completely revamp our homes to some R-value that costs a fortune, it's not a problem; we are saving the planet. Belief is a terrible thing when it is not based on all of the facts. In this issue we will explore some of the facts and fallacies that are thrown around as common knowledge. Yes, by and large, we are taking the side of the skeptics, because to be honest, the non-skeptics already have the airwaves, the tv cable channels, and many, many books espousing our imminent demise. If you are open-minded enough to take the challenge, dig in, and hear, as Paul Harvey would have said "the rest of the story."

**We can have facts without thinking but we
cannot have thinking without facts.**

John Dewey

US educator, Pragmatist philosopher
& psychologist (1859 - 1952)

<http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/32951.html>

LESSONS LEARNED FROM THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF GOVERNMENT ENERGY POLICY

Jim Remmert
jimremmert@comcast.net

Edwin Drake drilled the first successful oil well near Titusville, Pennsylvania in 1858. Between then and the early 1970s, American and European companies created thousands of uses for petroleum and expanded its production, refining, transportation, distribution and sale to every corner of the globe. These companies discovered most of the oil fields that today are controlled by the member countries of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries [OPEC] and comprise almost 70% of the world's crude oil reserves. By 1970 petroleum had become the primary source for more than 60% of the world's energy. It had also become a component in everything from toothpaste to space vehicles.

In the early 1970s, the members of OPEC demonstrated, with an oil embargo and large price increases, that their cartel controlled the world market for crude oil. However, the history of the oil industry is replete with attempts to control the price and production of crude oil. Many of these attempts, like the Texas Railroad Commission, have even been sponsored by governments within the United States.

But such cartels are inherently unstable; its members have incentives to cheat on the prices and production quotas that are fixed by the cartel. Customers for the cartels' production have incentives to counter the cartel's higher prices by reducing their consumption and using alternatives to crude oil. Producers who are not members of the cartel have incentives to increase their own production and take market share away from the cartel members. And the higher prices that are set by the cartel create opportunities for businesses within and outside the energy industry to invest in alternatives to the crude oil sold by the cartel members.

The United States could have relied on these incentives, competition and a free market to destabilize the OPEC cartel or otherwise adapt to the changes brought on by it. However, in response to the actions of the OPEC cartel members, President Nixon said, "Let this be our national goal: At the end of this decade the United States will not be dependent on any

other country for the energy we need to provide our jobs, to heat our homes and to keep our transportation moving."

Every President since Nixon has reiterated, in his own way, that government should attempt to achieve energy independence as a national goal of the United States. And, for the last thirty-five years government has been micro-managing the market for energy, about 8% of the total United States economy, on this assumption. This history of economic regulation shows why lawmakers, who are understandably motivated by political considerations, should not manage the economic freedom of the country. And it gives evidence of the many unintended consequences that are created by government's attempts to manage this important segment of the economy.

The United States put a man on the moon within nine years from when President Kennedy made it a national goal. With all of the scientific knowledge necessary to do that and all of natural resources within the United States, it should have been relatively easy for this country to achieve President Nixon's goal within a reasonable period of time.

However, not only has the United States failed to achieve energy independence within the last thirty-five years; it has even become more dependent on other countries. In 1974 the United States imported 37% of its petroleum, and by 2008 the country's dependence on imported petroleum had grown to about 65%. Since the country relies on petroleum for almost all (98%) of its transportation energy, any present-day disruption of the petroleum we import would shock the economy to an even greater extent than the economic chaos which Americans experienced during the 1973 Arab oil embargo.

Even after thirty-five years of government policy that has attempted to discourage the use of petroleum, the market for energy is dominated by liquid petroleum and natural gas because they are the most economic, flexible and convenient sources of energy for most consumer needs. They are the source relied upon for about 60% of the country's total energy needs. And, despite the criticism that fossil fuels [petroleum, natural gas, and coal] create carbon dioxide, they provide about 85% of our energy needs today.

Why has there been so little progress toward a national goal on which there has been such widespread agreement among the people who have been in

charge of our government for almost thirty-five years? My answer to this question comes from giving legal advice for more than twenty years to everyone from first line supervisors to the Chairman and members of the Board of Directors of a major energy company, what is now the Exxon-Mobil Corporation.

Exxon, and other energy companies, have been criticized for not making investments in alternative and renewable sources of energy. It was my experience that the members of Exxon's management were no less concerned about the country's energy welfare than any other loyal American. However, like the managers of other publicly owned large and small businesses, they have a legal and moral obligation to manage the business in the self-interest of its constituents.

Exxon's priorities were to make a profit for its shareholders in the business of supplying energy that met the needs of its customers. It is primarily a petroleum explorer, producer, refiner and distributor. However, if Exxon's management thought the company could make a competitive return on its investment by supplying energy, other than petroleum, to meet the needs of its customers, I have no doubt that the company's management would do so.

Exxon's management has considered entering into businesses supplying energy from sources other than petroleum. And, at one time, Exxon was in the nuclear and coal businesses. It got out of the nuclear energy business when it became clear, after the Three Mile Island nuclear accident, that government would prevent any growth in that industry. It got out of the coal business when it became clear that the return on its investment in that business would not be competitive with alternative investments. Other energy companies are in one or more of the alternative energy businesses, including wind and solar.

Government's failure to achieve the goal set by President Nixon and subsequent presidents is obviously not due to any lack of scientific or natural resources. Ironically, it is due in large part, to government itself and the unintended consequences of its attempts to tax and regulate the exploration, production, distribution and use of energy. One such unintended consequence has been a reduction in the freedom and incentives for America's scientists, engineers, geologists, economists and energy managers to increase our own energy production.

Shortly after declaring the national goal of energy independence, the Nixon administration, with help from Congress, rationed petroleum and imposed price controls on it. This reduced the incentive for the people who produce energy to explore for more of our own petroleum. The consequence was long lines at service stations and a decline in the amount of petroleum that was produced in the United States. By delaying the impact of higher petroleum costs, price controls also led utilities, manufacturers, and other energy users to put off conserving petroleum, something that has since become such an obviously desirable thing to do for many energy users. And, by delaying the impact of higher petroleum costs, price controls postponed the development and use of substitutes for petroleum.

Then came President Carter. One of his administration's principal energy policies was a windfall profits tax that was imposed on crude oil produced in the United States. It increased the cost of production in the United States and reduced the incentive for businesses that produce crude oil to increase their output. Again, the United States increased its dependence on other countries for the growing energy needs of its economy.

Another reason there has been so little progress toward the government's energy goals is that a perception has been created that many of the solutions conflict with the country's environmental objectives. Environmental interest groups have used the courts, administrative agencies and legislatures to obstruct the freedom to produce more energy within the United States. They have contended that environmental protection requires nature to be preserved in its pristine state based on the false choice that environmental protection and energy production are irreconcilable alternatives that cannot be pursued in harmony with each other.

As a consequence, most of the government controlled territorial waters of the United States, as well as the 40% of the United States land area that is controlled by federal and state governments, have been off-limits for the exploration and production of crude oil. This, even though crude oil has been produced for many years from the ocean [e.g. the North Sea] and other environmentally sensitive areas in harmony with the ecosystem.

In fact, the production of already-discovered crude oil has been prohibited from an area about the size of New York City's Central Park on the coastal plain of Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. This, even though the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the size of South Carolina and its coastal plain is a barren arctic desert much like Prudhoe Bay, Alaska from which oil has been produced for more than thirty years without significant environmental damage. This prohibition is also contrary to the expressed wishes of the local residents in Alaska, who would benefit from the economic opportunities that would result from development of this resource.

Although the United States has been very inhospitable to investments in the oil industry for the last thirty-five years, it is an international business in which investments are made where the opportunities are greatest. Since so many obstructions have been created to energy production in the United States, the businesses that could help the country become more energy self-sufficient have redirected their resources outside the country.

In the 1960s the largest energy company in the United States, what is now the ExxonMobil Corporation, had about 60% of its assets in the United States and obtained about the same percentage of its earnings from its energy business in the United States. However, for 2006 ExxonMobil reported that less than 30% of its investments were in the United States and more than 70% of its earnings came from operations outside the United States. Thus, although most of us think of ExxonMobil as a United States energy company, it has become primarily an investor in energy projects outside the United States because of the lack of freedom and opportunities to develop energy projects within the United States. And, although the United States consumes about 25% of the world's crude oil, we now have less than 2% of the world's known crude oil reserves and we produce less than 7% of the world's crude oil.

Not only has the United States discouraged crude oil production; its restrictions have also increased our dependence on other countries for electricity and refined petroleum products. Since the late 1970s, government policies have prevented energy producers from building even a single new nuclear power plant or oil refinery in the United States. So, the United States has had to import an increasing amount of electricity and motor gasoline from other countries. In fact, the world's largest oil refinery

was commissioned at Jamnagar, India in December 2008 and it was built to export motor gasoline to the West Coast of the United States to make up for the growing shortage of petroleum refining capacity on the West Coast.

The politicians who have controlled our government have also been micro-managing the consumption of energy. One way is by restricting the choice of products that use energy. In many instances, people no longer have the freedom to buy products that use energy based on their cost and other considerations that are important to individual consumers.

For instance, manufacturers are required to produce fluorescent light bulbs and cannot offer consumers the choice of the lower cost incandescent light bulbs. Automobile manufacturers have been required to produce cars that meet minimum fuel economy standards. One state, California, even required that a minimum percentage of the cars sold by manufacturers be zero emission automobiles. Appliance manufacturers can only produce products that meet government energy standards. Homebuilding permits are conditioned on meeting higher cost energy consumption standards. And consumers must pay the usually higher cost of all these requirements.

Governments, both federal and state, have also used taxes as a way to manage the consumption of energy. Gasoline taxes have thereby become a very large source of government revenue, more than \$50 billion in 2005. In fact, gasoline tax revenue to federal and state governments has far exceeded oil company profits from the sale of motor gasoline in the United States. And, in response to criticism of the high prices their member countries charge for crude oil, OPEC has pointed out that consuming country governments, like the United States, obtain more revenue from gasoline and other petroleum taxes than the OPEC countries derive from the sale of their crude oil.

Significant additional taxes have also been proposed based on the idea that the earth is warming because fossil fuels [petroleum, natural gas & coal] are used to produce energy. The Obama administration has proposed that carbon dioxide emissions from the use of fossil fuels be capped and that emissions above the cap be taxed in order to curtail the use of energy that produces carbon dioxide. Since the United States relied on fossil fuels for 85% of the energy that was consumed in

2007, this proposal would substantially increase the cost of energy and promote the transition to non-fossil fuels.

There is disagreement among knowledgeable scientists about whether global warming will be ended if the use of fossil fuels is substantially reduced. However, there is no disagreement about the fact that, even if the United States significantly reduces its use of fossil fuels, global warming will not be reversed without even more dramatic reductions in the use of fossil fuels by other countries, especially by China and India. According to the International Energy Administration, the United States carbon dioxide emissions were 21% of the world's total in 2005 and are forecast to decline to about 16% by 2030.

However, carbon dioxide emissions from the developing nations of the world, and especially China and India, are expected to increase from about 50% to more than 62% of the world's total.

Our politicians have also been unsuccessfully attempting to micro manage the search for new sources of energy that could be alternatives to fossil fuels, instead of allowing competition between the people who invest their own money sort out the best energy alternatives. The Department of Energy has reported that, during the last thirty years, it has spent \$57.5 billion subsidizing research for renewable sources of energy. Yet, over that period of time, the percentage of the country's total energy needs that are met from renewable energy sources [e.g. solar, wind, geothermal, waste, biofuels, wood & hydroelectric] has only increased by 1%, from 6% to 7%. And, 68% of the renewable energy that we use today is generated from hydroelectric plants and wood, not from the sources [wind, solar, bio-fuels and waste] to which most of the government subsidized research has been devoted.

Our lawmakers have also used the nation's support for alternatives to imported petroleum as pretext for thousands of government subsidies that have served the narrow economic interests of their financial supporters and constituents. However, these subsidies have not significantly increased the country's domestic energy supplies. The 2008 bill that appropriates federal government money for energy and water projects contained more than 1700 "earmarks" or "pork barrel" expenditures totaling \$6.7 billion. These expenditures set out the specific projects, the amount of government money to be spent and the

name of the recipients of the government contracts. The New York Times has reported on instances in which these expenditures were directly linked to political campaign contributions to the sponsoring lawmakers.

Lawmakers from farm states have created one of the largest government subsidies for an alternative fuel. Since 1978 they have used the country's enthusiasm for alternatives to imported oil as an excuse for very large government subsidies, more than \$1 billion per year, for corn and ethanol producers. This, even though ethanol is a very uneconomic substitute for motor gasoline and the use of corn to make ethanol has led to increases in the cost of food.

These are just a few of the many examples that illustrate how government has distorted the markets in which people would otherwise have the freedom to choose how much and at what price they will use energy to meet their needs. More than anything else, the problematic and volatile state of America's energy markets is a reflection of the way in which decisions have been made over the last thirty-five years. To a very large extent, decisions about energy have been made by politicians and they have, not surprisingly, made many of them based on political considerations. On the other hand, consumers can better shape the market for energy through the exercise of their economic freedom to make decisions about how they will use energy. And scientists, engineers, geologists, economists and energy managers can better shape their response to consumer needs without government micro management.

More petroleum, or even more fossil fuels, is not the only answer to our country's energy needs but it is an answer, among many others. Conservation and greater efficiency in the use of energy are also a part of the answer. Alternative sources of energy, like wind and solar, are part of the solution as well. And, improvements in science and technology are part of all the other solutions. Free markets are not perfect, but they are superior to government micro-management, as a means of sorting out the most economic and responsive solutions to our country's energy needs.

If the last thirty-five years have taught us anything, it has demonstrated that government management will not cause the country to become a more resourceful energy market. Government involvement in a market is more likely to make it

more political and less responsive to consumer needs. There are also lessons to be learned from this experience that apply to other markets, like health care and the current crisis in financial markets. It is a good idea to remember the last thirty-five years of our experience with government micro management of energy whenever our politicians suggest that government assume greater control over other aspects of our economy.

I have written more extensively about the relationship between government and economic freedom in a book entitled, *Common Sense in the Twenty First Century*. You are welcome to receive a complimentary copy by emailing me.

A FEW THOUGHT-PROVOKING QUOTATIONS ON ENERGY AND CLIMATE

(whether you agree with them or not, they make us think)

But for all the talk, clean-burning coal will likely remain an oxymoron for years to come. The utility industry, which uses coal to generate 52% of its electricity, faces formidable political, economic and technological obstacles to getting "clean." ... Coal contains dozens of noxious chemicals, including lead, arsenic and other heavy metals; sulfur dioxide, which creates acid rain; nitrogen oxides, which create smog; tiny soot particles, which can invade and collect in human lungs; mercury, a toxic metal that accumulates in animals, fish and the humans who eat them; and carbon dioxide, which many scientists believe is artificially warming Earth's atmosphere by trapping more heat from the sun.

-John J. Fialka
"'Clean Coal' Remains an Oxymoron,"
Wall Street Journal, 18 May 01

Even if nonpolluting power were feasible and abundant, the use of energy on a massive scale acts on society like a drug that is physically harm less but psychically enslaving. A community can choose between Methadone and "cold turkey" -- between maintaining its addiction to alien energy and kicking it in painful cramps — but no society can have a population that is hooked on progressively larger numbers of energy slaves and whose members are also autonomously active.

-Ivan Illich (1926-2002)
"Energy and Equity," *LeMonde*, 1973

Other scientists found conflicting evidence. In 1992, a team from the University of New Mexico reported that ancient soils showed extremely high levels of carbon dioxide 440 million years ago, an age of primitive sea life before the advent of land plants and animals. The carbon dioxide levels were roughly 16 times higher than today. Surprisingly, the scientists said, this appeared to coincide with wide glaciation, an analysis, wrote Crayton J. Yapp and Harald Poths in the journal *Nature*, that "suggests that the climate models require modification."

William J. Broad
In *Ancient Fossils, Seeds of a New Debate on Global Warming*
from NY Times, reprinted in
"The Best American Science Writing, 2007"
Harper Perennial, www.harperperennial.com

A COHERENT ENERGY POLICY

Curtis Harris
2010 candidate for Congress
2nd Congressional District
(seat currently held by Jared Polis)

America's future economic health depends on many factors, one being energy supplies and costs. Energy policy must be based on creating a sound platform that supports economic growth, prosperity and quality-of-life.

We have three major problems:

1. We are dependent on foreign supplies of oil from hostile nations such that price and supply can be used as weapons against us.
2. We have not developed domestic energy sources and the distribution systems necessary to keep pace with domestic demand.
3. There are negative environmental impacts that result from the use of fossil fuels.

As sensible energy policy will include the following elements:

1. Rapid development of the oil and gas supplies off-shore and in ANWAR.

2. New refineries and distribution systems to fix the current bottlenecks in our supply chain.

3. A new gasoline and diesel tax that will fund construction of a national electricity grid and incent private industry to develop new transportation technologies.

4. Construction of a national electricity grid by private industry with appropriate government planning and funding from the fuel tax.

5. Rapid construction, by private industry, of new nuclear power plants.

6. A final solution for disposal and/or reprocessing of the spent fuel from nuclear plants.

7. The fuel tax will also be an incentive to increase the use of liquefied natural gas as a transportation fuel as part of the bridge to new technologies.

8. Development of wind and solar where economically viable. This will require technology advances as well as the national grid.

9. An emphasis on free market innovation and private industry over government planning and control.

Curtis Harris' viewpoint:

These 9 elements only require that there be sensible regulation from government. Once the regulatory roadblocks and environmental lawsuits are eliminated, the market dynamics exist to drive private industry in these areas.

The amount of the tax called for in element 3 can be adjusted to match the actual cost of the grid as it is built. It will be important to keep the Congress from stealing this money for other programs and earmarks.

There is ample historical evidence that element 9 is necessary for rapid progress and cost containment.

These 9 elements will serve to reduce our dependence on foreign oil supplies. They will reduce the shares of our energy source mix that petroleum and coal represent while increasing the shares of natural gas and nuclear. They will open a window of time in which private industry can develop the innovative technologies that will produce the energy sources of the future.

Bio-fuels are not a solution. Ethanol, for example, produces less energy output than the total energy inputs required to produce it. It also damages land, uses scarce water resources, and raises the price of all corn related products, including food staples that many economically disadvantaged people rely on for survival.

Electricity from wind and solar sources are not a complete solution. They can supplement base sources of electricity, but their supply is not available all of the time in the right places. There are solid reasons to make changes in America's energy use. Fossil fuels, even if not finite in the foreseeable future, present problems due to the geographic distribution of the resources and the total impact of their extraction, processing and use as fuels.

Climate change is a fact of life and has been since the formation of the Earth. There is no proven link between global temperature changes and human activity. The supposed global warming caused by human activity is a hoax, a political movement meant to cripple America's economy.

The environmentalists in America object to virtually all efforts to increase energy supplies that will bridge the supply gap between present and future technologies. In thirty years, hydrogen fuel cells or batteries may power most cars. But in the meantime, we need fossil fuels for transportation. Modern technologies have virtually eliminated the environmental risks commonly associated with oil and gas exploration and production. Just saying "No" to all efforts to produce more domestic energy from fossil fuels is not an answer. If we do not have a prosperous and vibrant society in the next two decades we will not be able to do the investment necessary to create new energy technologies.

[Curtis Harris is the author of two books: "Ending Entrenched Power" and "It's the Congress, Stupid." See references on last page of this newsletter for more information -Ed.]

ARE WE REALLY ON THIN ICE?

Eva Kosinski

Back in 1989, when research began into what was then called “Earth Systems Science,” the mandate was to discover how earth systems evolved, how they functioned, and how changes could be predicted in advance. Even then, there was a hint that the funding sponsors were looking for human-caused problems. One proposal read “In our effort to achieve a higher standard of living for an expanding population, we are spreading advanced technology to every region of the Earth and are making steadily increasing demands on natural resources. These actions have begun to alter the atmosphere, oceans, lands, and life forms on our planet in ways that have no precedent in human history.”

When, in the same year, the New York Times touted the “25 year Mission to Planet Earth,” it also acknowledged much more needed to be done because “These climatologists rely on computerized mathematical simulations of the global climate in a flawed and imperfect attempt to understand how the climate is changing. But the models do not include many of the crucial factors that interrelate to make the global system function, since they lack data the mission is intended to provide.” They hastened to add, however, that “The amount of funds available will determine how many platforms are actually put into orbit.”

We are now 20 years into this “Mission to Planet Earth”; as we all know NASA's had a setback or two since then, and some funding cuts, so it's unclear if many of the platforms actually went up. Did the data they gathered match what was coming from ground measurements? [Here's a thought...is weather prediction better in your experience than it was 20 years ago?]

One area where doubt is in play is in the matter of thermal sensors ground-side. In a scathing report “Is the US Surface Temperature Record Reliable?” ISBN 13: 978-1-934791-29-5, ISBN 10: 1-934791-26-6, Anthony Watts hunted up the actual temperature sensors (complete with photos) and discovered that a large number of sensors had been located in areas known to be a great deal warmer than the immediate environment, thus altering the records significantly. “Changing the technology and locations of temperature stations and a blatant disregard for NOAA's own rules about keeping

sensors at least 100 feet away from heat sources and radiative surfaces have undoubtedly contaminated the U.S. temperature record. But it gets worse. Adjustments applied to “homogenize” the data (comparing to surrounding stations and adjusting) impart an even larger false warming trend to the data.”

Back in 1870, Thomas Henry Huxley wrote “The Great tragedy of Science – the slaying of a beautiful hypothesis by an ugly fact.” But if you change the facts, you can help secure the hypothesis. No matter the year, the temptation remains.

Scientists eager to truly understand the incredibly complex atmosphere and its interactions, have over many years, bemoaned the fact that those interested in challenging, with new studies, the underlying current assumption that humans dictate the Earth's environment, have been denied funding, and in some cases, publicly ridiculed.

Take the case of Timothy Ball from the University of Manitoba,

(http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/mostread/s_492572.html)

His long years of work showed (contrary to the now discredited and removed from the IPCC report “hockey stick graph”) that the interaction between CO2 levels and warming were reversed; the warming caused the release of CO2. The sunspot generated heat patterns were followed very closely by increases in CO2 in the atmosphere. His work was omitted from the IPCC report and he was laughingly joked about as the guy with a degree in geography trying to do science. What could he know? Of course, the entire Earth System Science curriculum is under the Geography Dept at UM. Who's ignorant now? If you read the interview and don't have some doubts, you are trying really hard to defend a belief.

Sunspots and their effect on global climate have long been understood. Studies of the 30's Dust Bowl phenomenon clearly linked sunspot activity and the struggles in the midwest. Yet suddenly all of this established science was irrelevant as the common wisdom asserted itself that it must be human-caused CO2. John Tyndall (1820-1893) said “The brightest flashes in the world of thought are incomplete until they have been proved to have their counterpoint in the world of fact.” (Fragments of Science, vol II, Scientific Materialism). Maybe the climate is changing, but our habits of following the money, and filling in the blanks with

our own preconceived notions has not.

Now scientists whose work was rejected by the IPCC, some of whom have had to continue their studies without the massive funding given to those who assume our woes are all human caused, have banded together to publish their work (available for download on the Internet at the Heartland Institute (<http://www.heartland.org>)) in an NIPCC report. Over 800 pages (the last 100 pages is a list (in very fine print) of 31,478 scientists, of whom 9,029 have PhDs) who have signed the following petition:

“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 gases 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.”

Think quick, what was it that you were told, and by whom, about why the US never signed the Kyoto Treaty, and you will understand where politics and science collide. This petition was signed only by US scientists, and many in other parts of the world are even less convinced that global warming is a reality. Kyoto is a political agreement, based on significantly flawed assumptions, being pursued for geo-political reasons. There are definitely “inconvenient truths” and the most important one is the sad reality that science is being selectively used for political ends.

Our 25 year “Mission to Earth” is not yet complete. All the studies have not been done; the facts are not in; even if you are one of the few open-minded ones who have actually looked at the NIPCC report, containing the research that would have made it extremely difficult to argue for commercial, political, and social changes based on the premise of Earth's long expected im-

minent demise, you can see that consensus (shouldn't we all agree on the “truth” if it's really true?) just plain isn't there.

Long attributed to Mark Twain, the following still applies: “It ain't what you don't know that gets you in trouble. It's what you know that ain't so.” If we are only listening to half the facts, if we are letting our fears overrule our science, and if we create an entirely different energy infrastructure based on a faulty premise, we may find ourselves in far worse shape than we're in now.

Every child knows if the ice isn't thick enough (all the data isn't in for a secure understanding), don't skate on it!! Those who really, really, want to skate, who convince themselves, as a matter of faith, that the ice is actually solid enough and they can have what they want, right now, are the ones who pay the price. When kids do it, we call it bad judgment.

The truly sad part is that millions, if not billions (if you count the NASA weather monitoring platforms) have been spent, and we deserve to get some truth from that money. With “climategate” breaking all around us, some folks will reject everything they hear now, dump their stock in alternative energy companies, and pretend nothing is wrong. That might be equally poor judgment. Just because humans aren't causing it does not mean we don't have global warming from some other source. We need to want the truth, not whichever set of data fits our preconceived beliefs or our political aspirations.

I'm no scientist, but I believe it takes both sides of an argument to find the truth. Anything less is self delusion or faith, or wishful thinking, and our global future depends on getting it right.

DENYING DECEIT W. Earl Allen

I am proud to call myself a denier of catastrophic human-caused global warming.

I deny that there is any scientific evidence that the carbon dioxide I emit while breathing, driving, flying, or computing, is going to change our planet's climate in any measurable way.

I deny that carbon dioxide is a pollutant. I affirm that carbon dioxide is the source of all life on earth, and that more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will promote the growth of plants, thus providing more food for humans and animals.

I deny that carbon dioxide, the vital gas of life, is anything more than a very minor part of the misnamed "greenhouse effect." I affirm that the most important part of the so-called greenhouse effect is water.

I deny that there is any scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration, from whatever source, will make the earth's oceans less alkaline, will cause more and bigger hurricanes, or will make the sea level rise any faster.

I deny that humans and their activities are a cancer on the face of the earth.

I deny that humans are the most destructive species. I affirm that only humans can love Polar Bears, save the Whales, and enjoy the beauties of our still-mostly-untouched planet.

I deny that poverty-creating actions like energy taxation or rationing will help humans clean up pollution. I affirm that humans who are allowed to innovate and profit from energy will have the ability to clean up any real pollution they might create.

I deny that energy taxation and rationing will save human lives in either the long run or the short run. I affirm that subsidies for food-destroying ethanol have killed thousands, perhaps millions of actual live humans, and that continuing such subsidies will drive up the price of food worldwide, causing even more starvation and future human holocausts.

I deny that politically funded science, done at the behest of politicians whose sole lust is for more taxpayer money and more power over ordinary people's lives, is science. I affirm that such politically funded science is, in fact, propaganda in its most insidious form.

I affirm humanity and human intelligence, and affirm that humans are capable of adapting to whatever climate the planet may change to, whether that be warmer or colder.

I am a denier of catastrophic anthropogenic climate change. And I'm proud of it.

My name is Earl, and you can read my blog at <http://flypro.blogspot.com>

WHY DIDN'T FORD NEED A BAILOUT?: A C2C SUCCESS STORY

Eva Kosinski

Bailouts as far as the eye can see. Where did the free market fail, forcing all of us taxpayers to get stuck paying indefinitely to pull their fat out of the fire? Did the free market fail, or did the companies who got used to getting special consideration from government feel they no longer had to work at making themselves profitable, confident that legislation would help to defend American products against competition, that it would help them create rulings that made it harder for competitors to come up with simpler cars (extra requirements that only the big guys could produce) and more? Maybe taking a quick look at the company that *didn't* need our money (although they did ask if they could have a rain check just in case), Ford Motors, could give some perspective on all of this.

I was not aware that Ford had been doing anything truly different until I ran across a book in a used book store called "Cradle to Cradle: Remaking the Way We Make Things." This book, written back in 2002 was unique in a number of ways. It's made out of a material that can be recycled, not into something less quality, but back into the same materials so it can be made into other books. It's waterproof, but the ink can be removed with heat, and the writers, one an architect, the other a chemist, William McDonough & Michael Braungart, respectively, have come up with a new paradigm for building and creating products that sounds too sensible for most of us in our buy-it-use-it-send-it-to-the-landfill society. But seriously, it's been 7 years, and how much have we heard about Cradle to Cradle?

It may not have made its way into the everyday jargon, but C2C is becoming a big thing for the successful businesses out there. President Clinton gave an award, Forbes made a big deal back in 2004.

(http://www.forbes.com/2004/12/15/cz_ag_1215beltway.html) Why? Because, to some extent, they'd heard about the work that McDonough had done for Ford back in 1999 (http://mcdonough.com/writings/restoring_industrial.htm). Ford spent the money and took the risk to renovate their huge River Rouge factory and turn it into a stellar example of what re-thinking design requirements in an environmentally friendly way can do. McDonough and Braungart's key point is, don't recycle later; design it so that it can be recycled, reused or renovated without waste. Ford saved \$35 million dollars "on day one." Let's see, saving \$35 million a year since its completion in 2002 -- that certainly would help Ford stay in the black.

As we continue to be asked to bail out every company that made a bad decision in the past few years, let's think about this: For every hidebound dinosaur out there trying to give money to political campaigns to look out for their interests, there are lots of small, hungry companies who are going to plan their new companies around environmentally-solid principles, who will be able to run meaner and leaner with more value for their shareholders. Which one would you rather be investing in, either as a shareholder or a taxpayer? Letting the dinosaurs die might have been in our best interest, because the new technologies, (which they show no interest in, by and large, and it was a struggle for Ford as well) will kill them off eventually anyway. There's a cartoon around on the net a caption saying something like "the importance of being on time" with Noah's ark out on the water and two dinosaurs who arrived late, watching them sail away. Those companies had their chance to take the risks to do it right. They were too late. Ford went for it, at the right time, and not only stayed afloat but appears to be pulling way ahead. Ironically, the companies now actively pursuing these technologies are not in the US, but in China and other countries. Our bailouts have made it seem unnecessary to pursue a new course, and Americans are being told to distrust the free market, so the contracts (including one from the Chinese government to design a whole City, while we are still dithering with "SmartGrowth") go elsewhere. We told everyone the government could handle it, by interfering in the market and regulations -- dependencies on government support replaced innovation, and now our oldest companies are coming in last in the race to the future.

The point? Cradle to Cradle works. It is a completely free market approach to both doing the right thing for the environment, and ensuring the success of our technological breakthroughs, which have propelled us to a clearer understanding of how to use the resources of the planet without abusing them. Throwing government money away to encourage us to return to the age of coal, or to lives that have limited freedoms in the name of saving the planet is totally unnecessary. Let the companies that start with clear thinking pave the way, and let the old ones retire and leave the field to a new age where thinking about the environment is the *first* thing that's done - not the last. Watch the video and see if you don't feel that sense of dread lifting and a new hope for how the world will proceed.

www.ted.com/talks/william_mc_donough_on_cradle_to_cradle_design.html
transcript at:

<http://dotsub.com/view/ca41c757-52e3-451d-bb66-00e9c98ecbaa/viewTranscript/eng>

REFERENCES:

- <http://cstep.cs.utep.edu/research/ezine/Ezine-TheUseandAbuseofScience.pdf>
Article on the way science is abused for many different purposes
- <http://www.stthomas.edu/recycle/ENERGY.HTM>
quotations on energy
- <http://globalwarming-arclein.blogspot.com/2009/11/co2-myth-busted.html>
Refuting the linkage between global warming and C02 [yup, the link misspelling is correct]
- http://visibleearth.nasa.gov/view_rec.php?id=2413
Previous NASA comments on ice changes
- http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/features/ice_bridge/ice_campaign.html
Ongoing research into changes in the ice sheets
- <http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/TimeShelf/>
2005 info on ice research
- <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/11/22/video-dr-tim-ball-on-the-cru-emails/>
An interview with Timothy Ball on the CRU emails aka "climategate"
- http://www.americanthinker.com/2008/10/an_open_letter_from_the_viscou_1.html
An Open Letter to John McCain aka the Monkton Letter
- <http://www.heartland.org/books/SurfaceStations.html>
Is the U.S. Surface Temperature Record Reliable?
- <http://www.defeatcongress.org/>
- <http://redrocks.libertyontherocks.com/?p=97>
Links to articles on Curtis Harris' book "It's the Congress, Stupid"
- <http://www.cokesbury.com/forms/ProductDetail.aspx?vsl=0001&pid=9780595268412>
Information on Curtis Harris' book "Ending Entrenched Power"

JOIN US FOR STIMULATING DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES AT THE LIBERTARIAN LUNCHESES IN BOULDER AND LONGMONT

For specific information, see our website at <http://www.lpboulder.org>
For questions, contact newsletter@lpboulder.org

LPBC BOARD MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT

NOVEMBER 30, 2009

The LPBC board will meet at Carelli's in Boulder
This meeting is open to the public

6:00 pm
(if you want to order dinner and get to meet some folks)
7:00 pm meeting

Carelli's is at 30th and Baseline
in the small mall across from the CU towers.

THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF BOULDER COUNTY

LPBC * 2525 Arapahoe Ave, Suite E4, PMB 427 *
Boulder * CO * 80302