Our Insane Anti-American Energy Policy

Introduction

Our nation has been blessed materially. Our fertile fields, our lakes and rivers and our climate are all beneficial for our production of weaalth. We are the largest exporters of food in the world. In addition, we have large deposits of coal, of natural gas and oil as well as being able to generate energy from our streams.

We also in our past registered more patents and invented more devices than anyone else. We produce over 30% of the worlds' products and have the biggest economy in the world in spite of only having 6% of the worlds' population.

However, our management of our resources leaves much to be desired. Even though we were first in the development of nuclear energy we are now far behind other developed nations. We are so burdened with rules and regulations that the obstructions to build cause us to take much more time than any others. China is presently building four nuclear power plants using American and French companies to do the construction and their plans are that a plant will be built in four years. In our country if the same construction companies were used it would take ten years. We have not built a nuclear power plant in the last thirty years and even though restrictions are supposedly being lessened there is still nothing under construction.

There have been no oil refineries built in the last thirty years and our productive capacity has decreased while our consumption has increased. We now import 60% of our requirements and thereby allow a cartel to establish prices and determine production. And, the price established has no relationship to the costs of mining, refining and distributing the oil. The cartel sets the price to maximize their profits and we do nothing. Even though we have huge oil deposits off our shores, in the gulf, Alaska and in shale in the Rocky Mountains we are not drilling and mining and trying to produce more oil.

We also are blessed with huge deposits of coal and steps have been taken by our government to reduce our production of coal. Our natural gas fields are really big and even though natural gas is used to heat our homes and produce electricity we have done nothing to encourage its use in transportation where it could reduce our costs.

In other words, our government seems to be against developing our energy production. If we did develop it there would be a substantial reduction in the costs of energy to our country but there is a greater reason for developing our energy especially considering oil for much of the world's production of oil comes from the volatile middle east and oil is an absolute necessity for us. Our security is threatened by our past actions and by our lack of internal energy sources.

Much of the blame for this problem is placed with the environmental movement. It seems that the environmentalists are against energy development as well as wanting to save the environment. They opposed nuclear power development even though nuclear is the cleanest and safest way to produce energy. They place more value on trees, varmints, animals and birds than on people. Many of their programs have financially harmed businesses and individuals to save some obscure critter. Man is the greatest thing God created and the Bible admonishes us to love our neighbor and not to value some fish more than man.

The environmental movement has lots of money and can advertise and write articles and books and hire lobbyists but they do not pass the laws that have led to our problem. The Congress passes those laws and the regulatory agencies they created have established issue rules and regulations that have prevented our energy development. We may conclude that the environmental-wackos are completely, totally wrong but that does not explain why our government has led us to our present situation. One possible explanation is that all of our government people responsible for this are insane. That is a better conclusion than thinking that they are deliberately doing this to harm our country and our people. It is possible that some environmental-wackos would like that but certainly not our own government.

That leaves us with some hope for if they are insane then we have a system that enables us to replace them. That is why this book is being written – we need to replace all of those responsible for interfering with our energy production – whatever reason they may have.

Chapter 1

The Environmental Octopus

This book is about our energy problem and a big part of that problem is caused by the environmentalists. As mentioned before it is really the Congress that is at blame but the thoughts, concepts, reasons and actions of the environmental groups must be addressed and refuted in order to allow us to free up our development of energy. We may even be able to convince some of the insane members of Congress and not have to replace all of them.

The publication , Federal Environment Laws, contains 61 Acts of Congress that have been passed to regulate and control our environment. These regulations started in the middle 1960's and were generally completed in the 1990's. Those laws regulate the air we breathe and the water we drink. They also control asbestos hazards, atomic energy, our coastal zones, nuclear and oil refinery and processing, endangered species, insecticides, and fungicides. They are involved with federal land policy, forest and rangelands,

atmospheric and pollution control, global climate protection, hazardous substances, lead based paint, low level radioactive waste, marine mammal protection, medical waste, mining and mineral resources, coastal monitoring, contaminated sediment, invasive species, noise control, ocean dumping, refuses, renewable energy, rivers and harbors, solid waste disposal, surface mining, toxic substances, and wood residues.

In other words, we are controlled in all aspects of our lives by the environmental laws.

It is probable that our environment is healthier and that our whole country is cleaner and a nicer place to live. However, there must have been some cost for all of that. Maybe we have even given up something of value for that. Or maybe what has been accomplished could have been achieved at lower costs and without depriving ourselves of something that we really need.

These environmental laws have been used to stop our building of nuclear power plants and to reduce our oil refinery capacity. They have prevented our drilling for oil and increased the costs to us of our gasoline. They have forced us to purchase oil from foreign countries in spite of our supply in Alaska, off of our coasts and in shale located in the Rocky Mountains.

They have led to clean-ups in unnecessary locations, have actually led to the mistaken destruction of a whole community, have forced dam construction to be postponed until supposed errors have been fixed, have forced the movement of a hospital to protect some bug, have prevented the clearing of fire-breaks which have led to the fires destroying the property involved, have stopped logging in forests, have stopped farmers from receiving water leading to loss of billions of dollars in lost production and have led to the loss of 40, 000 jobs, have led to the destruction of millions of acres of forest lands by obstructing cleanup in those forests, have had millions of acres of private property placed under the control of the government , have increased the costs of doing business to many companies, have forced us to drive less-safe, less-comfortable and more expensive cars and have enriched thousands of lawyers and law firms in that process.

These laws have been written in a manner that makes it possible for environmentalists to sue at little or no cost to them and has promoted actions which are detrimental to our country. When you examine what has been done it makes you wonder if the purpose was to improve our environment or to harm our nation. The environment in many cases has been improved but in other cases has actually been harmed. Many of the actions taken against businesses has interfered and added to their costs and has deprived us of the use of our own resources.

An excellent example of a law which has harmed us and not helped is the requirement for “environmental impact studies” that is necessary for every project. The study is expensive for it tries to examine all aspects of a project and it also takes a lot of time. Then, some bureaucrat or bureaucrats have to review and approve it and that takes more time and money. When that process is completed nothing has been accomplished. Money has been spent and time wasted but there has been no production of anything. When the project has been finished and completed then tests are done to see if there are violations. If so, then the company is responsible to fix them.

The company was always responsible to meet the requirements of the law and the impact study is ridiculous, expensive and time consuming and does not prevent pollution or anything. It is either an excellent example of bureaucratic stupidity from our government or an actual attempt to interfere with our progress or some form of insanity and should be repealed.

Having a clean environment is obviously good but being deprived of our resources is bad (disastrous?) and anything which substantially increases our costs of doing business is harmful to us. The government is like an octopus strangling us and controlling our economy and the environmentalists have tentacles into every aspect of our lives.

It is time to examine this whole movement and evaluate the results from the environmental laws and their application and what has been done to our ability to produce energy.

Chapter 2

The Global Warming Scam

Global Warming was not identified as a problem until the mid 80’s and we have not always had accurate measurement devices to define the problem. Naturally, over the past there have been periods of cold weather and periods of warm weather. Around 1000 AD there was the Medieval Warm Period which was very beneficial for everyone but it was followed by a cooler period. One of our sources for this information is The Little Ice Age,: How Climate Made History 1300 – 1850 by Brian Fagan.

After that period the weather cooled until the late 1840’s and after 1850 there has generally been a warming trend. There was cooling in the 1920’s, heating in the 1930’s and 1940’s, cooling in the 1950’s, 1960’s and 1970’s , warming in the 1980’s and 1990’s and cooling the last decade. There is nothing that has happened to justify the alarms of today.

Today, we have weather scientists and instruments and computers and all sorts of stuff that should enable us to record and analyze and predict the weather. (except what will take place tomorrow). Just 35 years ago – in the 70’s- those weather experts presented the following:

Science magazine (Dec.10, 1976) warned of "extensive Northern Hemisphere glaciations". Science Digest (February 1973) reported that "the world's climatologists are agreed " that we must " prepare for the next ice age". The Christian Science Monitor (" Warning: Earth's Climate is Changing Faster than Even Experts Expect, " Aug . 27 , 1974) reports that glaciers " have begun to advance ," "… growing seasons in England and Scandinavia are getting shorter " and " …the North Atlantic is cooling down about as fast as an ocean can cool". Newsweek agreed (the Cooling World, " April 28, 1975) that meteorologists "are almost unanimous " that catastrophic famines might result from the global cooling and the New York Times (Sept. 14, 1975) said "…may return to another ice age". The Times (May 21, 1975) also said "… a major cooling of the climate is widely considered inevitable " now that it is "…well established" that the Northern Hemisphere's climate " has been getting cooler since about 1950". From Fortune (February 1974). "Climatologists now blame those recurring droughts and floods on a global cooling trend. It could bring massive tragedies for mankind".

In 1969 environmentalist Nigel Calder warned, "The threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind". In 1968, professor Paul Ehrilch predicted, "…in the 1970's …hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death" as he predicted there would be major food shortages due to the impending cold weather.

There are more comments about the dangers of the new "ice age" but that should be enough to show that global cooling was considered to be a real problem in the 70's. They were wrong and very wrong. The news media that presented this terrible doom–day forecast about a coming ice age is the same group that presented global warming to us just 25 years later. How could they change so quickly and why should we believe them now?

Phil Jones, head of Great Britain's University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit (CRU) and a well known promoter of global warming, stated, "…the difference of warming rates for the periods 1860-1880, 1910-1940, and 1975-2009 is statistically insignificant … and that there has been no statistically – significant global warming since 1995; that in fact global temperatures have been trending to the downside since January of 2002. ".

Therefore, this chapter should be ended with the conclusion that global warming is non-existent and is not any more of a problem than the previously predicted ice age . However, let me assure the reader that the global warming industry will not accept this and that they will not go away. It is an industry and they have an agenda on which their employment depends and which they will not drop.

Vicious alarmists

Later we will look at the deliberate lies and deceptions involved with Climategate but it is of interest to realize the viciousness and hate that some of these alarmists have for those who disagree with them. A June 2, 2009 article posted to Talking Points Memo asked, "At what point do we jail or execute global warming deniers?". In June 2009, former Clinton administration official Joe Romm commented on his Climate Progress web site, "An entire generation will soon be ready to strangle you and your kind while you sleep in your beds". In 2008, Canadian environmentalist David Suzuki called for governmental leaders skeptical of global warming to be thrown "into jail". In 2007, the Weather Channel's climate expert called for withholding certification of skeptical meteorologists.

A July 2007 Senate report detailed how skeptical scientists have faced threats and intimidation. NASA's James Hansen has called for trials of climate skeptics in 2008 for "high crimes against humanity". Environmentalist Robert F. Kennedy Jr. lashed out at skeptics of 2007 declaring. "This is treason. And we need to start treating them as traitors". In 2009 RFK Jr. also called coal companies "criminal enterprises' and declared CEO's "should be in jail for all of eternity". These people are radical and vicious (and insane?) and are intent on keeping global warming as an accepted doctrine.

So, let us embark on a look at GLOBAL WARMING.

"The Sky is Falling" said Chicken Little

The term "global warming" does not sound very bad for warm is usually better than cold. Therefore, it is necessary for them to define it in such a manner that we will be concerned about it. So, we have alarmists who will describe all of the terrible things that happen because of global warming so that we will not want that to happen to us.

We'll start with the most famous of those who claim that global warming is a real problem and that "it is settled science" and that "the debate is over".– Nobel Laureate, Al Gore who won the prize for his movie , An Inconvenient Truth. However, a British judge, Justice Burton, ruled there were nine instances in the movie in which Gore went so far outside the scientific mainstream that he deemed his presentation "alarmist" and "apocalyptic". The British government, who is very supportive of global warming dangers, had ordered a copy sent to every public high school in the country and the judge ruled that any school which showed the movie would have to tell the students of nine gross errors. (the judge missed the biggest error for Gore had included the now discredited "hockey stick" graph as truth)

Sea levels were predicted to rise 20 feet, low lying pacific atolls were being inundated with the rising sea levels because of global warming and inhabitants were being forced to evacuate , the Ocean Conveyor will shut down, there is a direct coincidence between the rise in carbon dioxide and temperature, the snows of Kilimanjaro are disappearing, Lake Chad has dried up because of global warming, Hurricane Katrina was caused by global warming, polar bears are decreasing in number, and coral reefs are bleaching and fish species are decreasing at a rate 1000 times greater than normal. All of the claims are indeed "alarmist " and "apocalyptic" as the judge said and also erroneous. These claims are so ridiculous that it makes you wonder at AL Gore's sanity. The book and movie were effective for they were not exposed in our country and are essentially accepted and are still used and cited by these nutty alarmists.

Al Gore continues his ridiculous statements for his latest is that the heavy snowfalls of 2010 and 2011 are caused by global warming. Up is down and black is white with Al. I wonder if he has had a psychological exam recently?

And, there are more unbelievable predictions. Daniel Kammen, an energy professor at UC, Berkeley in a speech said, "Enjoy your camping now, people , because the Sierra forests will be burned up by 2050…Greenland's ice cap will melt… the oceans will rise 50 feet.

In July 2003, John Houghton, former co-chairman of the International Panel on Climate Control of the United Nations said that he "had no hesitation " in describing global warming "as a weapon of mass destruction".

From the Economist, July 10, 2010 we read, "Cleo Paskal, at the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, predicts that floods, storms, the failure of the Indian monsoon and agricultural collapse will bring " enormous, and specific, geopolitical, economic, and security consequences for all of us…the world of tomorrow looks chaotic and violent".

Former U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, now president of the Geneva-based Global Humanitarian Forum, issued a lengthy report warning that climate change disasters , such as droughts and floods, kill 315,000 each year and cost $125 billion, numbers that it says will rise to 500,000 and $340,000 by 2030. However, Roger Pielke ,Jr. an expert in disaster trends at the University of Colorado called the report," a methodological embarrassment" and a "poster child for how to lie with statistics". It is amazing that statements like these are actually accepted as likely to occur.

Because of the involvement of the United Nations and Kofi Annan in global warming it is appropriate to digress and review another activity of the United Nations which really demonstrates the corruption that exists in the UN. The Food for Oil Program that the United Nations and Kofi Annan had with Saddam Hussein really indicates the extent of how much we can trust Kofi Annan and the United Nations. The Oil for Food Program was established in 1995 for the purpose of enabling Saddam Hussein to sell oil and obtain funds to help provide for the people of Iraq. In addition to the usual profits from the sale of the oil Saddam also obtained around $10.2 billion more for his personal use. He did that by bribing various people and governments (France, Germany and Russia) through granting them options to purchase oil at special prices, usually without taking possession of the oil.

The most interesting part of the Food for Oil program was the investigation that took place. Mr. Annan was able to appoint the investigator, Mr. Paul Volcker. Mr. Volcker was known as a U.N. supporter and was on the Board of Directors of the United Nations Association of the USA and a major contributor to the U.N..

Mr. Annan also appointed the investigative panel. Mr. Annan then refused to grant them subpoena powers and required that all of those interviewed be approved by Mr. Annan. A threatening letter was sent to all the involved contractors informing them that they were not free to talk to the investigation without permission from the UN and UN employees were also instructed to obtain permission before talking to the investigators. The UN audit committee had audited the program on 58 different occasions and Mr.Annan refused to turn those audits over to the investigators and later refused to turn over documents to our Congress who also wished to investigate.

Mr. Vocker also stopped our Congress and withheld documents from them. Mr. Igbal Riza, chief of staff for Mr. Annan ordered the shredding of thousands of documents potentially of relevance to the Oil for Food inquiry. Some of those documents may have been generated by various organizations that were there to prevent these actions. There was an Undersecretary – general for Management duties, a Board of Auditors, a Joint Inspection Unit, an Office of Internal Oversight and an Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budget Q□estions. Since the documents were shredded there is no way to find out if these organizations were fulfilling their functions to prevent fraud.

Mr. Annan also stipulated that the final report be turned over to him and approved by him before it was issued.

The final report stated, " Our assignment has been to look for mis-or-mal administration in the Oil for Food program and for evidence of corruption within the U.N. organization and by contractors. Unhappily, we have found both". That report led 60 of our Congressmen to ask for Mr. Annan to resign. Mr. Annan called the findings "deeply embarrassing" but said he had no intentions of resigning". In other words Kofi feels immune to any criticism. In case you were not aware the U.N. is impervious to our criticism and control.

This report tells us that there is no reason to trust anything that Kofi annan says and this also reveals that the United Nations is also corrupt and not to be trusted which is also borne out by their reports on climate change.

Which leads us to review the activity of the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The global warming movement needed an organization behind it and the U.N. was perfect for that. Composed of bureaucrats from all over the world with the necessary funding the IPCC was formed in 1988.

In 1990 the UN IPCC issued a report on global warming which had been worked on by two thousand persons and more than 1000 of them were scientists. About 80 people saw and approved what they thought was the final report and then just a few altered it. That alternation was opposed by many who were skeptical about the altered version which included a "Summary for Policymakers" containing a previously unmentioned factor involving human activity's effect on climate. This led to the conclusion that "the balance of evidence suggests there is a discernible human influence on global climate". Those altering the report actually altered a graph and some of the text of the report and got away with it.

The media welcomed the report and ignored those who were objecting to the reports conclusion and maligned those who objected to the alterations . That included Dr, Frederick Seitz, the former president of the National Academy of Sciences whose objection was

published in the Wall Street Journal.

That IPCC executive Summary for Policymakers report says they are certain that emissions resulting from human activities are substantially increasing the atmospheric concentrations of the greenhouse gases, resulting in an additional warming of the earth's surface.

The Supplementary Report was issued in 1992 and confirmed the 1990 report. The Second Assessment report was issued in 1995 and agreed with the past presentations and again blamed human activity for altering the earth's climate as well as placing confidence in the computer models they were using to predict the future. (These models were absolutely necessary for their data was not sufficient to prove their contentions).

The Third Assessment Report was issued in 2001, verifying the past reports and conclusions but this report led to some complaints. Keith Shine, one of the IPCC"S lead authors, discussing the Policymakers Summary said, "We produce a draft, and then the policymakers go through it line by line and change the way it is presented".

Solid- state physicist Frederick Seitz, president emeritus of Rockefeller University, and past President of the National Academy of Sciences, publicly denounced the report, writing "I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to the IPCC report". His opposition was printed in the Leipzig Declaration of S. Fred Singer's Science and Environmental Project.

The Fourth Assessment Report was issued in 2007 and continued with their global warming claims. " Most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic (human) greenhouse gas concentrations". (This presents a problem for the temperature did not increase from the mid-20th century). Further the report states that anthropogenic warming and sea level rise would continue for centuries….However, these claims are no longer being accepted.

The New York Post published an article on Sept. 2, 2010 titled, Meltdown of the climate 'consensus'. "For two decades, The IPCC has spearheaded efforts to convince the world's governments that man-made carbon emissions pose a threat to the global temperature equilibrium – and to civilization itself". IPCC reports are widely cited as evidence for the urgent need for drastic action to "save the planet".

But, the prestigious InterAcademy Council,a consortium of national scientific academies which was formed in 2000 to give "high quality" advice to international bodies, "has finished a thorough review of IPCC practices – and found them badly wanting".

For example, the IPCC's much – vaunted Fourth Assessment Report claimed in 2007 that Himalayan glaciers were rapidly melting, and would possibly be gone by the year 2035. The claim was actually false – yet the IPCC cited it as proof of global warming. Then there's the IPCC earlier prediction in 2007 – which it claimed to have "high confidence" in – that global warming would lead to a 50 percent reduction in the rain-fed agricultural capacity of Africa. But, the Inter Academy council investigation found this IPCC claim was also based on weak evidence.

Some IPCC practices can only be called shoddy. As the Wall Street Journal reported, " some scientists invited by the IPCC to review the 2007 report before it was published questioned the Himalayan claim but those challenges "were not adequately considered". The truth is that the claim was speculation made after a phone interview of a single scientist.

The Wall Street Journal also reported that the InterAcademy council also said that the IPCC ignored scientific nuances and dismissed minority viewpoints in the report. John Christy, a climate scientist at the University of Alabama, who had participated in two of the IPCC's Reports said his doubts about man-made global warming were largely pushed aside both times. The investigation also said the IPCC sometimes failed to adequately reflect " properly documented views of scientists who disagreed with the consensus conclusions".

The 2007 report being criticized had stated that climate change , "is unequivocal" and "very likely" caused by human activity. However, Vice chair of the IPCC, Yuri Izrael, two months later, wrote " the panic over global warming is totally unjustified, " there is no serious threat to the climate" and humanity is "hypothetically … more threatened by cold than by global warming"

Everyone associated with the IPC C does not support global warming for Mojib Latif who is with the IPCC says we are in the first stage of a long-term cooling trend that will last another 10 to 20 years.

Shall we trust the bureaucrats at the United Nations? Their climate change bureaucrats are dependent upon global warming for their income. It is logical to conclude that they are always going to find that the globe is warming – and the faster the better for them.

The obvious conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the IPCC has an agenda to promote global warming and that this agenda is leading them to present information to "prove" their view and that this proof is not accurate and is even untrue.

There are many, many more predictions of catastrophe that could be cited but that should give an idea of the terrible fate that these alarmists state awaits us if we do not stop the globe from warming.

KYOTO

The Kyoto treaty was signed in 1997 and was rejected by our Senate by a vote of 95-0. Russia, China and India were exempted from it and so even if implemented would have had little effect on the environment. However, it was rejected on excellent grounds by our

Congress.

The Kyoto treaty (1997) will not accomplish anything even it it was implemented states Dr, Fred Singer, head of the S&EPP. The treaty would reduce emissions by a mere 5% among industrialized nations but would have a devastating effect on our economy. The Energy Information Administration has predicted that Kyoto would cost the United States 4.2% of GDP per year from 2008 to 2012 and $240 billion a year in GDP by 2030.

According to one study, by 2010 Kyoto will trigger a rise in food costs of 9%, medical care of 11% , and housing of 19%.

The Global Warming Petition Project urged Congress to reject the Kyoto pact as 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". More than 31,000 scientists signed the petition.

Dr. Arthur B. Robinson started a petition (The Oregon Petition) which was signed by 20,000 persons, 18,000 of whom have scientific degrees, many of them advance degrees and Dr. Fred Seitz helped get signatures by sending a letter stating the Kyoto agreement was "based on flawed ideas" and that "data on climate change do not show that human use of hydrocarbons is harmful".

The petition stated:

"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 natural plant and animal environments of the Earth."

Now there is a real refutation. Carbon dioxide has been pictured as the villain in our atmosphere and here is someone claiming it is beneficial. Someone is very, very wrong and/or lacking in the ability to reason.

Measurements

How do we know the globe is warming? Obviously, we now have a much greater ability to measure temperature than we did 200 years ago. History tells us of Greenland supporting agriculture around the period 1100 AD but we don't know how warm it was. We know that the Arkansas River froze solidly in the early 1800's but we don't know how cold it was then. Even now there are questions about the way we measure and the instruments used and their placement.

Dr. Walter Williams, professor at Georgetown University reported in his column that , "During the 1960's and into the 1980's the number of stations used for calculating global surface temperatures was about 6000. By 1990 the number of stations dropped to about 1500. Most of the stations dropped were in the colder regions of the Earth. According to Science & Environmental Policy Project, (S&EPP) Russia reported the East Anglia University Climate Research Unit was ignoring data from colder regions of Russia. NASA satellites uniformly monitor the Earth's lower atmosphere. The satellite based measurements are uncorrupted by urban heat islands and localized use changes that often taint records from surface temperature stations, giving false indications of warming".

Meteorologist Joe D'Aleo said, "the global databases of (surface station reports) are all contaminated by urbanization , major station dropout , missing data, bad siting, instruments with known warm biases being introduced without adjustment, and black-box and man made adjustments designed to maximize (reported warming) "

Dr. Fred Singer, past President of the Science and Environmental Project and distinguished research professor at George Mason University has indicated that weather satellites do not show any warming and they have been giving us data for 25 years. Weather balloons give the same results as the satellites.

Unfunded volunteers exposed how 89% of the temperature sensors at NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) were being collated from sites polluted by being too near heating and air-conditioning outlets and car parks and other artificial sources of heat.

Satellite based devices are the most uncorrupted and provide the most accurate way of measuring temperatures and the S&EPP state that "data from earth satellites in use since 1979 do not show any warming". Those scientists who present reports and analyses are free to use whatever they wish and it would seem that all sorts of measurement devices are available and can justify any conclusions. However, anyone using anything other than satellite devices are presenting data to prove their contentions and so there are alarmists that are still saying that the globe is warming and has been for the last decade. They are wrong and probably know it and are deliberately lying to protect their jobs or are lacking in sanity. Satellite devices are the most accurate and incorruptible and any other source should be viewed with skepticism.

Climategate

Michael Mann, James Hansen, Phil Jones, Michael Openheimer, Stephen Schneider, and Kevin Trenberth are some of the most well known players in the global warming scam and Climategate is exposing them.

Clive Cook of the Atlantic, after reading the climate email files of the U.K.'s Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia, called the overpowering "stink of intellectual corruption" – combined with mafia like suppression of dissent , suppression of evidence and methods , and "plain statistical incompetence " exposed by the documents.

Three weeks before the United Nations Climate Change Conference convened on December 7, 2009 in Copenhagen , Denmark an unknown hacker penetrated the computer system of the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at Great Britain's University of East Anglia. Those emails revealed that the climate change bunch were guilty of suppression of dissent, serious charges of fraud, unethical attacks on colleagues, censorship of opposing points of view and possible criminal destruction of, and withholding of evidence. Wow, that makes us wonder if this whole global warming movement is a scam.

Phil Jones, head of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit writes to colleagues that he has just used, "Mike's Nature trick " of adding other temperature data to "hide decline" in recent global temperatures. The Mike referred to is Michael Mann, professor of meteorology at Pennsylvania State University, whose influential "hockey stick" graph utilized statistical manipulation to produce a curve that would support claims about global warming. (Mann later admitted the hockey stick was incorrect). In the same email Jones opines that the death of global – warming critic John L. Daly, "In an odd way this is cheering news".

In a May 29, 2008 e-mail message, Jones writes, " Mike, can you delete any e-mails you may have had with keith re AR4? Keith will do likewise…Can you also e-mail Gene and get him to do the same? Will be getting Caspar to do likewise".

East Anglia climatologist Keith Briffa wrote, "I tried hard to balance the needs of the science with the IPCC , which were not always the same." In another e-mail Jones suggests to Mann that he has received legal advice that he will not have to comply with the Freedom of Information requests from other scientists that would require him releasing data that would justify his research claims.

A statement from Willie Soon and Sallie Baliunas which was published in the journal Climate Research led to Phil Jones writing to Mike Mann, "I'll be emailing the journal to tell them I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor". Mike Mann responded, " I think we should stop considering Climate Research as a legitimate peer-reviewed journal. Perhaps we should encourage our colleagues… to no longer submit to, or cite papers in, this journal. We would also need to consider what we tell or requests our more reasonable colleagues who currently sit on the editorial board". On July 11, 2003 Mr. Mann wrote to Mr. Jones, "I think the community should …terminate its involvement with this journal at all levels … and leave it to wither away into oblivion and disrepute".

In a July 8, 2004 e-mail Jones assures Mann that he and Kevin Trenberth will censor opposing scientific views from the forthcoming IPCC report. Jones writes, "I can't see either of these reports being in the next IPCC report. Kevin and I will keep them out somehow-even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is".

We then have the minority report from the Senate.

Washington, D.C.-The Minority Staff of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works released a report today titled, "'Consensus' Exposed: The CRU Controversy." The report covers the controversy surrounding emails and documents released from the University of East Anglia's Climatic Research Unit (CRU). It examines the extent to which those emails and documents affect the scientific work of the UN's IPCC, and how revelations of the IPCC's flawed science impacts the EPA's endangerment finding for greenhouse gases.

The report finds that some of the scientists involved in the CRU controversy violated ethical principles governing taxpayer-funded research and possibly federal laws. In addition, the Minority Staff believes the emails and accompanying documents seriously compromise the IPCC-based "consensus" and its central conclusion that anthropogenic emissions are inexorably leading to environmental catastrophes.

In its examination of the controversy, the Minority Staff found that the scientists:

- Obstructed release of damaging data and information;

- Manipulated data to reach preconceived conclusions;

- Colluded to pressure journal editors who published work questioning the climate science "consensus"; and

- Assumed activist roles to influence the political process.

"This EPW Minority Report shows that the CRU controversy is about far more than just scientists who lack interpersonal skills, or a little email squabble," said Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. "It's about unethical and potentially illegal behavior by some the world's leading climate scientists.

"The report also shows the world's leading climate scientists acting like political scientists, with an agenda disconnected from the principles of good science. And it shows that there is no consensus-except that there are significant gaps in what scientists know about the climate system. It's time for the Obama Administration to recognize this. Its endangerment finding for greenhouse gases rests on bad science. It should throw out that finding and abandon greenhouse gas regulation under the Clean Air Act-a policy that will mean fewer jobs, higher taxes and economic decline."

Climategate was so significant that the IPCC felt it necessary to have an "independent" investigation. Their report, produced by a committee chaired by Harold Shapiro, former president of Princeton reported as follows, "the IPCC needs clear statements on who decides, and by what criteria, what should be in its reports; on what it is looking for in its authors and on how they measure up; on what constitutes a conflict of interest for a panel member; and on what sort of primary material should be deemed worthy of inclusion (peer-reviewed science, yes; other stuff only if explicitly approved by the authors with appropriate arguments for so doing). Review authors need to marshal the thousands of comments they receive on drafts into clear arguments, and the authors need to respond to those arguments fully. Statements that go beyond the evidence or move into the realm of advocacy need to be avoided". In their own mealy-mouthed way it would seem that many scientists were being criticized.

A much clearer and direct statement was made as follows:

The July 19, 2010 editorial in the Wall Street Journal reads," At its core, the scandal (Climategate) was as much about the integrity of the scientific process as it was about the quality of science. Leading climate scientists were caught advising each other to delete potentially compromising emails, stonewall freedom of information requests and game the peer review process to exclude contributions from skeptical colleagues".

Climategate is not the only instance of corruption in this global warming war.

John Coleman, in an hour long television documentary titled, Global Warming: the Other Side, presents evidence that our National Climatic Data center has been manipulating weather data just as the British University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit.

Stop the Opposition

The opposition has become sufficient enough that the alarmists have felt a need to try to silence it. Al Gore felt it necessary to state that "the debate is over" in the hopes that it would stop and also to say "the science is settled". That was his hope for his income is dependent upon stopping the opposing views.

The EPA has stifled Dr. Alan Carlin, a senior research analyst at the EPA who questioned the outdated research on the health effects of greenhouse gases. Dr. Carlin produced a report complete with graphs using data from satellites which showed that the actual global temperature has FALLEN by 0.3 degrees C in the last three years. The EPA's answer to actual data is to tell him to "shut up".

Recently, they sought to yank a YouTube Video of created by EPA lawyers Allan Zabel and Laurie Williams that is critical of Cap-and-Trade. Carol Browner reportedly threatened auto execs in July by telling them to put "nothing in writing…ever" about negotiations with her.

On May, 2006 The Washington Post asserted that there were only " a handful of skeptics' of manmade warming fears. Bill Blakemore on Aug. 30, 2006 said , "after extensive searches, ABC News has found no such (scientific) debate on global warming". U.N . Framework Convention on Climate Change Executive Secretary Yvo Boer said it was "criminally irresponsible " to ignore the urgency of global warming. U.N. special climate envoy Dr. Gro Haarlem Brundtland on May 10, 2007 declared the climate debate "over" and added "it's completely immoral, even, to question the U.N.'s scientific "consensus" . C NN's Miles O'Brien said, " the scientific debate is over". Science czar, John Holden , was found in the Climategate files belittling the report.

The Weather Channel's senior climatologist, Heidi Cullen, has recommended that meteorologists be denied professional certification if they voice doubts about global warming alarmism. If they can shut dissenters up then they can continue to sell global warming.

The Deniers

The media has just told us that there is really not a large group of scientists that disagree with the global warming alarmists but they have applied a term "deniers" in case they find some. There are some.

Among the deniers are Richard Lintzen, the Alfred P.Sloan professor of Meterology at MIT, the University of Alabama's Roy W. Spencer, Stephen McIntyre of Climate Audit blog.

The Edmonton Journal (Alberta, Canada) reported that 68 percent of climate scientists and engineers do not believe " the debate on the scientific causes of recent climate change is settled".

Weather Channel founder John Coleman said, " global warming is the greatest scam in history". He said, " environmental extremists, notable politicians among them… create this wild 'scientific 'scenario of the civilization threatening environmental consequences from global warming unless we adhere to their radical agenda… I have read dozens of scientific papers. I have talked with numerous scientists … There is no runaway climate change. The impact of humans on climate is not catastrophic. Our planet is not in peril… In time, a decade or two , the outrageous scam will be obvious".

Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology said that it will take several years for the climate change scare to finally die, but " the death spiral will begin at some point, and it looks like the spinning will start in '08".

In December 2008 the Senate released the U.S. Senate Minority Report: "More than 650 International Scientists Dissent over Man-Made global Warming Claims : Scientists continue to Debunk 'Consensus in 2008".

On March 21, 2009, 59 additional scientists from NASA, the EPA, the Navy, the Air Force, the Defense and Energy Departments and

major universities joined the previous 650 who disagreed with the anthropogenic (human) global-warming hypothesis.

Here are some of the highlights of the Updated 2008 Senate Minority Report featuring over 650 international scientists dissenting from man-made climate fears: "I am a skeptic…Global warming has become a new religion." - Nobel Prize Winner for Physics, Ivar Giaever.

"Since I am no longer affiliated with any organization nor receiving any funding, I can speak quite frankly….As a scientist I remain skeptical...The main basis of the claim that man's release of greenhouse gases is the cause of the warming is based almost entirely upon climate models. We all know the frailty of models concerning the air-surface system." - Atmospheric Scientist Dr. Joanne Simpson, the first woman in the world to receive a PhD in meteorology, and formerly of NASA, who has authored more than 190 studies and has been called "among the most preeminent scientists of the last 100 years."

Warming fears are the "worst scientific scandal in the history…When people come to know what the truth is, they will feel deceived by science and scientists." - UN IPCC Japanese Scientist Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an award-winning PhD environmental physical chemist.

"The IPCC has actually become a closed circuit; it doesn't listen to others. It doesn't have open minds… I am really amazed that the Nobel Peace Prize has been given on scientifically incorrect conclusions by people who are not geologists." - Indian geologist Dr. Arun D. Ahluwalia at Punjab University and a board member of the UN-supported International Year of the Planet.

"So far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming." - Scientist Dr. Jarl R. Ahlbeck, a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in Finland, author of 200 scientific publications and former Greenpeace member.

There are many, many more scientists who have expressed their doubts.

"Anyone who claims that the debate is over and the conclusions are firm has a fundamentally unscientific approach to one of the most momentous issues of our time." - Solar physicist Dr. Pal Brekke, senior advisor to the Norwegian Space Centre in Oslo. Brekke has published more than 40 peer-reviewed scientific articles on the sun and solar interaction with the Earth.

"The models and forecasts of the UN IPCC "are incorrect because they only are based on mathematical models and presented results at scenarios that do not include, for example, solar activity." - Victor Manuel Velasco Herrera, a researcher at the Institute of Geophysics of the National Autonomous University of Mexico

"It is a blatant lie put forth in the media that makes it seem there is only a fringe of scientists who don't buy into anthropogenic global warming." - U.S Government Atmospheric Scientist Stanley B. Goldenberg of the Hurricane Research Division of NOAA.

"After reading [UN IPCC chairman] Pachauri's asinine comment [comparing skeptics to] Flat Earthers, it's hard to remain quiet." - Climate statistician Dr. William M. Briggs, who specializes in the statistics of forecast evaluation, serves on the American Meteorological Society's Probability and Statistics Committee and is an Associate Editor of Monthly Weather Review.

"The Kyoto theorists have put the cart before the horse. It is global warming that triggers higher levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, not the other way round…A large number of critical documents submitted at the 1995 U.N. conference in Madrid vanished without a trace. As a result, the discussion was one-sided and heavily biased, and the U.N. declared global warming to be a scientific fact," Andrei Kapitsa, a Russian geographer and Antarctic ice core researcher.

"Nature's regulatory instrument is water vapor: more carbon dioxide leads to less moisture in the air, keeping the overall GHG content in accord with the necessary balance conditions." – Prominent Hungarian Physicist and environmental researcher Dr. Miklós Zágoni reversed his view of man-made warming and is now a skeptic. Zágoni was once Hungary's most outspoken supporter of the Kyoto Protocol.

Ivar Giaever, Nobel Laureate in physics said," I am a skeptic…Global warming has become a new religion". Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an environmental physical chemist, said warming fears are the "worst scientific scandal in the history…When people come to know what the truth is they will feel deceived by science and scientists". Dr. Jarl R . Ahlbeck , a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in Finland and author of 200 scientific publications said, " So far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming". Atmospheric physicist James A. Peden, formerly of the Space Research and Coordination Center in Pittsburg, said, "Many (scientists) are now searching for a way to back out quietly (from promoting warming fears), without having their professional careers ruined."

Atmospheric scientist StanleyB. Goldenburg of the Hurricane Research Division of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration said, " It is a blatant lie put forth in the media that makes it seem there is only a fringe of scientists who don't buy into anthropogenic global warming".

David Bellamy, an Australian botanist wrote in the Australian that, "it's not even science anymore; it's anti-science". He noted that, "in every year since 1998, world temperatures have been getting colder, and in 2002 Arctic ice actually increased."

Astrophysicists Sallie Baliunas and Willie Soon at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics in the Solar, Stellar and Planetary Sciences Division published a report in 2003 showing that "the 20th century is probably not the warmest nor a uniquely extreme climatic period of the last millennium".

A statement sent to Congress in 2009 reads, "The sky is not falling". Far from warming, "the earth has been cooling for 10 years". That was signed by, Hal Lewis, physicist (emeritus at the University of California) , physicists Will Happer and Robert Austin of

Princeton, Lawrence Gould of the University of Hartford and climatologist Richard Lindzen of MIT.

There have been several books written explaining that global warming is not a threat. Climate Confusion by Roy W. Spencer, Climate of Fear, by Thomas Gale Moore, Taken by Storm, by Christopher Essex and Ross McKitrick, and Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years by S. Fred Singer and Dennis Avery, The Deniers by Lawrence Solomon and the Really Inconvenient Truth by Ian Murray.

Maybe the news media just didn't want to find anyone that disagreed with global warming for it is very obvious that there are many that find the "science" lacking in truth.

Errors, mistakes or deliberate misrepresentations

The NASA Goodard Institute for Space Studies has now revised their previous erroneous statements and now say the 1934 was the warmest year on record, not 1998; the third hottest year was 1921, not 2006 and three of the five hottest years occurred in the 1930's.

This has enormous significance for the alarmists have claimed that the warming trend is due to mankind and especially to industrialization. However, in 1934 there were only a few cars, fewer planes, not very many smoke-belching factories and not nearly as many humans as there are now. If the temperatures now are lower than 1934 then it is difficult to claim that industrialization and humans are causing the problem. If that is the case then there is no reason or cause to adopt any measures to correct a non-existent problem.

Michael Mann, professor of Meteorology at Pennsylvania University utilized statistical data to produce a curve that would support claims of recent human activities causing the warmest period in the past millennia (known as the "hockey stick" due to the shape of the curve).

Prior to Mr. Mann's "hockey stick curve" the accepted view (see IPCC's 1990 report) was that the world had undergone a warming period in the Middle Ages followed by a mid- millennium cold spell and a subsequent warming period. That view also held that the previous warming period was warmer than the present day.

Two Canadian climate experts, statistician Stephen McIntyre and economist Ross Mckitrick requested copies of Mann's calculations. Mann refused and also refused to divulge the algorithm he had used to concoct his graph. After his refusal the two published several articles challenging Mann's work. By the time the "hockey stick" was discredited the damage was done for many articles accepted the "hockey stick". Al Gore used it in his movie. Mann continues to receive grants from our government to continue his work on global warming.

. Mr. Mann's curve meant that we were now in a much worse situation than ever before which fit in well with the alarmists' programs. That "hockey stick" indicating significant warming trends was based on his computer models which he was unable to present and verify. Since there are no records indicating that catastrophic events occurred in the previous warming period one could conclude that warmer periods were not dangerous. Mr. Mann tried to remove that thought. His "hockey stick" was a projection and not fact but it was used by many to conclude that we were really heading for trouble and his changing of the past history helped show that our present danger was much more serious than ever before.

The obvious conclusion is that existing data does not substantiate the global warming belief and so it is necessary for them to make up data from which conclusions can be drawn to prove their theory.

When all the facts are examined it is clear that the earth has been following a very normal pattern for the last two centuries which we can accurately measure and that there is no need to be concerned about global warming or global cooling nor is there a need to take action to interfere with the climate of the Earth.

Indeed, global warming is the "greatest scam in history".

Common Sense

Although many would like to believe that mankind has a significant effect on the temperature of the earth that is probably not true. The earth is about 25,000 miles around and 70% of it is covered by water. The balance has mountains, deserts and uninhabited areas and so it is probable that mankind is concentrated on less than 10% of the earth. The atmosphere above the earth extends for many miles but the most dense concentration is about five miles. That is a lot of atmosphere to absorb the pollution that man emits and the atmosphere has a self-cleaning mechanism known as rain. Since the atmosphere constantly moves around the earth it is unlikely that any pollution remains in one place for an extended time and thus there is less likelihood of significant problems caused by that pollution. In other words man is puny as far as his influence on our environment is concerned.

With that in mind consider that the two most populous countries – China and India – have no intention of adopting any measures that would increase their costs of producing energy (and Russia is now expressing doubt about global warming). Thus, 40% of the population is not participating in any scheme to reduce carbon dioxide or limit global warming.

Without discussing this with any scientist common sense tells us that any action we take to reduce non-existent man-made global warming or carbon dioxide emissions will have no effect. And then consider that nearly all of Asia will do nothing to combat global warming leads to the conclusion that attempting to change the earth's temperature in fact borders on larceny or stupidity.

Then we must remember that this earth was organized by God with the accompanying solar system. For many thousands of years it

has functioned quite well – with or without the interference of man-and it seem likely that it will continue to do so –with or without man. If we don't like the environment then we should adapt to it for this earth is going to continue to exist and common sense should tell us to quit thinking we are capable of altering something that God has designed, organized and established.

Energy

There is another reason for us to be concerned about the erroneous claims about global warming. It is used as a means of reducing our production of energy.

Coal mining is being reduced and we get nearly half of our electricity from coal. President Obama continues to ask for subsidies for wind farms and solar plants to provide our energy because of his concern about global warming. We are wasting money in the development of green energy while reducing our production of that energy from oil. It is a misallocation of our resources and is harmful to us.

Chapter 3

The Carbon Dioxide Hoax

Since this chapter is more of the same let me start with a statement from the previous chapter which is pertinent .

Phil Jones, a real supporter of the global warming group and head of Great Britain's University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit (CRU) stated, "the difference of warming rates for the periods 1860-1880, 1910-1940, and 1975-2009 is statistically insignificant … and that there has been no statistically – significant global warming since 1995; that in fact global temperatures have been trending to the downside since January of 2002. ". Mr. Jones is one of the recognized experts who had been promoting the concept of global warming.

Carbon dioxide

The atmosphere is composed of approximately 95% water vapor, 4% carbon dioxide and smaller amounts of methane, argon, nitrous oxide and ozone . Carbon dioxide is produced by decaying plants, by humans and animals inhaling oxygen and then exhaling carbon dioxide and also produced when wood, oil, gasoline or any fuel containing carbon burns with a large supply of oxygen.

Greenhouse gases are gases in an atmosphere that absorb and emit radiation within the thermal infrared range. This process is the fundamental cause of the greenhouse effect..

Carbon dioxide is used by plants during photosynthesis to make sugars. Photosynthesis is a process that converts carbon dioxide into organic compounds, especially sugars, using the energy from sunlight. Photosynthesis occurs in plants, algae, and many species of bacteria, but not in archaea. Photosynthetic organisms are called photoautotrophs, since they can create their own food. In plants, algae, and cyanobacteria, photosynthesis uses carbon dioxide and water, releasing oxygen as a waste product.

Photosynthesis is vital for life on Earth. As well as maintaining the normal level of oxygen in the atmosphere, nearly all life either depends on it directly as a source of energy, or indirectly as the ultimate source of the energy in their food. The rate of energy capture by photosynthesis is immense, approximately 100 terawatts which is about six times larger than the power consumption of human civilization.] As well as energy, photosynthesis is also the source of the carbon in all the organic compounds within organisms' bodies. In all, photosynthetic organisms convert around 100–115 teragrams of carbon into biomass per year.]

So, with the above definitions we know that carbon dioxide is a fertilizer, is necessary for life here on earth and is part of the so called "greenhouses gases".

With that knowledge it seems that we would want to increase the amount of carbon dioxide in the earth. However, climate scientists have claimed that those greenhouses gases form an umbrella over the earth and retain heat which leads to global warming. These are the same scientists that have claimed that global warming is a significant problem for us and that we must reduce the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. We have already established that there is no global warming but the claims about greenhouse gases needs to be examined.

Because the idea of our earth warming does not seem terribly bad, the environmentalists needed to find something that would make it bad. Since our atmosphere consists primarily water vapor, which is clearly not bad, the wackos had to find something else and the only other element of the atmosphere that is significant is carbon dioxide. That is still a problem for carbon dioxide comprises only 4 to 6 % of the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide still represents a problem for them for carbon dioxide is very, very beneficial for mankind.

Ian Pilmer, author of Heaven and Earth, states that atmospheric carbon dioxide is actually the lowest it's been for 500 million years and that the hypothesis that humans can actually change climate is unsupported by evidence from geology, archaeology, history and astronomy.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administrations Earth System research Laboratory at Mauna Loa, HI , consistently and reliably has measured CO2 for the last fifty years . They state that CO2 concentrations have risen steadily for a half century .

Walter Williams, Professor at Georgetown University, reports, "The earth has been cooling for ten years…the present cooling was not

predicted by the alarmists' computer models. Last March, more than 700 international scientists went on record dissenting over manmade global warming claims. About 31,500 American scientists , including 9,029 Ph.D's have signed a petition that reads, "There is no convincing evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane or other greenhouses is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate.

"Even doubling or tripling the amount of carbon dioxide will virtually have little impact, as water vapor and water condensed on particles as clouds dominate the worldwide scene and always will." – . Geoffrey G. Duffy, a professor in the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering of the University of Auckland, NZ.

Dr.. Alan Carlin of the EPA wrote an analysis that noted that the global temperatures have declined over the last 11 years while carbon emissions have increased. His report says," Fossil fuel and cement emissions increased by 3.3 percent per year during 2000-2006 , compared to 1.3 percent per year in the 1990's. Similarly, atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased by 1.93 parts per million per year during 2000-2006 compared to 1.8 in the 1990's. And yet, despite accelerating emission rates and concentrations, there's been no net warming in the 21st century, and more accurately, a decline ."

Professor Syun-Ichi Akasofu, director of the International Arctic Research Center notes,"CO2 began to increase exponentially in about 1940. But, temperature actually began to decrease in 1940 and continued until about 1975 . He notes that CO2 is not causing climate change. "When the CO2 is increasing rapidly, but yet the temperature decreasing then we can not say that CO2 and the temperature go together."

MIT professor Richard S. Lindzen states, "atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide have risen over the past two centuries and that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas whose increase is likely to warm the earth (one of many, the most important being water vapor and clouds). But, - and I cannot stress this enough – we are not in a position to confidently attribute past climate change to carbon dioxide or to forecast what the climate will be in the future."

Dr. John R. Christy, professor of Atmospheric Science and Director of the Earth system Science Center at the University of Alabama pointed out that carbon dioxide is not a "pollutant" and that its beneficial effect on plant life "is the lifeblood of the planet."

From an article in The New American by Dennis J. Behreandt we read," Imagine a world without carbon dioxide. It would be a world without life. Plants of all kind would disappear…gone too would be herbivorous creatures,…and the great carnivores would disappear as well. Finally, without plants and animals man too would disappear.

"Fortunately, there is no shortage of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the Earth's plant life continues to thrive. What would happen in a world in which carbon dioxide is increasing? Will plant growth benefit? Will crop yields improve? Will the Earth actually become greener? Even a rudimentary knowledge of carbon dioxide … would suggest that the answer to all of these questions must be yes." "With increasing levels of carbon dioxide, all sorts of crops, including wheat, can be expected to be more productive, increasing the food supply."

Dr. Robert Balling, the director of climatology at Arizona State University, claims that increased carbon dioxide, far from being harmful, is extremely beneficial. Dr. Balling notes that there are "thousands of articles showing that elevated concentrations of carbon oxide will be beneficial for plants." Dr. David Bellamy, a famed environmentalist, author and producer for the BBC and Dr. Jack Barrett, professor of physical chemistry at London's Imperial College have written," It (carbon dioxide) is in fact, the most important airborne fertilizer in the world and without it there would be no green plants at all".

Dr. S. Fred Singer, the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service has stated, "…that any warming from the growth of greenhouse gases is likely to be minor, difficult to detect above the natural fluctuations of the climate, and therefore inconsequential. In addition, the impacts of warming and the higher carbon dioxide levels are likely to be beneficial for human activities, especially for agriculture that thrives on carbon dioxide". "If it (the earth) does warm, there will be numerous benefits. Agriculture will be aided because crops will grow faster and sturdier."

Dr. Arthur B. Robinson started a project known as the Oregon Project to object to the Kyoto treaty, signed by over 20,000 scientists. In part, the project stated, "The proposed limits on greenhouse gases (in the Kyoto treaty) would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of humankind. 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 evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth".

Dr. Timothy Ball of the Natural Resources Stewardship Project in Canada states, "Believe it or not, Global Warming is not due to human contribution of Carbon Dioxide. This, in fact is the greatest deception in the history of science".

"I am convinced that the current alarm over carbon dioxide is mistaken...Fears about man-made global warming are unwarranted and are not based on good science." – says Award Winning Physicist Dr. Will Happer, Professor at the Department of Physics at Princeton University and Former Director of Energy Research at the Department of Energy, who has published over 200 scientific papers, and is a fellow of the American Physical Society, The American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Academy of Sciences.

It seems hard to believe that carbon dioxide has been selected as the "villain" in the global warming debate. It does exist in the atmosphere and greenhouse gases do form a barrier over the earth that will help retain heat. However, that heat could be very

beneficial to the earth and carbon dioxide itself is very definitely beneficial – even necessary- for our existence and the fact that the global warming alarmists have selected it as a problem tell us more about their real objective.

Since the burning of oil, coal, wood and other fossil fuels produces carbon dioxide their real objective must be to reduce the amount of energy that is produced by that action. With all the above information it is hard to conclude that these wackos don't know that. It has been known for years that carbon dioxide is beneficial so this is not a newly discovered revelation. What is new is their claim that it is bad. Are these "scientists" stupid, deliberately trying to stop the development of energy or just "looney tunes"?

The production of carbon dioxide does not lead to global warming and the above statements from scientists should establish that fact. If it did, since the globe is not warming, there would still be no need to reduce the amount of carbon dioxide. As established above carbon dioxide is beneficial to plants and mankind so their objective is something else. That seems hard to believe but logic leads us to conclude that these alarmists either do not want the production of energy or do not want us to industrialize our world. Are these environmental alarmists really this far gone? Or, is it possible that there is another motive? Money?

Chapter 4

WHY

Why has global warming become such a huge problem, or rather a reported problem? One natural conclusion is that those promoting it have a great deal to gain from it – namely their employment. That doesn't explain the news media support, the support of business, of governments and bankers. Could it possibly be money?

Automobile companies have invested billions in research and investment in producing "green cars". General Electric and Phillips have spent millions lobbying Congress to outlaw incandescent bulbs to force us to buy costly compact fluorescent light bulbs. (General Electric has just closed a plant in West Virginia that was producing incandescent bulbs and laid off 200 people for they will be getting the fluorescent light bulbs to replace them from China). Farmers and ethanol manufactures have gotten Congress to enact laws mandating greater use of their product (since they could not sell it), as well as massive subsidies.

Federal, state and local agencies have spent billions of dollars to deal with all aspects of global warming.

An article in Human Events dated August 10, 2009 entitled, How the US Government Subsidizes Global Warming Industry contains the following:

By the end of 2009, U.S. tax payers will have subsidized the American global-warming industry to the tune of $79 billion – with trillions more to come. Climate Money, published last month by the Science and Public Policy Institute (SPPI), is the first study to compile the cost to U.S. taxpayers of national climate-related policies taken from figures in the government's own documents . Author Joanne Nova points to a "well- funded, highly organized climate monopoly" that, she says, is wasting billions of dollars through the lack of any proper science "audit".

Most scathing is the accusation that massive public expenditure has "created a powerful alliance of self-serving vested interests" drawn by the prospect of lucrative profits soon to be garnered from carbon trading (CCX is examined later).

Climate Money says the U. S . Government has "poured in $32 billion for climate research – and another $36 billion for development of climate-related technologies" over the last 20 years. Yet, " after spending $30 billion on pure science research, no one is able to point to a single piece of empirical evidence that man-made carbon dioxide has a significant effect on the global climate. The report makes the telling point that a burgeoning industry employing thousands and receiving billions in free government handouts simply has no "real incentive to 'announce' the discovery of carbon's role ".

Nova also perceives a "ratchet effect" whereby pro-AGW (anthropogenic – man made – global warming) theory is "reported, repeated, trumpeted and asserted" while anti AGW findings, often the work of unfunded, retired scientists , lie unstudied, ignored and delayed". Unfunded volunteers exposed how 89% of the temperature sensors at NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) were being collated from sites polluted by being too near heating and air-conditioning outlets and car parks and other artificial sources of heat.

The World Bank reports that carbon trading has doubled from $63 billion in 2007 to $126 billion in 2008 primarily in Europe. Bart Chilton of the commodity Futures Trading Commission predicts carbon trading will become a $2 trillion market and the "largest commodity market in the world"

Which leads us to the other reason for them demonizing carbon dioxide.

In 2001 a new organization was founded in Chicago – The Chicago Climate Exchange (CXX). (Notice that the CCX was formed in 2001- way before Cap and Trade was passed). In anticipation of a Cap and Trade program the exchange was founded to process the trading that would take place under the program. It was anticipated that trading volume would eventually reach trillions of dollars and with a 4% commission that would generate over $40 billion dollars to the owners. In 2009 the CXX declared their membership to represent 17% of Dow Industrials, 20% of US Utility sector and 10% of Fortune 100 companies. There are lots of groups and people that are ready to trade emissions and who would benefit from a Cap and Trade bill such as the Waxman-Markey bill.

We have the new report from Patrick Henningen (August 10,2010) .

“Plagued by a free fall in carbon emissions prices and the perennial failure of Washington to pass any binding Cap and Trade Bill, it seems that the Chicago Climate Exchange is on its last leg, announcing that it will be scaling back its operations.

“Chicago Climate Exchange or CCX, is North America’s sole voluntary, legally binding greenhouse gas trading and carbon “offset” projects in North America and Brazil. Rueters reported on Aug 11th that Intercontinental Exchange Inc, the operating body who purchased the struggling CCX in May this year, will be scaling back major operations this month, a move that includes massive layoffs. This is likely due to the complete market free-fall of their only product… carbon emissions.

“Anthony Watts from the climate watchdog website Watts Up With That posts a graph from the CCX which shows carbon prices dropping like a stone, bottoming out this week at the embarrassingly low figure of 10 cents per tonne. Compare this to trading prices during its brief hey day in May and June 2008 where market highs reached $5.85 and $7.40 respectively, and you can say that most investors will be evaluating carbon as one of today’s more worthless commodities.

“Unlike most real markets, the carbon market was created by banks and governments so that new investment opportunities could seamlessly dovetail with specific government policies. It’s a fantasy casino based on a doctrine of pure science fiction. Certainly, gaming the system has always been at the top on the agenda of the new green eco-trader. Most people, investors included, might innocently ask the fundamental question, “what’s the point of having a CO2 commodities market?” The answer to that question should be obvious by now, and you can certainly look to the initial stakeholders in the various international climate trading bodies for a ‘Who’s Who’ list of individuals that have actively been pushing the global warming concept from its inception.

“Carbon trading is underpinned by an equally dodgy product called ‘carbon off-sets”, most of which are taken on face value by the buyer. Not based on an actual ton of carbon emitted, rather governing agencies are issuing certificates for a fictional commodity of emissions not emitted. A rather wild concept. Worse than this however, it is near impossible to verify which of these thousands of so-called off-set projects in the developing world are actually legitimate. In the coming years, we will no doubt see or read a number exposes detailing the depths of this fantastic green scam.

“Get in early and then get out.

“The formula: create an investment vehicle, hype the new commodity, buy low, watch share prices rise, sell high. The result is money, lots of it. In some cases it’s been about driving up the share prices of companies Gore’s group has already invested in. The fact that the original shareholders of the CCX have already bailed out with their sale to Intercontinental Exchange Inc. for a modest $600 million earlier this year only reinforces the reality that its creators have already lost faith in their elaborate invention. Likewise, the self-styled leaders of the climate change crusade Maurice Strong and Al Gore have already cashed in carbon fortunes already, whilst other active politicians like US President Barrack Obama, and United Nations IPCC Chief Rajendra K. Pachauri (arguably the world’s wealthiest retired railway engineer) are engaged in similar play with their own financial Interests in the Carbon Markets.

“Like all government rigged quasi-commercial schemes, the only real beneficiaries are the initial shareholders- a special inner circle who are naturally ahead of the curve knowing about legislation and policy before it comes into existence. They are sometimes called the great and the good, the in-crowd, or the smartest men in the room (again, see Enron). Of these, almost all have jumped ship out of the market while their preferred shares- or in the case of the larger energy and manufacturing monopolies, their gratis “carbon allowances” given to them free by their governments- are still worth something. If you’re on the inside, it’s simple: get in early, make money and then get out”.

So, global warming and carbon dioxide demonizing are schemes to enrich those who can influence and even control the news media and governments and the CCX and its demise are excellent examples of that”.

U.S. companies and interest groups hired 2,430 lobbyists in 2008 - up 300% from five years ago. Fifty of the biggest U.S. electric utilities – spent $ 51 million on lobbyists in just six months. The largest wind-turbine manufacturer , Vestas, sponsors CNN’s Climate in Peril , and urges governments to invest heavily in the wind market.

S. Fred Singer, professor emeritus of Environmental Science at the University of Virginia and President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project , said, ”Environmental organizations globally, such as Greenpeace, the Sierra Club and the Environmental Defense Fund, have raked in billions of dollars. Multi-billion-dollar government subsidies for useless mitigation schemes are large and growing. Emission trading programs will soon reach the $100 billion a year level, with large fees paid to brokers and those who operate the scams.”.

Conclusion

Weather Channel founder John Coleman said, “ global warming is the greatest scam in history”

There are many who are making and have made lots of money from it, some in salaries, some in subsidies (manufacturing, farming and development) , some in university grants, some in publishing, some in trading and some in banking and many in government. It has taken the cooperation of many, many individuals, groups and organizations – so many in fact that it almost seems unbelievable.

That would require “scientists” who would use incorrect measurements to prove the existence of global warming, and who would agree to a treaty on global warming, and who would alter reports from organizations that were investigating global warming, and who would attack those that were opposing their contentions. It would also require those “scientists” to try to silence all those disagreeing

and even try to destroy any publication that might present the other side. If questioned those "scientists" would need to appoint a friendly group to investigate them in order to clear them of malfeasance. It would necessitate ignoring those who objected and would require the news media to promote the global warming view and to deny the existence of opposition even when that opposition presented petitions and books showing the other view.

It would require hundreds of lobbyists representing ethanol manufacturers, algae producers, electric car manufacturers, windmill manufacturers, battery developers and solar panel producers to try to gain financing for their schemes. It would require stupid or corrupt politicians (maybe insane?) to grant funds for that effort.

It would even require some "scientists" to invent erroneous data like "hockey sticks" and change known past history in order to further their agenda. It would require mistakes by NASA in identifying the temperature that existed at certain dates and then using that erroneous data to establish their incorrect position.

It appears that all of those requirements have been met.

Chapter 5

CAP and TRADE

Emissions trading (also known as cap and trade) is a market-based approach used to control pollution by providing economic incentives for achieving reductions in the emissions of pollutants

A central authority (usually a governmental body) sets a limit or cap on the amount of a pollutant that can be emitted. The limit or cap is allocated or sold to firms in the form of emissions permits which represent the right to emit or discharge a specific volume of the specified pollutant. Firms are required to hold a number of permits (or credits) equivalent to their emissions. The total number of permits cannot exceed the cap, limiting total emissions to that level. Firms that need to increase their emission permits must buy permits from those who require fewer permits. The transfer of permits is referred to as a trade. In effect, the buyer is paying a charge for polluting, while the seller is being rewarded for having reduced emissions. Thus, in theory, those who can reduce emissions most cheaply will do so, achieving the pollution reduction at the lowest cost to society. There are active trading programs in several air pollutants. For greenhouse gases the largest is the European Union Emission Trading Scheme.

On June 26, 2009, the House of Representatives passed the Waxman – Markey bill which would have enacted a cap and trade scheme here in our country. Fortunately, the bill did not pass the Senate and right now appears to be dead.

If it had passed there would have been limits placed on the amount of carbon dioxide that could be emitted by various businesses with the objective of reducing the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Analysis by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) shows that a 60 percent reduction in CO2 emissions by 2050 will reduce CO2 concentrations by only 25 ppm in 2095. This reduction would affect world temperatures by 0.1 to 0.2 degrees C. In other words, it would make virtually no difference. Even though the reduction in CO2 is the published reason for this bill there must be some other reason for doing this for the bill does not accomplish that.

The Heritage Foundation has analyzed the Waxman-Markey bill and provides the following comments. "Implementing a cap-and-trade program to cut emissions by 70 percent creates a transfer within the United States that is equivalent to taxes on the order of $250 billion to $300 billion per year, just for the years 2012 to 2030. The combined transfer is about $5 trillion in just the first 20 years. This takes the purchasing power from the households and turns it over to the federal government or to whomever the government assigns the rights to the permits for emissions (allowances). This would be one of the largest taxes in the economy--almost twice as large as the highway use taxes".

They further state: "Our analytical models are not suited to making projections beyond 2030. Nevertheless, the economic impacts of this cap-and-trade program in just the first two decades were extraordinary. The estimated aggregate losses to Gross Domestic Product (GDP), adjusted for inflation, are $4.8 trillion. By 2029 the job losses in the manufacturing sector will be nearly 3 million.

Because the transfer, in this case, is similar in magnitude to the lost GDP, we need to be clear on the distinction. A cap-and-trade program with an emissions reduction profile similar to that of last year's Lieberman-Warner bill, will cause an aggregate $5 trillion of transfers after it destroys $4.8 trillion of national income (GDP).

"In colloquial terms, the pie gets smaller by nearly $5 trillion and then a $5 trillion piece is cut out and redistributed.

"There are other problems associated with this. Cap-and-trade programs frequently include provisions to protect domestic industries from competition with firms in countries that have not adopted similarly costly mechanisms for reducing CO2. While the intent is certainly understandable, the provisions create the possibility of a protectionist wolf in global-warming clothes.

"Putting these protectionist policies into operation is a bureaucratic nightmare. Every product from every country will need to be judged to determine the level of advantage it may have due to different carbon-cutting regimes. Since different countries can have different approaches and since different manufacturers can use different technologies and processes, assigning an offsetting CO2 tariff will necessarily involve arbitrary decisions. The potential for a trade war is very real".

"The Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation analyzed a proposal to cut CO2 emissions by 70 percent. Such a cut would

have little impact on global temperatures. At best, the trade-off is trillions of dollars in lost income and hundreds of thousands of lost jobs" .

There are also the costs of this Cap and Trade scheme. Last week, the Congressional Budget Office released their analysis of the Waxman-Markey climate change bill that had proponents of the bill claiming we could save the planet for just $175 per household. That was the figure CBO estimated cap and trade would cost households in 2020, which "includes the cost of restructuring the production and use of energy and of payments made to foreign entities under the program, but it does not include the economic benefits and other benefits of the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and the associated slowing of climate change."

The Heritage Foundation assessment continues. "The trouble with the analysis is that costs are grossly underestimated. The trouble with legislation is that it will have virtually no impact on climate.

Overall, there are a number of basic problems with CBO's analysis:

• Their allowance cost numbers don't add up. They say the allowance price will be $28. Since there are 5.056 billion tons of CO2 equivalent in the cap that year, that implies a $141 billion gross cost. They list 91.4.. In the CBO's June 5 analysis of Waxman-Markey, they projected allowance revenues of $119.7 billion, 129.7 billion, $136 billion, $145.6 billion, and $152.9 billion for the years 2015 to 2019. It's hard to believe that the next number in that series would be $91.4 billion.

• They assume that spending/distribution of allowance revenue is dollar-for-dollar equivalent to a direct cash rebate to energy consumers. That is, the carbon tax isn't a tax if the government spends the money. When have Americans ever seen all of a tax returned to them? It's like suggesting your tax rebate will be as large as the amount taken from your paycheck every year.

• Most problematic is their complete omission of economic damage from restricting energy use. Footnote three on page four reads, "The resource cost does not indicate the potential decrease in gross domestic product (GDP) that could result from the cap. The reduction in GDP would also include indirect general equilibrium effects, such as changes in the labor supply resulting from reductions in real wages and potential reductions in the productivity of capital and labor." That's a pretty big chunk of change to ignore. In The Heritage Foundation's analysis of the Waxman-Markey climate change legislation, the GDP hit in 2020 was $161 billion (2009 dollars). For a family of four, that is $1,870 that they ignore.

"It's also worth noting that 2020 had the second lowest GDP loss of the 24 years we analyzed. For all years the average was $393 billion or over double the hit in 2020. In 2035 (the last year analyzed by Heritage) the lost GDP works out to $6,790 per family of four and that is before they pay their $4,600 share of the carbon taxes (again, costs are adjusted for inflation to reflect 2009 prices).

Also telling, on page 5, the report says:

"The distribution of the gross cost of complying with the policy would be quite different if the price level did not increase as a result of the cap—if, for example, the Federal Reserve adjusted monetary policy to prevent such an increase. In that case, the compliance costs would fall on workers and investors in the form of lower wages and profits.

"So high inflation will help mask the pain (at least in 2020); however, it is doubtful the Fed would not act to try to keep inflation low especially if investors and international investors are getting hit. According to the CBO, then, this would cause workers and investors to be hit harder. But if investors are hit harder, they will invest less; therefore, there will be less capital and the potential GDP will be lower going forward than it would otherwise be. A lower potential GDP means fewer opportunities for future populations. (Note: The Heritage analysis assumes the Fed would use a Taylor type rule. The CBO inflation number in 2020 [0.7 increase in CPI] matches Heritage's exactly. Yet the CBO claims it assumes no action by they Fed, while Heritage does.)

"Furthermore, the CBO is misleading on the "costs" estimates. They are comparing "net costs" as those assuming the government did not recycle the revenue from allowances back to the consumers (the "gross cost" of the allowance) to the "net cost" of allowance that has been recycled. Their analysis is not a net cost to the economy in terms of the overall economic cost without a Waxman-Markey cap and trade bill versus the overall economic cost with Waxman-Markey. Our analysis measures the effects of cap and trade versus a baseline with no cap and trade legislation in place.

"Higher energy costs create a significantly slower economy and reduce America's growth potential. Heritage analysis finds that by 2035, a projected 2.5 million jobs are lost below the baseline (without a cap and trade bill). The average Gross Domestic Product (GDP) lost is $393 billion, hitting a high of $662 billion in 2035. The negative economic impacts accumulate, and the national debt is no exception. The increase in family-of-four debt, solely because of Waxman-Markey, hits an almost unbelievable $114,915 by 2035.

"Whatever the costs, we will get almost nothing in exchange. According to climatologist Chip Knappenberger, Waxman-Markey would moderate temperatures by only hundredths of a degree in 2050 and no more than two-tenths of a degree at the end of the century. This doesn't sound like a great deal for the next generation—millions of lost jobs, trillions of lost income, 50-90 percent higher energy prices, stunning increases in the national debt, and all for undetectable changes in world temperature.

"Farm income (after paying all expenses) is expected to drop $8 billion in 2012, $25 billion in 2024 and over $50 billion in 2035. These are decreases of 28%, 60% and 94%, respectively.

"The average net income lost over the 2010-2035 timeline is $23 billion, which is a 57% decrease from the baseline. Construction costs of farm buildings will go up from the baseline by 5.5% in 2025 and 10% by 2034. By 2035, gasoline and diesel costs are expected to be 58% higher and electric rates 90% higher. "No wonder agriculture groups are increasingly coming out against the

Waxman-Markey bill. They know agriculture is a target. They know that cap-and-trade promises to destroy their livelihoods. A bill of this magnitude deserves thoughtful consideration and debate. Instead, Speaker Pelosi is rushing it through Congress to "the detriment of all of us," says Ranking Member Frank Lucas.

"To date, 42 agriculture groups have written letters to members of Congress expressing opposition to the Waxman-Markey bill".

In 2007 Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed AB-32 which was California's version of "Cap and Trade". The state auditing agency released on May 13 its study concluding, "California's economy at large will likely be adversely affected in the near term by implementing climate-related policies that are not adopted elsewhere". The study finds that AB 32 will raise energy prices, "causing the prices of goods and services to rise; lowering business profits; and reducing production, income and jobs".

Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) has issued a statement concerning Waxman-Markey: "EPA's Anti-Industrial Policy - Threatening Jobs and America's Manufacturing Base

"On that note, let's begin with the claim that Waxman-Markey will be an engine of job creation. First, there's no evidence that this will create an overall net gain of new jobs. Putting stress on "net gain" is important here. Backers routinely claim the bill will create "green" jobs in the renewable energy. That's true—there will be greater demand for solar panels and windmills. But that's only one side of the equation.

"The fact is that Waxman-Markey will destroy millions of manufacturing jobs, meaning that America will experience a net job loss. Consider a recent analysis of Waxman-Markey by CRA International, commissioned by the National Black Chamber of Commerce. The analysis found that, "the number of these new 'green jobs' will be lower than the number of the other jobs that [Waxman-Markey] would destroy elsewhere in the economy.

"In total, Waxman-Markey would cause a net reduction of 2.3 million to 2.7 million jobs. In other words, on the one hand, we'll create some green jobs, but on the other, we'll destroy many more jobs. Take Spain as an example. According to a study from King Juan University in Madrid, every job in renewable energies created in Spain in the year 2000 has cost 571,138 Euros and has been the cause of the loss of 2.2 jobs elsewhere in the economy. Now the Democrats want to transfer that same logic to the United States. They want to use expanded government, bureaucracy and taxes to create jobs, while if the private sector could just go to work, 2.2 jobs could be created for every 1 job that is created by the government. In this economy, those numbers add up.

"Now let's take a closer look at the legislation. I think most Americans would find it curious that a bill that supposedly creates jobs contains provisions to help people who would lose their jobs because of the legislation. But here they are. Let me read the provisions to you.

"Title IV, Section B, Part 2, is called "Climate Change Worker Adjustment Assistance." Just beneath that is Sec. 425, called "Petitions, Eligibility Requirements, And Determinations." This provision allows workers to file for a "certification of eligibility" as a group with the Department of Labor. These workers can apply for "adjustment assistance," subsequent to a hearing to determine if they are eligible.

"What does this mean? The authors of Waxman-Markey, through this provision, implicitly acknowledge that Waxman-Markey will destroy jobs. The "adjustment" mentioned here is just a euphemism for the pink slip workers get when Waxman-Markey goes into effect. And then, through a laborious process, they can petition the federal government for taxpayer handouts.

"Now let's turn to Sec. 426, called "Program Benefits." This provision allows for payment of a "climate change adjustment allowance" for an "adversely worker." The obvious question here is: "adversely affected" by what? Well, by the bill, of course. This provision authorizes payment to these workers for a week of unemployment that "shall equal 70% of the average weekly wage of that worker for a period of not longer than 156 weeks," or 3 years. Again, this payment would be made because of the provisions of Waxman Markey. Let's read on. The bill provides job training benefits, including "individual career counseling" and "prevocational services," defined as "development of learning skills, communications skills, interviewing skills, punctuality, personal maintenance skills, and professional conduct to prepare individuals for employment or training." But that's not all: workers may be eligible in certain circumstances for a one-time job search allowance up to $1,500, and for relocation assistance up to $1,500.

"What's going on here? Again, the authors of Waxman-Markey created an elaborate bureaucratic, taxpayer-funded social services program for people who lose their jobs because of Waxman-Markey.

"But isn't Waxman-Markey a jobs bill? Why would any of these big government programs be necessary if the bill is supposed to create jobs? The answer is simple: buried at the end of nearly 1,400 pages of taxes and mandates, we see the stark reality of this bill: it sends pink slips to workers and then promises the unemployed that they will get assistance from the government.

"So workers beware: Waxman-Markey is coming for you, and if you get caught, you'll be unemployed and standing in line hoping that the federal government keeps you whole".

The Waxman – Markey bill seems to be dead but it is important to realize what these Democrat- environmentalists are willing to do. Their agenda shows no concern over the economic damages it would cause and there is also very little benefit even if global warming and carbon dioxide production is considered to be a problem. Naturally, since those things are not a problem there is absolutely no benefit from it but the disastrous effects of the bill lead us to wonder what the real effect is. Are they on our side or are they trying to

destroy our economy or do they have a loose screw somewhere?

The other reason for considering the Waxman – Markey bill is that the Obama administration has another means of accomplishing the essential parts of the bill. In 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down perhaps the most significant decision ever reached in environmental law. The Court ruled that the Clean Air Act, the landmark 1970 law aimed at protecting our air, is written to include greenhouse gas pollution. On April 17, 2010 Jackson's EPA issued an endangerment finding on greenhouse gases, concluding that carbon dioxide and other emissions posed a threat to public health and welfare. That potentially opens the door for the EPA to directly regulate greenhouse gases, which would represent the most far-reaching action in the agency's history.

Today's announcement by EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson that the Environmental Protection Agency is proposing to regulate greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) from factories, utilities and refineries is a big deal. The proposed rule would require new businesses and businesses that modify their operations and that emit 25,000 or more tons of GHGs annually to adopt what is called "Best Available Control Technology" to control those emissions. Jackson's actions are the direct result of Massachusetts v. EPA. In that case, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Bush Administration's failure to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act wasn't justified. The Obama Administration has responded to the Mass v. EPA case by announcing that it will regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act. Today's newly proposed rule is one step toward what is likely to be much more extensive regulations aimed not just at new businesses that emit large amounts of greenhouse gases but also at existing ones.

So, the Waxman – Markey bill may be dead but the EPA is going to try to use regulations to institute the main points in the bill.

The conclusion is that a Cap and Trade scheme would cause serious damage to our economy, add huge taxes to the country, have very little effect on carbon dioxide emissions and would greatly benefit a few companies and individuals that were involved in the trading of carbon emissions.

All of this in the planned alarm over a non-existent problem that is caused by a beneficial gas that has been erroneously demonized to harm many and to

benefit a few. Hoax seems to be an accurate term to apply to the carbon dioxide scare.

Chapter 6

Endangered Species

The Endangered Species Act has been used to stop logging, to reduce the production of farm produce, to stop building a dam, to interfere with the construction of hospitals and other buildings, has added significant costs to road construction and has prevented people from control and use of their own property.

The Endangered Species Act is administered by the Environmental protection Agency. As the reader finds out the “stupid “ things that the EPA has done concerning endangered species there will be a question of “why”. There is a cult of Mother Earth worshippers (strongly supported by the United Nations) that really believes that the problem we have with our environment and plants and animals is because of man and they place a higher value on the plants, animals, birds and bugs. They look on man as a predator and have no concern over taking actions that will cause man to be unemployed, harmed and in case of some “lower forms of man” to not even object to their numbers being reduced. Thus, fewer humans would make it possible to save, promote and increase plants, animals and bugs. As ridiculous as that sounds there is no other logical explanation as we will see as we look at endangered species. (we could attribute insanity to them)

One of the laws enacted by our Congress was the Endangered Species Act.

The law was enacted in the 1960’s by authorizing the identification of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction and the purchase of habitat for their protection. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) was amended in 1973 to “require that species be listed ‘without reference to possible economic or other impacts’ ”and was going to preserve species that would be lost due to various factors – mostly people who did not care about such things. The result has been disastrous to land owners and businesses but has not done much for the critters it was supposed to help preserve. The environmentalists and Mother Earth lovers have seized on this act and have used it for their purposes. Supported by liberal judges they have effectively prevented the logging of timber, the clearing of forests, the irrigation of farm land, and mining and exploring for oil and minerals

In 2002, Arizona Gov. Jane Dee Hull flatly blamed “greenies” for obstructing work to clean up national forests which led to burning half a million acres of Arizona forests. The Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society blasted her statement claiming that reports showed that their legal actions had not interfered with clearing and led to only 1% of the destruction. However, the National Forest Service corrected them and indicated that , in Arizona, nearly half of the Services plans for getting rid of hazardous fuels had been legally opposed by those groups. Why would anyone object to cleaning up our forests? In other areas the legal actions of those clubs were even greater.

In California, the ESA prevented private landowners from clearing firebreaks on their own land because they might disturb the habitat of the Stephens’ kangaroo rat. In the fire that resulted since the land had not been cleared, several homes burned as well as the habitat of the kangaroo rat. Why is a rat more important that preventing fires? A Taiwanese immigrant farmer was arrested for running over a kangaroo rat while tilling his own land and fined $200,000. Why should killing a rat on his own property lead to a huge fine?

In December of 1995 a storm destroyed much of the forest in the Six Rivers National Forest in California leaving dead trees across 35,000 acres. Environmental groups opposed the cleaning up by the Forest Service and in 1995 the fires roared over that forest as well as 90,000 more acres. Then there was the 135,000 acres fire close to Denver. The Fish and Wildlife Service has over 18 million privately owned acres covered by "habitat conservation plans" that restrict what an owner can do on his land.

The environmental groups coupled with liberal judges using the Endangered Species Act have prevented the cleanup of our forest land which has led to the destruction of much of our forests by fire.

There are over 1300 endangered species on the list to be protected by the ESA and less than 47 have been protected to the point where they can be removed from the list which leads to the conclusion that the act is not effective in protecting those species.

There have been numerous mistakes made such as one identifying the snail darter which interfered with the construction of the Tellico Dam. Construction of the dam could have conserved water as well as generating electrical power. Later there were numerous numbers of the little creatures found far away from the Dam. The ESA bureaucrats identified gnatcatchers who occupy some 54,000 acres which must be protected but the ESA did not identify the areas where they reside. The fact that they did not identify the areas where they live just shows that the ESA is only interested in raising our costs and leading them to have authority to interfere in the future. Estimates are that the cost for protecting them will be around $6 billion.

Predictions were that the listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse would lead landowners to destroy the habitat they might live in and thus avoid the problems that occur if a mouse would be found on their property. The Animal Conservation journal has now concluded that the Preble's mouse "is not a valid subspecies based on physical features and genetics".

The California red- legged frog has been designated as an endangered species as well as 4.1 million acres for its habitat and 70% of that land is private property that the land owners no longer can control. Whatever happened to the idea that private property was under the control of the owner? Are red-legged frogs really more valuable than people? If you are a Mother Earth worshipper then you probably think so.

The fairy shrimp is another species that has been designated and led to a construction delay costing $250,000.

Eight Delhi Sands flies on the endangered list were discovered near the construction site of a hospital in Colton ,CA and forced the hospital to move the construction about 300 feet at a cost of $300 million and a fly preserve was established at a cost of $4.5 million. The marbled murrelet is a diving seabird that has sued the Pacific Lumber and the 9th Circuit Court decided that the lumber company had to stop logging on 65 acres and also had to pay the legal expenses of $1.1 million for opposing the murrelet. Is it really possible that a company can be sued by a diving seabird and found guilty? It is also time for us to consider the impeachment and removal of court judges.

The ESA provides for funds for those wishing to file legal suits to enforce the Act.

The identification of the spotted owl in Oregon has led to the protection of the forests and the loss of 30,000 logging jobs in that state. Now, there are indications that the spotted owl was not really endangered. They are quite capable of flying and even if not the loss of 30,000 logging jobs is more important than some owls. Or that loss is more important to normal people that do not share the beliefs of some Mother Earth Worshippers. The Klamath Basin is a real tragedy. Farmers in the area depend on

irrigation for farming and have long been allocated water for that purpose. However, it has been decided that the Lost River sucker, the short nosed sucker and the Coho salmon were more important than 1500 farmers and so their irrigation allocation was cut off. There is no scientific "consensus' that the "endangered" sucker fish are truly endangered and the warm waters used from Lake Klamath are not beneficial to Coho salmon who prefer cold water.

Projects have been cancelled due to listing the delhi sands flower loving fly. There are 400,000 acres just outside of Las Vegas that have been placed off limits in order to protect the desert tortoise. The plant, Johnston's frankenia, was listed but then they discovered 9 million more. There are now 283 species available for listing and it is estimated that the costs for adding those will be $150 million.

Obscure life forms such as the Stock Island tree snail, the Banbury Springs limpet and the triple-ribbed milkvetch as well as 1348 other animals and plants are covered by this act. Is it possible to add some sense into the process? Could Congress amend the act to place more value on people and their land and jobs than on insects, critters, bugs and stuff?

Is it likely that the bureaucrats involved in these actions would turn reasonable? Consider the case of the Canadian lynx. The lynx is more prevalent in Canada but has been found in the US. In order to have it listed as an endangered species six Forest Service biologists planted samples of lynx hair on rubbing posts in three forests to show that the lynx inhabited those forests. Thanks to a retiring "whistle blower" this was exposed and the six biologists were reassigned to other work – not fired. Obviously, their transgression was not considered very bad and essentially was approved. What kind of people do we have running the Forest Service? Agents drove 15 miles on to Richard Smith's ranch, accused him of poisoning eagles and seized his pick up truck. They presented no evidence for that accusation and returned his truck nine months later.

It is especially disgusting to see the politicians disregard the ESA when their own welfare is affected. Construction of the new Woodrow Wilson Bridge which would ease traffic flow around the Washington beltway could have endangered several species (including the bald eagle) but the ESA bureaucrats granted permission for the project.

The latest action is to declare the polar bear as an endangered specie in spite of their substantial increase in population over the past 20

years. The state of Alaska has instituted a law suit to have this action overturned. The fear is that the environmentalists will use this as another reason to stop drilling for oil in Alaska.

Under existing law all federal agencies must consult the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration before undertaking any actions that could affect an endangered species. There is no requirement placed on these agencies to reply in a set time period and so that request can take months or years. The Bush administration (July 2008) is proposing to reduce the environmental reviews that are required and the environmentalists are objecting. While that indicates that the Bush administration recognizes some of the problems with the act their solution is wholly inadequate.

Based on the past practices and actions of bureaucrats and on the actions of federal judges the only real solution to this is to rescind the law. Declare it and all of its past actions "null and void". People are of greater importance than endangered species and we need to remove our federal bureaucrats from imposing their concerns about bugs, critters and insects on us. Our forests will be all burned up if we don't stop this bunch. Our businesses are much more able to take care of our land and forests and water resources and we need to remove the laws that enable these environmental groups to be paid to sue and interfere with private property while claiming to be protecting the environment. The protection of plants and animals should be left up to the states who can evaluate the effect on citizens of the state and protect people first and critters, bugs, plants and animals in proper order rather than have some pointy – headed loony bureaucrat in Washington DC who worships Mother Earth make these decisions.

Chapter 7

The Environmental Protection Agency

The Environmental Protection Agency is the government department that has been given the responsibility for enforcing all of the environmental bills passed by Congress. In that activity it has done tremendous harm to our economy and our energy production. It has stopped the mining of coal in some locations and has stopped some utilities from using coal to produce electricity. Through its interpretations of regulations it has forced the additions of very expensive devices to reduce pollution. It has accepted global warming as a fact and has issued regulations to reduce the production of carbon dioxide without regard for the costs incurred by utilities to accomplish that. It has contributed to delaying and in some cases stopping various projects such, as building of oil refineries, and has generally caused increased costs and problems with our production of energy.

The Environmental Protection Agency was established under President Nixon (another reason to dislike President Nixon) and made a department under Bush 41. The Environmental Protection Agency has become a nightmare. It was started to implement the Clean Air Act but it has mushroomed into a monster. There have been improvements to our air quality, to our water quality and to other environmental areas. However, in the process of improving our environment the EPA has caused massive expenses and has made many mistakes.

Our original constitution was to protect our citizens from the government and this is an excellent example of how a government can oppress its people. A small group of radical, crazy, environmental activists have been able to influence enough of our legislators to pass laws and ignore our constitution as we become more like a democracy and less a republic.

The burden placed on our businesses is huge. In 1995, Carol Browner, then head of the EPA, announced that the EPA had streamlined its regulatory procedures to save businesses and state and local governments 23 million hours of unnecessary paperwork each year. That means that prior to that time there was 23 million hours of wasted time spent each year and there was no mention of how many hours of time was still required.

The Super Fund which was started in 1980 to clean up toxic waste sites is a good example. The EPA and Congress had started to assess the polluter for the clean up but in many cases no one knew who had polluted. The government came up with the concept of "joint and several liability" to try to get anyone to pay for the cleanup on land they were occupying even if they were not responsible for it. It seems crazy but that was their solution.

Naturally, that led to massive law suits as those who were innocent fought those charges in courts. At one time it was estimated that 60% of clean up costs were legal costs. Finally the EPA recognized that the system would not work and so a special tax was assessed on chemical and oil companies and that generated billions of dollars in tax revenue and huge costs to those companies. The clean ups were performed and in 1995 the tax was allowed to lapse with $3.8 billion left in the EPA to pay for the remaining sites. In 2002 there were still 33 toxic sites in 18 states that were still in the process of being cleaned and the EPA estimated that $450 million would clean them up.

At that point the administration had allocated $228 million for that purpose. The costs were much larger than they should have been (over $50 billion) but the cleanups have been or are in the process of being done.

Not all of the clean ups were necessary. In 1996 the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory said that maybe all the hundreds of millions of dollars spent on excavation, removal of tanks treatment of soil and etc was misguided and misspent effort. Cleanup efforts

were examined in California and tank cleanup costs are estimated to be $2.5 billion and much of that was not necessary. The Alexis de Tocqueville institution reports that "EPA consistently assumes that future sites will include children, who will live there for 70 years, ingesting less than one teaspoon of local dirt every day, and rely exclusively on contaminated local ground water for bathing and drinking". Insane?

The EPA has been a lawyers' dream. The toxic waste clean up was handled in a manner that generated many law suits but there have been many others due to the EPA's practices of issuing rules that are overly stringent and that have little scientific base. Congress passed the New Source Review Act which permitted older facilities to improve parts of plants without revising the whole facility to new standards. The EPA did not agree and hauled TVA, Detroit Edison and Alabama Power into court to make them update their complete facilities as they tried to improve them. A district court overruled the EPA.

In 1987 the EPA fixed levels for six pollutants and was sued. The DC district court ruled that their action "was an unconstitutional allegation of legislative power" and that the EPA was not authorized to legislate. Air quality has been one of the EPA's major areas to regulate but EPA administer Carol Browner stated, "…existing emissions inventories and air quality modeling to date… simply do not provide a sufficient analytical foundations from which to draw accurate results". That has not stopped the EPA from issuing rules and in some cases they have admitted that rules have been issued on "policy judgments" rather than facts.

In 1993 the EPA announced that second hand smoke (environmental tobacco smoke) causes 3000 deaths each year. (the EPA then assigns costs based on their estimate that a human life is worth $4.8 million) . A US district judge stated that, "EPA publicly committed to a conclusion before research had begun" and " established procedure and scientific norms to validate the agency's public conclusion". "EPA cannot show a statistically significant association between environmental tobacco smoke and lung cancer". Of course by the time the decision was rendered in 1995 the EPA's position was well publicized and accepted.

When the Safe Drinking Water Act was implemented by the EPA they decreed that a safe chemical level was zero. The Court of Appeals in DC overruled them. The EPA is now considering complying with a United Nations edict that would eliminate the use of inhalers for asthma sufferers. Inhalers are primarily used by children but the EPA has announced they will eliminate inhalers to "help" children.

In 1997 the EPA issued a ruling requiring 23 states to lower their omissions by 85% and estimated the costs would be around $17 billion. Many of the states sued and questioned the accuracy of the percentage established as well as to whether each state was identical.

In 1999 the EPA issued new guidelines to "protect people and children with respiratory problems" and estimated the costs would be around $18 billion per year. George Mason University estimated the costs at $380 billion but it didn't matter when a US district court judge overthrew the ruling and slapped the EPA for its "arbitrary and capricious" behavior in their guidelines.

General Electric was ordered to clean up the Hudson River at an estimated cost of $490 million because GE had dumped PCB's in the river in the past. The Institute of Evaluating Health Risks "found no association between actual exposure to PCB's and death from cancer or any other disease." The National Cancer Institute stated, "the NCI has no evidence that eating fish from the Hudson River posed a human cancer risk". The EPA refused to rescind its order. There was much publicity about this and there were 19 different organizations supporting the EPA in wanting the river dredged. Thirteen of those groups received financial contributions from the EPA to help them in their legal battle with General Electric.

As a side note a federal judge ordered the EPA to release its records concerning contributions. From 1993 to 2001 the EPA contributed over $2 billion to various organizations. The EPA erased hard drives and back –up emails were destroyed and so the EPA never complied with that order.

The EPA has an Environmental Education Division which is responsible for educating our youth in environmental matters and in a five year period spent $34.9 million in producing material to "brain-wash" our children. If you wonder why our children are so concerned over pollution and the environment it is because they are being taught that way. The EPA has incorrectly identified toxic substances. Second hand smoke was one and so was PCB's.

The EPA issued rules concerning dioxin and published a three volume report on dioxin emissions. They then selected 39 scientists to review the report. That panel of scientists then reported that, "…the agency had overstated the risks of dioxins and that its conclusions were not scientifically defensible and that it would not endorse its report."

That has not stopped the EPA from issuing regulations concerning dioxin omissions. The streets in Times Beach, MO had been covered with dioxin and so the EPA ordered the whole community evacuated. After the expenditure of $ 32 million Times Beach became a ghost town. After that was done and the truth became known the EPA admitted the action had been unnecessary.

The EPA established a danger level for Radon but Science Magazine stated, "the EPA has no solid evidence that exposures around 4 picocuries per liter of Radon cause any lung cancer, or indeed that any of the levels common in houses in American have killed anyone." Acid rain was going to be a big problem until someone found that putting inexpensive lime into the "poisoned" lakes and rivers would cure the problem.

Uniroyal was forced to halt production of Alar because it contained damanozide. The EPA later changed its position when the World Health Organization approved its use. Formaldehyde suffered the same fate.

Then we have asbestos. On September 11 when the World Trade Center was destroyed the EPA was asked to estimate the danger of

asbestos in the air at the site. EPA officials admitted that, "asbestos was harmful only if breathed at high levels and over sustained periods of time." That wasn't the story we had heard previously. It was because of the EPA that schools throughout the nation had spent millions on removing asbestos and it was the reports from the EPA that had led to the law suits that caused 40 companies to file for bankruptcy because they had been involved with the manufacture or installation of asbestos.

The New American issue of July 23, 2007 states, " In June of 2007 the EPA has announced its new rule for a reduction in federally acceptable ozone levels from 84 parts per billion to 70 or 75 parts per billion. Hundreds of cities and towns will not be in compliance. Scientists, economists, and health professionals critical of the proposed regulations point out that the costs of complying will be enormous, but the promised benefits are highly dubious.

'At best it can be argued that the benefits of the new restrictions are unknown' says Dr Elizabeth Whelan, president of the American Council on Science and Health. 'But the costs of the draconian proposal are quite clear. EPA estimates, for example, range between $6.5 billion and $8.5 billion each year….The president's Council of Economic Advisers estimates that full attainment costs of the proposed new standard would range from $12 billion to $60 billion. Another study concluded that the new standard would cost the city of Chicago alone from $2.5 billion to $7 billion annually'. According to Dr. Whelan, 'The new standards will cost so much that they could actually worsen public health by lowering living standards and reducing access to health care. Among the known risk factors for asthma are several factors associated with poverty: exposure to cockroaches and other indoor allergens, limited access to health care and prematurity'.

Of course, we know the reaction we can expect from the EPA. They will expect each state or city to file law suits objecting to the rule and allow the courts to decide the issue. It will be another boon for the lawyers and expense for the country.

The latest edict is to issue restrictions on gas powered lawn mowers. The rule will require a 35% reduction in emissions by 2011. That same edict will require reductions for speedboats and other recreational watercraft. While that will certainly increase the cost of those items is it really going to help reduce pollution?

The EPA has also vetoed a federal flood- control project to build a huge water pump intended to reduce flooding in the Mississippi Delta. It is hard to understand how a bunch of unelected bureaucrats has the authority to stop a program authorized by the Congress. It is probable that this veto will be challenged in the courts which will add to the costs.

In mid 2008 the EPA produced a 1000 page document to reduce the U.S. output of global warming gases. The reactions to that are not surprising. The Bush administration stated, "… it relied on untested legal theories and would impose crippling costs on the U.S. economy". The administration attached a letter from the secretaries of transportation, agriculture, commerce and energy , asserting the EPA's work "does not recognize the enormous – and, we believe, insurmountable - burdens, difficulties and costs and likely limited benefits" of using the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouses gases. The Bush administration has long opposed economy – wide regulation of greenhouse gas emissions, and argued that allowing the EPA to regulate greenhouse gas emissions would turn it into a massive planning and zoning board, with the power to block construction of schools, hospitals , apartment buildings and a range of other facilities whose emissions have previously not been subject to regulation. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce stated,. "This is a classic example of EPA staff saying we can better manage the economy of the United States better that the president".

EPA's regulations and reporting requirements have led to the expenditure of billions of dollars according to the National League of Cities. They stated, "EPA's regulations are written in Latin with Greek footnotes"

The EPA has stifled Alan Carlin, a senior research analyst at the EPA who questioned the outdated research on the health effects of greenhouse gases. Dr. Carlin produced a report complete with graphs using data from satellites which showed that the actual global temperature has FALLEN by 0.3 degrees C in the last three years. The EPA's answer to actual data is to tell him to "shut up".

Al McGartland, his boss, forbad him from "any direct communication" outside of his office with regard to his analysis. Recently, they sought to yank a YouTube Video of created by EPA lawyers Allan Zabel and Laurie Williams that is critical of Cap-and-Trade.

When all of this is considered it seems that the EPA has about served its purpose and should be abolished. We have clean air and water and it would help our financial situation to remove 18,000 employees and not spend $10 billion. There would be an even greater savings by stopping them from writing more rules and regulations.

We now have an even greater reason for abolishing the EPA for since the election of Barrack Obama the EPA has "run amok". It is logical to conclude that Obama understood the background and beliefs of Lisa Jackson who he appointed as head of the EPA and it is also logical to conclude that he approves of what she is doing.

On October 8, 2010 the Washington Times had an article about Lisa Jackson, the Obama appointee as head of the EPA. During the first 18 months of Bush's (43) first term the EPA issued 16 "significant" regulations. The government defines regulations as "significant" if they have an impact on the economy of $100 million or interfere with other agencies' actions. During the last 18 months the EPA has issued 42 "significant" regulations.

The new rules seek to reduce ozone pollution from factories and cars; coal ash waste from power plants; storm-water runoff from construction sites; greenhouse gas emissions from cars and mercury emissions from industrial boilers. Here are some specific items.

Since 2004, Toll Bros. has worked on a plan to revitalize Brooklyn's Gowanus Canal and has a sensible plan for cleaning the 1.8 mile long channel and then transforming the area with 450 housing units and 2000 square feet of retail space. In January of 2010 the EPA declared the canal a Superfund site which means the EPA will now be responsible for the cleanup and will "go after the polluters" and

with the usual law suits that process will take around 12 years or more. Toll Bros. has announced that they are dropping their plan to develop the area and cleanup the canal.

The San Joaquin Valley of California has long been known as the most productive agricultural area of the U.S. That was until three years ago when the EPA's regulations designed to protect the three-inch Delta smelt were enforced. Tens of billions of gallons of water from mountains east and north of Sacramento have been channeled away from farmers into the ocean leaving hundreds of thousands of acres of arable land fallow or scorched. Mendota – in the middle of the valley – now has an unemployment rate of 40% leaving more than 10,000 unemployed and hundreds of farms destroyed. How could a three inch fish be more important than those people? The EPA must be staffed by a bunch of nuts. This action was reviewed by the Jackson EPA and after considering the terrible results on the farms and people in the valley they decided that the fish were more important than the people. Insane?

Atrazine is the nation's second most common herbicide. The weed killer is used in the production of 60% of corn, 75% of sorghum and 90% of sugarcane. In 2006 the EPA completed a 12 year review involving 6,000 studies and 80,000 public comments. The agency concluded the risks "posed no harm that would result to the general U.S. population…" In October of 2009 the EPA announced it would begin a re-evaluation of atrazine. Tort lawyer Stephen Tillery has filed a class action lawsuit against atrazine manufacturers and the EPA is helping .

On April 2, 2010 the EPA tightened water quality standards that could severely limit future coal mining operations throughout Appalachia, while mining industry officials said the change was unfair and endangers jobs. The new guidance issued under the Clean Water Act could put at risk many of the 27,000 people employed at surface coal mines. A previously approved water permit has been vetoed by the EPA and that is the first time in its 40 year history that the agency has vetoed a permit after it was issued.

The EPA has announced it plans to block a proposal by Arch Coal Inc. to dig the largest mountain top coal mine in Central Appalaicha, the first time in 37 years the agency has moved to veto such a project. Arch Coal already had a permit to dig. On 10/1/2009 the EPA said it had held up 79 permits to extract coal and the industry stated that thousands of jobs are now threatened. The agency cited the Clean Water Act as the reason. About 180 permits await approval. "If they are not intending to damage the coal industry, then they have made an enormous miscalculation," said Luke Popovich an NMA spokesman.

Why would he think they are not intending to damage the coal industry? All of their actions seem to indicate that they are going to damage that industry.

Ian Murray, VP of the Competitive Enterprise Institute, reports on April 12, 2010 that the EPA has decided it has the power to: "License California and other states to adopt nonfederal fuel economy standards within their border; to act as co-equal partner with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in setting fuel-economy standards for the auto industry; to establish climate and energy policy for the nation and "tailor" the Clean Air Act as desired".

On January 8, 2010 the EPA proposed tougher standards for reducing smog and business groups said the change would inflict new costs on employers and consumers. Power plants, refineries, gas stations and other businesses would be compelled to take steps to reduce emissions of chemicals that help form smog. The EPA estimates the cost could range between $19 billion and $90 billion annually . The EPA would set acceptable ozone levels between 0.06 and 0.07 per million, stricter than the current 0.075 ppm.

It was reported on August 10, 2009 that he EPA's Office of Research Development is pushing hard to redefine the level at which arsenic would be considered toxic. The "toxicity slope" for inorganic arsenic would be increased 20 times. To meet that standard would put enormous pressure on municipalities to spend additional billions of dollars.

Never let a good crisis (like the Gulf oil disaster) go to waste. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson is lobbying to reinstate the Superfund tax which was placed into effect in 1980. The tax was applied to oil, gas, chemical companies or any company with revenues over $2 million when the EPA was unable to identify those who had polluted sites in the past. Today, 70% of all areas the EPA has designated as contaminated are already being cleaned up but the EPA would just like to have more money available and has thought that $19 billion over 10 years would be a good number.

With the conclusion that the Congress could not pass Cap and Trade, Lisa Jackson, EPA administrator, has ruled that greenhouse gases are dangerous pollutants and that under the clean- air laws the EPA is authorized to regulate them. In 2007 five liberals on the Supreme Court ordered the EPA to determine if carbon dioxide qualified as a "pollutant."

On April 24, 2009 the EPA ruled that carbon dioxide is a dangerous pollutant. Ms. Jackson did not refer to any studies or examinations that had taken place nor to any scientists that had identified carbon dioxide as a pollutant. This is cap and trade without the trade but the EPA will probably incorporate that too. Ms. Jackson has previously announced a "tailoring rule" to the Clean Air Act that any new rules would apply to those sources that emit more than 25,000 tons a year like coal fired plants and heavy manufacturing. She has announced that originally her agency will only target cars and trucks. Of course , the environmentalists will soon sue to have all carbon dioxide emitters regulated and who knows where this will stop. However, the House Energy and Commerce and the Senate Environment and Public Works committees have released draft legislation (Feb. 2,2011) that would take away the EPA authority to regulate greenhouse gases.

On 9/17/2010 the state of Texas sued the EPA in a federal appeals court in Washington, DC claiming that four new regulations imposed by the EPA are based on thoroughly discredited findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (U.N.) and are factually flawed. One of the suits claims that the "tailoring rule" applied by the EPA is not legal.

On October 4, 2010 Human Events reported that the EPA was considering lowering ozone standards again to levels that are at or below what occurs naturally in the air. It is estimated that there would be around 600 counties that could be in “non-attainment”. Unions for Jobs and the Environment, an organization of 12 national and international unions thinks the ozone revision “would lead to significant job losses across the country… due to the significant increase in the number of counties classified as “nonattainment”. EPA’s new cement kiln regulation could shut down 18 plants threatening 1,800 direct jobs and 9,000 indirect jobs and could send 28 million tons of U.S. cement production offshore, mainly to China.

Senator James Inhofe has issued a new report, ”EPA’s Anti-industrial Policy: Threatening Jobs and America’s Manufacturing Base”. The report covers new regulations concerning industrial boilers, greenhouse gas emitters and ozone levels issued in June of 2010 has been examined by industry and the Congress. The EPA has admitted that tough new greenhouse gas regulations will “ slow construction nationwide for years” while only reducing global temperatures by 0.0015 of a degree Celsius. A GOP minority report issued on September 30, 2010 stated that these regulations will put over 800,000 jobs at risk with little environmental benefit. Here is the statement from Senator Inhofe

As Prepared for Delivery

By Senator James Inhofe (R-OK)

“Today, I am releasing a Minority staff report from the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, where I serve as Ranking Member. The report examines the impacts on jobs and the economy from four significant EPA rules, including EPA's greenhouse gas proposals. This report outlines how these rules threaten the economic viability of America's manufacturing base and hundreds of thousands of well-paying jobs. It focuses on the following:

the pending Boiler MACT regulations; the revised National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone; the new Cement MACT regulations; and EPA's endangerment finding and tailoring rule. And these 4 rules are by no means all that the EPA has planned. In the coming months, EPA is expected to propose (and, in some cases, finalize), among many others: standards for cooling water intake structures at power plants; national ambient air quality standards for dust and particulate matter; maximum achievable control technology standards for coal-fired power plants; new source performance standards for coal-fired power plants and refineries; and rules governing disposal of coal combustion waste.

“So what does all this mean? The American Forest and Paper Association estimates that: "about two dozen new regulations being considered by the Administration under the Clean Air Act, if all are promulgated, potentially could impose on the order of $17 billion in new capital costs on papermakers and wood products manufacturers in the next five to eight years alone."

“And this is just for one industry. Many others will be similarly affected.

“Unfortunately, the Obama EPA favors bureaucracy and heavy-handed intervention more than jobs and growth. In many cases, the Clean Air Act is no longer about clean air; instead, it has become a blunt instrument for EPA to punish American's manufacturers and small businesses. If America wants to compete economically with China, India, and other developing economies, this cannot continue.

“Boiler MACT

“The first rule covered in the report is the Boiler MACT. The Boiler MACT (MACT stands for maximum achievable control technology) would impose stringent emission limits and monitoring requirements for eleven subcategories of boilers and process heaters. This proposed rule covers industrial boilers used in manufacturing, processing, mining, refining, as well as commercial boilers used in malls, laundries, apartments, restaurants, and hotels.

The Industrial Energy Consumers of America (IECA), which represents companies with 750,000 employees, said that they are "enormously concerned that the high costs" of the Boiler MACT "will leave companies no recourse but to shut down the entire facility, not just the boiler."

“This is what the econometrics firm IHS-Global Insight found in its analysis of EPA's proposal. IHS-Global Insight concluded that the proposal could put up to 798,250 jobs at risk. Moreover, they said every $1 billion spent on upgrade and compliance costs will put 16,000 jobs at risk and reduce US GDP by as much as $1.2 billion.

“EPA's pending Boiler MACT regulations also threaten my home state of Oklahoma. Covanta Energy, which in 2008 reopened the Walter B. Hall Resource Recovery Facility, a waste-to-energy plant that can process up to 1,125 tons of municipal solid waste per day and generate 240,000 pounds of steam per hour, would be forced to install costly controls. From what I understand, the Boiler MACT proposal threatens its economic viability.

“These concerns are shared by 40 of my colleagues, including 18 Democrats, who wrote to Lisa Jackson on the Boiler MACT regulation yesterday. Quote-

"As our nation struggles to recover from the current recession, we are deeply concerned that the pending Clean Air Act boiler MACT regulations could impose onerous burdens on U.S. manufacturers, leading to the loss of potentially thousands of high-paying jobs this sector provides. As the national unemployment rate hovers around 10 percent, and federal, state, and municipal finances continue to be in dire straits, our country should not jeopardize thousands of manufacturing jobs."

“Ozone

“On January 6, 2010, for the second time in less than two years, EPA proposed to tighten the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ground-level ozone. Specifically, EPA is proposing to strengthen the 8-hour "primary" ozone standard.

“EPA estimates that setting the primary standard within its proposed range will cost $19 to $90 billion.

“This proposal comes on the heels of the revised 2008 ozone standard, which was lowered significantly. The CAA only requires a NAAQS revision "at least" every five years, so EPA is not required to revise the status quo. Meanwhile, states are in the midst of planning to meet the 2008 ozone standard, while some communities are not yet in compliance with the 1997 standard.

“EPA recently announced that it is delaying the announcement of the new ozone standards until "late October." My guess is that they will be delayed until after the election. It's not hard to see why. Whatever level EPA ultimately picks, it will dramatically increase the number of so-called "non-attainment" areas nationwide.

“Based on 2008 air quality data, we could see as many as 608 new non-attainment areas, with many of them highly concentrated in manufacturing regions and states relying on coal for electricity.

“So what does Non-attainment mean? Well, for local communities, it can mean the following: loss of industry and economic development, including plant closures; loss of federal highway and transit funding; increased EPA regulation and control over permitting decisions; increased costs for industrial facilities to implement more stringent controls; and increased fuel and energy costs

“In my State of Oklahoma, at least fifteen counties--Adair, Caddo, Canadian, Cherokee, Cleveland, Creek, Dewey, Kay, Mayes, McClain, Oklahoma, Ottawa, Pittsburg, Sequoyah, and Tulsa--would face new restrictions on economic growth and development, depending on what EPA decides.

“We all support cleaner air, but here's where the Obama EPA and I disagree: it shouldn't come at the expense of people's jobs or the economy. Apparently I'm not alone in thinking this way.

“On August 6, 2010 a bipartisan letter was sent to EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson on the agency's ozone reconsideration. It was signed by Senators Voinovich, Bayh, Lugar, Landrieu, Vitter, McCaskill, and Bond. Quote:

"While we believe we can and should continue to improve our environment, we have become increasingly concerned that the Agency's environmental policies are being advanced to the detriment of the people they are intended to protect. That is, these policies are impacting our standard of living by drastically increasing energy costs and decreasing the ability of our states to create jobs, foster entrepreneurship, and give manufacturers the ability to compete in the global marketplace."

“Portland Cement MACT

“The third rule discussed is the Portland Cement MACT. According to EPA, "A projected 181 Portland cement kilns will be operating at approximately 100 facilities in the United States in the year 2013." EPA's new emissions standards under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act will apply to 158 of those kilns. About seven kilns will be subject to EPA's new source performance standards under Section 111 of the CAA.

“The cement industry is essential to America's economy. According to a study by the Maguire Energy Institute at Southern Methodist University (SMU), the cement manufacturing industry in 2008:

“Produced $27.5 billion in GDP; $931 million in indirect tax revenue for state and local governments; and Sustained 15,000 high-paying jobs.

In addition to those 15,000 direct jobs, the industry has an "induced employment" effect, which helps create and sustain an additional 153,000 jobs. "Importantly," the Maguire Energy Institute noted, "these are primarily high-wage jobs generating about $7.5 billion annually in wages and benefits."

“According to the Portland Cement Association, EPA's rule puts up to 18 cement plants at risk of shutting down, threatening nearly 1,800 direct jobs and 9,000 indirect jobs.

“These jobs and cement production will go to China. Here's what a professor from King's College in London (UK) said about EPA's rule:

"So rather than importing 20 million tons of cement per year, the proposed [rule] will lead to cement imports of more than 48 million tons per year. In other words, by tightening the regulations on U.S. cement kilns, there will be a risk transfer of some 28 million tons of cement offshore, mostly to China."

“Senators Voinovich and Lincoln wrote a bipartisan letter to Administrator Jackson sharing these concerns back in February. Quote- "In a very real sense, if a reasonable standard is not adopted in this matter, we anticipate that substantial cement capacity may move overseas to the detriment of industrial employment, environmental protection, and infrastructure needs in the United States."

“Endangerment Finding/Tailoring Rule

“The final rule discussed in the Report is the Endangerment finding. As I have documented on the Senate floor before, EPA promulgated its endangerment finding for greenhouse gases in December 2009, which I said could lead to "the greatest bureaucratic intrusion into the lives of the American people." It will trigger costly, time-consuming permitting requirements for new and modified stationary sources of GHGs, such as power plants, factories, and refineries.

“But those are not the only sources potentially covered by EPA's regulatory net: schools, hospitals, churches, restaurants, farms, and many others may need to obtain Clean Air Act permits.

“We are talking about 6.1 million sources subject to EPA control and regulation. That's not mean saying this; it comes directly from EPA.

Based on these numbers, the US Chamber of Commerce found that these 6 million sources could include: 260,000 office buildings; 150,000 warehouses;

92,000 health care facilities; 71,000 hotels and motels; 51,000 food service facilities; 37,000 churches and other places of worship; and 17,000 farms

“GHG regulation will mean higher energy costs for consumers, especially for minorities, the poor, and the elderly. Remember they have to spend proportionately more of their incomes on energy, and rising energy costs inflict greater harm on these groups.

“In an attempt to stem the impending economic harm facing thousands of small businesses, EPA has developed the so-called "tailoring rule," which phases in the largest sources first, those that emit 75,000 tons and 100,000 tons. However this rule violates the plain language of the Act and is currently being litigated. If this Rule is thrown out by the Court, millions of sources, and the economic uncertainty that it brings, will be subject to EPA and citizen suit enforcement actions.

“That is why on Feb 19th Senator Rockefeller, joined by seven of his Democratic colleagues, wrote to Administrator Jackson on their concern with the tailoring rule and the endangerment finding. Quote: "We write with serious economic and energy security concerns relating to the potential regulation of greenhouse gases (GHGs) from stationary sources under the Clean Air Act...[W]e remain concerned about the possible impacts on American workers and businesses in a number of industrial sectors, along with the farmers, miners, and small business owners, who could be affected as your agency moves beyond regulations for vehicle greenhouse gas emissions..." Those eight senators have now introduced legislation that would postpone this act of the EPA by two years. (Feb., 2011)

“In some cases, these rules would have no meaningful environmental benefits. Consider EPA's rules to regulate greenhouse gases: they would reduce global temperatures by 0.0015 C by 2100, an amount so small it can't be measured on a ground-based thermometer.

“In the case of EPA's rules to regulate cement plants, we are at risk transferring 28 million tons of cement offshore, mostly to China, which uses less efficient, and therefore higher polluting, production technology.

“All of these rules have sparked bipartisan opposition. Just yesterday, 41 Senators wrote to EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson about their opposition to EPA's Boiler MACT rule. Here's what they wrote:

"As our nation struggles to recover from the current recession, we are deeply concerned that the pending Clean Air Act boiler MACT regulations could impose onerous burdens on U.S. manufacturers, leading to the loss of potentially thousands of high-paying jobs this sector provides. As the national unemployment rate hovers around 10 percent, and federal, state, and municipal finances continue to be in dire straits, our country should not jeopardize thousands of manufacturing jobs."

"While we support efforts to address serious health threats from air emissions, we also believe that regulations can be crafted in a balanced way that sustains both the environment jobs."

“These rules are out of balance, and EPA needs to change course.

“Our task ahead, which I believe is shared by some of my Democratic colleagues who have expressed their opposition to these rules, is to bring balance back to federal clean air policy, so that economic growth, job creation, and environmental progress can coexist, rather than be in conflict with each other.

End of statement

On October 27, 2010 the Wall Street Journal published the following: Yesterday the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, a highly regarded federal energy advisory body, released an exhaustive “special assessment” program. NERC estimates that the Environmental Protection Agency’s pending electric utility regulations will subtract between 46 and 76 giga-watts of generating capacity by 2015…. That would amount to about 7.2 % of national power generation, and almost all of it will hit coal-fired plants, the workhorse that supplies a little over half of U.S. electricity.

“NERC notes that the “pace and aggressiveness” of issuing so many rules at once is unprecedented. These don’t even include the REPA’s looming “carbon endangerment” rules…. As much as a fifth of the perfectly functioning coal-fired fleet will be forced into early retirement”. IN a recent research note, Credit Suisse estimated that compliance will cost as much as $150 billion in capital investment by the end of the decade”.

In February, 2011, President Obama issued an executive order to review our regulations with the intent to clean them up. However, that executive order includes a proviso that instructs the agencies making those reviews to consider,

“values that are difficult or impossible to quantify, including equity, human dignity, fairness and distributive impacts”. In other words, find any excuse you wish to not change anything.

A recently issued regulation, (January, 2010) By the EPA subjects dairy producers to the Spill Prevention, Control and

Countermeasure program which was created in 1970 to prevent oil discharges and applies to oil and natural gas.

To apply this to milk producers is asinine and hard to believe. They are out to regulate anything and everything in our country.

On February 7, 2011, the Wall Street Journal reported that the EPA was the worst agency as far as businesses were concerned when considering regulations they considered to be burdensome. "The EPA's rules to curb emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases were cited as impediment to growth by at least 30 organizations". The businesses included representatives of the agriculture, business, chemicals, energy, paper and manufacturing and steel and iron sectors. Other groups complained about "dozens of other proposed and existing regulations including the agency's plans to tighten limits on emissions of some pollutants from industrial boilers, ground-level ozone, mountain – top mining cooling water intake structures , the level of pollutants in Florida waters, and pollutants in the Chesapeake Bay."

In March, 2011 Texas regulators said that extensive testing showed that flammable water wells west of Ft worth were not contaminated by nearby gas drilling , as the EPA has maintained and has instructed Range Resources to continue to operate the wells as they continue to fight the EPA in federal court to overturn their ruling.

The Obama administration has proposed requiring power plants using coal or fuel oil to reduce emissions of mercury and certain other hazardous pollutants by 91% . The EPA estimates the annual cost will be about $11 billion and will add three or four dollars per month to consumer's electric bill. On March, 19, 2011 influential unions objected to this and other new rules which could put thousands of jobs in jeopardy.

On July &, 2011, the EPA announced it would require power plants in the eastern half of the U.S. to make major reductions in soot and smog. It will require them to cut emissions of sulfur dioxide by 73 % and nitrogen oxide by 54% by 2014. Costs to businesses and their consumers are estimated to be $2.4 billiion annually.

The 2007 energy bill included mandates to incorporate six million gallons of cellulosic ethanol in our gasoline. However, no cellulosic ethanol has been produced. The EPA still plans to assess the penalty against the oil refiners for not meeting that requirement. The cost to the refiners will be $6.78 million.

The EPA is a good example of what happens when bureaucrats are turned loose. Since Congress gave these government organizations the power to write their own rules the EPA has become a legislator, an executor and a judge over their own actions. They did clean up many toxic dumps (and cleaned up some that were not toxic) but at a cost that was double what it should have been. They have been a real blessing to lawyers who were hired to protect businesses from the EPA and who were able to use EPA rulings to get money from businesses and then the lawyers also benefited from representing businesses in bankruptcy.

The EPA actually forced the destruction of a whole community (Times Beach, MO). Their errors in determining toxic substances are amazing and the expenditures caused by that were huge.

The real problem with these regulations is that the EPA exists. As long as the unelected bureaucrats exist with this power they will write new rules and regulation (laws). Congress has given them the authority to do so and they will continue their activities. They can not be curbed and so the only solution is to eliminate the EPA.

In the House H.R. 199, Protect America's Energy and Manufacturing Jobs Act was introduced to actually strip the EPA of taking any action under the Clean Air Act for two years concerning the regulation of new carbon dioxide requirements and certain reporting requirements. H.R. 96, The Free industry Act, currently has 113 cosponsors and was introduced to "(1) exclude from the definition of the term 'pollutant' carbon dioxide, water vapor, methane, nitrous oxide, hydro fluorocarbons, perflourocarbons, or sulfur hexafluoride and (2) declare that nothing in the Act shall be treated as authorizing or requiring the regulation of climate change or global warming."

Rep. Bill Flores has introduced the Lease Extension and Secure Energy Act which will extend offshore leases affected by the Department of Interior's drilling moratorium for an additional twelve months. He also introduced the Expedited Offshore Permitting Act to streamline the offshore drilling permit process.

It is obvious that the Congress is trying to curb the EPA but an even better solution is to abolish it completely.

Our air quality is now good and toxic waste dumps are mostly eliminated. It is time we called this project to clean up our environment generally complete and abolish the EPA and turn over the maintenance of the environment to the individual states. Each state has an environmental protection agency and,, if desired, could use all the material generated by the EPA to protect the environment in their state. They could even hire some of the 18,000 bureaucrats employed by the EPA and we should then see a substantial reduction in the cost of running the EPA. Their 2009 budget was $10 billion. On the national level any unfinished business could be turned over to the Department of the Interior. Let's abolish the EPA.

Chapter 8

Green Energy Fantasizes

Environmentalists have been promoting the use of alternative sources of fuel for years because of their fear of carbon dioxide and

global warming. Since carbon dioxide is not harmful and the globe is not warming it seems logical that we don't need these alternative sources of energy. However, if they are practical and economical then they should be developed by our businesses without government subsidies and assistance. Wind power, solar power, electric cars, bio – mass, ethanol and anything else would contribute to our energy needs and there doesn't ever seem to be too much energy for us to have. But, what energy we do develop and use should be determined by economics while considering the environment. Pollution must be a consideration but carbon dioxide and warmer temperatures are not reasons for making decisions concerning alternative sources of energy.

According to the Energy Information Administration renewable resources produced 2.3% of the U.S. electrical supply in 2005. Biomass was responsible for 1.5%, wind for 0.44% and solar power for only 0.1%. In contrast, coal fired generation produced 49.7% of the U.S. electrical supplies in 2005, followed by nuclear power at 19.3%, natural gas at 19.1%, hydro power at 6.5% and oil-fired generation at 3%. We have coal, oil, natural gas and the ability to develop nuclear power and refine oil and are not doing it because of the government.

However, in encouraging the development of alternative energy we should stop subsidizing that development. It might be proper to encourage research but it is ridiculous to give tax credits and mandates for ethanol, wind or solar energy as well as loan guarantees and other politically favored energy projects.

We are able to produce a synthetic gasoline (which is now being used by our air force) for about $60 per gallon but no company is willing to spend the money to develop that because they afraid of our government. That synthetic gasoline is produced from coal and also produces CO2 and the environmentalists would holler, scream and yell and the Congress might pass a law restricting emissions. So, no company will build and produce that synthetic fuel even though it would help tremendously and we have plenty of coal. Sometimes you wonder if those bureaucrats and Congressman are on our side or if they are just a little insane.

Ethonal

. In Brazil ethanol is produced from Brazilian sugar cane for $.95 per gallon. We produce ethanol from corn for $1.44 per gallon. The logical conclusion is that we should be telling our farmers to grow more sugar cane. But we do not. Instead we subsidize and protect our ethanol producers and encourage our farmers to grow more corn. The biofuels industry receives a 45 cent tax credit for every gallon of ethanol produced or about $3 billion a year. That has caused the price of corn to increase and so now all of our meat products cost more. Each gallon of ethanol blended with gasoline receives a 51 cent tax credit and still remains more expensive than gasoline. To protect that industry we place a tariff of 54 cents per gallon on foreign imported ethanol as well as a 2.5% duty. That means that we do not import foreign made ethanol. If we really wanted to reduce the price of the ethanol in our country we could eliminate the 54 cent gallon tariff and that would really help our citizens.

There is a blending requirement from the federal government that our gas must contain 10% ethanol (The EPA is recommending that be increased to 15%). If that requirement were abolished it is probable that ethanol would no longer be a problem for the gasoline companies are not thrilled that they have to blend the ethanol in with their gasoline. The CBO estimates that from April 2007 to April 2008 "the increased use of ethanol accounted for about 10% to 15% of the rise in food prices".

The water content of ethanol prevents it being shipped by pipeline and so it must be shipped by truck, rail car or barge all of which are more expensive than pipeline.

Ethanol is 20 to 30 percent less efficient than gasoline which makes it more expensive per highway mile. Congress has given a subsidy of about $1.05 to $1.38 per gallon which is a tax on all of us.

So, we promote a more expensive substitute for oil and discourage other countries from trying to sell us a less expensive product. Gov. Rick Perry of Texas recently petitioned the EPA (why does a governor of a state have to ask an agency of the government for permission to do anything?) to reduce the amount of ethanol to be produced in his state because of the effect on his state of the price of corn but the EPA turned down his request. The cost of corn was hurting the beef and chicken farmers. Presently, it is estimated that 40% of our corm production is used to produce ethanol and this is contributing to a shortage of food for the world.

A recent Time magazine cover story, "the Clean Energy Myth" described how turning crops into fuel increases both food prices and atmospheric carbon dioxide.

To create just one gallon of fuel, ethanol consumes roughly four gallons of water and that when you count the water needed to grow the corn it requires 1,7 00 gallons of water, according to Cornell's David Pimentel, and 51 cents of tax credits. We have been blessed with an abundant supply of water but even that has a limit and the use of corn to make gasoline could have a very detrimental effect on our water supply. Kansas is threatening to sue Nebraska for consuming more than its share of the Republican River.

Writing in Science Magazine, Renton Righelato and Dominick Spracken estimate that in order to replace just 10% of our gasoline and diesel consumption, the U.S. would need to convert a full 43% of its cropland to ethanol production.

According to a 2007 OECD report, fossil-fuel production is up to 10,000 times as efficient as biofuel, measured by energy produced per unit of land.

In the 2005 and 2007 energy bills there were biofuel mandates and subsidies mandated and those should be repealed.

A study co-authored with Robert Hahn and Caroline Cecot stated, "We used EPA numbers to calculate the environmental benefits of ethanol…We then compared these benefits with the direct costs of producing and distributing ethanol, the environmental costs

associated with its manufacture and combustion and the cost of the slew of incentives offered to refiners and corn farmers. If annual production of ethanol increases by three million gallons by 2012 we estimate that the costs will exceed the benefits by about $1 billion a year.

Greenhouse gas emissions from corn ethanol over the next 30 years will be twice as high as from regular gasoline. (from ecologists at Princeton and the Woods Hole Research Center)

The water content also makes it less useful in many combustion engines (Brazil has changed their car engines to accept sugar produced ethanol) and so the use of ethanol is limited.

When we add all this up we find that ethanol is more expensive to produce, that it requires subsidies, that it uses too much water, that it is more expensive to transport, that it is limited in its use, that it is less efficient in generating energy and that using corn to produce energy makes the price of corn increase and thus increases the cost of the farm animals that use corn as food. STUPID seems appropriate for ethanol and the main reason for its acceptance was to reduce non-existent global warming and beneficial carbon dioxide. Is it stupidity or are these people "off of their rocker".

Wind

The main attraction of wind is that it is seemingly free. It is also intermittent, erratic and unreliable. In 2009, in Texas, which obtained 6% of its energy in that year from wind farms there was an extended period when the wind slowed down. And, the cost of the windmills, their erection and maintenance are not free. In addition, the wind blows best at places far away from where the electricity is used and the cost of transmission can be prohibitive. The federal government provides a production tax credit of $0.022 for each kilowatt-hour of electricity produced by wind. That amounts to $6.44 per million BTU of electric energy produced by wind. In 2008 the EIA reported subsidies to oil and gas producers were $0.03 per million BTU of energy produced or about 200 times more for wind production.

Europe has adopted wind as an energy source and we can learn much from their experience. Country Guardians is an organization in England that reports on various forms of energy and they are the source for much of the following information.

Denmark, because of its location with water nearly surrounding it is one of the countries that promotes and uses electricity produced by wind. While the cost of erection in the water is higher than on land there are some advantages of having the windmills in the water. It doesn't require getting permits for transmission lines and there is not a problem of complaints about the noise. If birds are killed by the blades they drop in the sea and are not seen.

Denmark (population 5.3 million) has over 6,000 turbines that produced electricity equal to 19% of what the country used in 2002. Yet no conventional power plant has been shut down. Because of the intermittency and variability of the wind, conventional power plants must be kept running at full capacity to meet the actual demand for electricity. Most cannot simply be turned on and off as the wind dies and rises, and the quick ramping up and down of those that can be would actually increase their output of pollution and carbon dioxide (the primary "greenhouse" gas). So when the wind is blowing just right for the turbines, the power they generate is usually a surplus and sold to other countries at an extremely discounted price, or the turbines are simply shut off. Denmark is just dependent enough on wind power that when the wind is not blowing right they must import electricity. In 2000 they imported more electricity than they exported. And added to the Danish electric bill are the subsidies that support the private companies building the wind towers. Danish electricity costs for the consumer are the highest in Europe. The head of Xcel Energy in the U.S., Wayne Brunetti, has said, "We're a big supporter of wind, but at the time when customers have the greatest needs, it's typically not available."

. Despite their being cited as the shining example of what can be accomplished with wind power, the Danish government cancelled plans for three offshore wind farms planned for 2008 and has scheduled the withdrawal of subsidies from existing sites. Development of onshore wind plants in Denmark has effectively stopped. Because Danish companies dominate the wind industry, however, the government is under pressure to continue their support.

Spain began withdrawing subsidies in 2002. Germany reduced the tax breaks to wind power, and domestic construction drastically slowed in 2004. Switzerland also is cutting subsidies as too expensive for the lack of significant benefit. The Netherlands decommissioned 90 turbines in 2004. Many Japanese utilities severely limit the amount of wind-generated power they buy, because of the instability they cause. For the same reason, Ireland in December 2003 halted all new wind-power connections to the national grid. In early 2005, they were considering ending state support. In 2005, Spanish utilities began refusing new wind power connections. In 2006, the Spanish government ended -- by emergency decree -- its subsidies and price supports for big wind. In 2004, Australia reduced the level of renewable energy that utilities are required to buy, dramatically slowing wind-project applications. On August 31, 2004, Bloomberg News reported that "the unstable flow of wind power in their networks" has forced German utilities to buy more expensive energy, requiring them to raise prices for the consumer. In Germany, utilities are forced to buy renewable energy at sometimes more than 10 times the cost of conventional power, in France 3 times. In the U.K., the Telegraph has reported that rather than providing cheaper energy, wind power costs the electric companies £50 per megawatt-hour, compared to £15 for conventional power. The wind industry is worried that the U.K., too, is starting to see that it is only subsidies and requirements on utilities to buy a certain amount of "green" power that prop up the wind towers and that it is a colossal waste of resources. In the U.K. (population 60 million), 1,010 wind turbines produced 0.1% of their electricity in 2002, according to the Department of Trade and Industry. The government hopes to increase the use of renewables to 10.4% by 2010 and 20.4% by 2020, requiring many tens of thousands more towers. As demand will have grown, however, even more turbines will be required.

In California (population 35 million), according to the state energy commission, 14,000 turbines (about 1,800 MW capacity) produced half of one percent of their electricity in 2000. Extrapolating this record to the U.S. as a whole, and without accounting for an increase in energy demand, well over 100,000 1.5-MW wind towers (costing $150-300 billion) would be necessary to meet the DOE's goal of a mere 5% of the country's electricity from wind by 2010. The DOE says there are 18,000 square miles of good wind sites in the U.S., which with current technology could produce 20% of the country's electricity. This rosy plan, based on the wind industry's sales brochures, as well as on a claim of electricity use that is only three-quarters of the actual use in 2002, would require "only" 142,060 1.5-MW towers. They also explain, "If the wind resource is well matched to peak loads, wind energy can effectively contribute to system capacity." That's a big if -- counting on the wind to blow exactly when demand rises -- especially if you expect the wind to cover 20% (or even 5%) of that demand. As in Denmark and Germany, you would quickly learn that the prudent thing to do is to look elsewhere first in meeting the load demand. And we'd be stuck with a lot of generally unhelpful hardware covering every windy spot in the U.S., while the developers would be looking to put up yet more to make up for and deny their failings.

Then we have the problem of size. Pictures from the energy companies show slim towers rising cleanly from the landscape or hovering faintly in the distant haze, their presence modulated by soft clouds behind them. But a 200- to 300-foot tower supporting a turbine housing the size of a bus and three 100- to 150-foot rotor blades sweeping over an acre of air at more than 100 mph requires, for a start, a large and solid foundation. On a GE 1.5-MW tower, the turbine housing, or nacelle, weighs over 56 tons, the blade assembly weighs over 36 tons, and the whole tower assembly totals over 163 tons. As FPL (Florida Power & Light) Energy says, "a typical turbine site takes about a 42×42-foot-square graveled area." Each tower (and a site needs at least 15-20 towers to make investment worthwhile) requires a huge hole filled with steel rebar–reinforced concrete (e.g., 1,250 tons in each foundation at the facility in Lamar, Colo.). According to Country Guardian, the hole is large enough to fit three double-decker buses. At the 89-turbine Top of Iowa facility, the foundation of each 323-foot assembly is a 7-feet-deep 42-feet-diameter octagon filled with 25,713 pounds of reinforced steel and 181 cubic yards of concrete.

The foundations at the Wild Horse project in Washington are 30 feet deep. At Buffalo Mountain in Tennessee, too, each foundation is at least 30 feet deep and may contain more than 3,500 cubic yards of concrete (production of which is a major source of CO2). On Cefn Croes in Wales the developer built a complete concrete factory on the site, which is not unusual, as well as opened quarries to provide rock for new roads -- neither of which activities were part of the original planning application. On many such mountain ridges as well as other locations, it would be necessary to blast into the bedrock, as Enxco's New England representative, John Zimmerman, has confirmed, possibly disrupting the water sources for wells downhill. At the Waymart plant in Pennsylvania, the foundations extend 30-40 feet into the bedrock. At Romney Marsh in southern England, foundation pillars will be sunk 110 feet. For each 6-feet-deep foundation at the Crescent Ridge facility in Illinois, another 24 feet was dug out and filled with sand. Construction at a site on the Slieve Aughty range in Ireland in October 2003 caused a 2.5-mile-long bog slide. The lesson we can learn from Europe is that energy produced from wind is too expensive, unreliable and should be left to private businesses. We should stop all subsidies and support and let them try to develop it. We do not have to fear from global warming nor carbon dioxide production which has been the main reason for developing wind power.

The environmentalists claim that they are in favor of wind generation and solar power but they oppose the construction of the transmission lines necessary to bring the power generated to where it can be used. They are lobbying in California to stop a 150 mile link between San Diego and solar panels. Hundreds turned out to protest a connection between the solar and geothermal fields of the Imperial Valley and Orange County. Duke Energy and American Electric Power have planned that the construction of 240 miles of transmission lines in Indiana will require 6 years to complete because of the time necessary to obtain government permits and finish the law suits that environmentalists will bring against that. They really should not be assigned all of the blame for even though they are wrong there is no reason for our crazy Congress and government to support them. You would think our elected representatives would be smarter than this or more in favor of doing what is right.

Or maybe they are smarter but just like the campaign contributions and wish to

get elected.

Solar energy

The big attraction of solar energy is the thought that it might be free for it obviously exists and is available for use if we can harness it. There are advantages of using solar energy on individual homes that have another source of power but the lack of reliability make it impractical for industrial use.

The obvious disadvantages are that it only produces during daylight and even during the day the sunlight can be erratic. The other big disadvantage is that under our present knowledge it is very expensive to build and install the necessary semi-conducting materials. It also requires a very large area for installation to achieve a good level of efficiency.

There also is a problem for the natural places where the sun shines – like deserts- are far away from where the energy would be used and so now the cost of storage batteries and transmission add to the costs and the problems.

According to a 2009 report from the Congressional Research Service a great deal of water is involved in generating electricity from solar. Utility-scale solar power works by generating steam that spins turbines. Cooling the system at the end of the process consumes almost twice as much water per megawatt hour as coal fired power plants that use the same cooling technique. Hot, arid regions best

suited for solar tend to be short on fresh water. So, add the initial construction costs, the space required, the amount of water and the transmission costs and solar does not seem to be a good answer. The following chart presents the cost analysis.

[edit] U.S. Department of Energy estimates

The table below lists the estimated cost of electricity by source for plants entering service in 2016. No subsidies are included in the calculations. The table is from a January 12, 2010 report of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE).[10]

Total System Levelized Cost (the rightmost column) gives the dollar cost per megawatt-hour that must be charged over time in order to pay for the total cost. Divide by 1000 to get the cost per kilowatt-hour. The easy way to do that is to move the decimal point 3 places to the left.

O&M = operation and maintenance.

CC = combined cycle.

CCS = carbon capture and sequestration.

PV = photovoltaics.

GHG = greenhouse gas.

The table, according to the DOE (emphasis added), "provides the average national levelized costs for the generating technologies represented in the National Energy Modeling System (NEMS) as configured for the Annual Energy Outlook 2010 (AEO2010) reference case. Levelized costs represent the present value of the total cost of building and operating a generating plant over its financial life, converted to equal annual payments and amortized over expected annual generation from an assumed duty cycle. The key factors contributing to levelized costs include the cost of constructing the plant, the time required to construct the plant, the non-fuel costs of operating the plant, the fuel costs, the cost of financing, and the utilization of the plant. The availability of various incentives including state or federal tax credits can also impact these costs. The values shown in the table do not incorporate any such incentives."

As can be seen from the table the most expensive sources are wind and solar and so they really are not free. If global warming and carbon dioxide are not problems then there are really no reasons to be promoting the use of wind and solar as far as being sources for our energy. We should stop subsidies for them and let private businesses pursue their development if they desire. It makes no sense for the government to subsidize their use. Research might be defended but it is difficult to defend trying to use either as a source of energy.

Electric cars

One of the main problems with electric cars is shown by comparing the cost of two cars made by Nissan. The starting price of the Nissan Versa hatchback is $13,520 and the price of the similar-size Nissan Leaf is $33,000. The Leaf has a battery in it that costs about $15,600. The U.S. Department of Energy has set a goal of bringing down car-battery costs by 70% by 2014. Jay Whitacre, a battery researcher and technology policy analyst at Carnegie Mellon/University, said in an interview the government's goals" are aggressive and worth striving for, but they are not attainable in the next three to five years."

There are more problems for the range of these cars vary from 50 miles to 150 miles (estimated) for all of them. Recharging time is generally around 8 hours in an in house charger. It is accurate that most people can generally live with that mileage range for most of the time but if you have an electric car you will also need a gas powered car for any trips so it is most practical for two car families.

So, why would anyone buy an electric car which costs lots more money and has a very restricted range? Our government is providing a $7500 rebate to those who purchase electric cars but that still leaves quite a gap in price. Our government has also provided $2.4 billion in federal grants to encourage companies to make the electric cars and develop better batteries. It makes little sense to provide grants to businesses to make cars for we have been making cars for a century. There might be some logic for providing money for battery research but not for cars. Batteries could also be a problem for the future for when they wear out disposal will become a real problem for recycling companies do not like small batteries now and the large car batteries will probably be refused.

At the present time there are four existing electric cars on the market but there are twelve others in development to be introduced in the next couple of years. That may not happen because the developers will naturally see the success of the other electric cars and adjust accordingly. In the first two months of 2011 the Chevrolet Volt sold 500 cars. That will probably cause the others to change their plans. Electric vehicles make sense on the golf course but not as a transportation vehicle.

It is clear that the reason for having electric cars is not convenience, comfort or cost so it must be because of the fear of global warming and the concern over carbon dioxide emissions. If that is the case (and it must be) then it is ridiculous to promote electric car production for the globe is not warming and carbon dioxide is not dangerous. The effect of the scare about global warming and carbon dioxide is really amazing and the amount of money we are wasting for concern about a non-existing threat is astounding.

This chapter is about economically failed energy sources. It is easily solved if we can get our Congress converted. We should stop forcing gasoline companies to include ethanol in their gas but the quickest solution is to stop the subsidies for all of this stuff. If businesses can make wind farms, solar power, ethanol or electric cars profitable then that would be excellent. If they can't then we

should stop supporting them. At the present time the only reason for supporting them is because of the non-existent fear of global warming and carbon dioxide. Stop the subsidies and save us a bunch of money. $billions ? $trillions ?

Chapter 9

Department of Energy

The Department of Energy Organization Act of 1977, which President Carter signed on August 4, 1977, created the Department of Energy, which assumed the responsibilities of the Federal Energy Administration, the Energy Research and Development Administration, the Federal Power Commission, and programs of various other agencies including the Nuclear Commission

The department employs 16,000 and has an additional 93,094 people under contract. The budget for 2010 submitted by Obama was $26.4 billion and an additional amount of $38.3 billion was allocated to the Department from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for the years 2009-2010. “half of that money is spent dealing with the Cold War’s environmental legacy”

The United States Department of Energy (DOE) is a Cabinet-level department of the United States government concerned with the United States' policies regarding energy and safety in handling nuclear material. Its responsibilities include the nation's nuclear weapons program, nuclear reactor production for the United States Navy, energy conservation, energy-related research, radioactive waste disposal, and domestic energy production. DOE also sponsors more basic and applied scientific research than any other US federal agency; most of this is funded through its system of United States Department of Energy National Laboratories. The agency is administered by the United States Secretary of Energy,

The original purpose for the Department of Energy was to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. It has failed miserably for we are now more dependent than when it was organized. In fact, it seems that it really is not seeking that goal at all. The 2009 Agency Financial Report says it is “Working to Save the Planet” which is a much different objective than reducing our oil dependence. We only occupy about 5% of the planet so how are we going to save it? Probably by spending money.

The Department received a “gift” from the 2008 stimulus program. That $38.3 billion “gift” was really used to dispense money to others – Ford received $5.9 billion to reengineer plants in five states and Nissan received $1.6 billion for a factory in Tennessee. The stated mission of the stimulus funds was to help deal with “economic uncertainty, U. S. dependence on oil and the threat of a changing climate”. In other words they were to try to figure out what to do with the money. We know they are doing nothing to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. How are they going to help us deal with “economic uncertainty”? And, exactly what is the threat of a “changing climate”?

The Doe also runs a $300 million appliance rebate program and has a $5 billion “Weatherization Assistance Program for weatherizing homes and creating green jobs

The Environmental Protection Agency is the main problem in our not having nuclear power plants, oil refineries and drilling for oil but the Department of Energy has the responsibility of developing plans and objectives for energy production in our country. Since we have stopped building nuclear power plants and oil refineries and curtailed oil drilling this department is partially responsible. When the gulf oil spill occurred the Interior Department was involved in stopping the drilling so it is also involved. . If so, and when you consider the lack of action in constructing power plants and oil drilling, it seems logical than the Department of Energy is not doing anything that helps us. Therefore, let us transfer the nuclear power functions to the Interior Department and close the Department of Energy and save a bunch of money. Since their total budget is $26.4 billion it would seem likely that we could save half of that and remove an obstacle to energy production.

Chapter 10

Real Energy

This chapter is entitled “real energy” for unlike the previous energy sources reviewed that are unrealistic the sources discussed here are the main sources we have for energy and are the sources which will continue to be the main sources for some time to come. According to the Energy Information Administration renewable resources produced 2.3% of the U.S. electrical supply in 2008. Biomass was responsible for 1.5%, wind for 0.44% and solar power for only 0.1%. In contrast, coal fired generation produced 49.7% of the U.S. electrical supplies in 2005, followed by nuclear power at 19.3%, natural gas at 19.1%, (now at 23.2%) hydro power at 6.5% (now at 7.5%) and oil-fired generation at 3%. We have coal, oil, natural gas and the ability to develop nuclear power and refine oil and are not doing it because of the government. Let’s look at each of these.

Natural Gas.

As natural gas is essentially irreplaceable (at least with current technology), it is important to have an idea of how much natural gas is left in the ground for us to use. However, this becomes complicated by the fact that no one really knows exactly how much natural gas exists until it is extracted. Measuring natural gas in the ground is no easy job, and it involves a great deal of inference and estimation.

With new technologies, these estimates are becoming more and more reliable; however, they are still subject to revision.

There is an abundance of natural gas in North America, but it is a non-renewable resource, the formation of which takes thousands and possibly millions of years. A common misconception about natural gas is that we are running out, and quickly. However, this couldn't be further from the truth. In fact, there is a vast amount of natural gas estimated to still be in the ground. In order to better understand exactly what these estimates mean and their importance, it is useful first to learn a bit of industry terminology for the different types of estimates.

U.S. Natural Gas Resource Estimates

The most recent EIA data on proved reserves in the U.S.

When combined with EIA's latest estimate of proved natural gas reserves, the Potential Gas Committee's report said total available future supply is 2,074 Tcf, equaling about 100 years of supply at current rates of consumption. (Americans consume an average 22 Tcf/year.)

Natural gas is a major source of electricity generation through the use of gas turbines and steam turbines. Most grid peaking power plants and some off-grid engine-generators use natural gas. Particularly high efficiencies can be achieved through combining gas turbines with a steam turbine in combined cycle mode. Natural gas burns more cleanly than other fossil fuels, such as oil and coal, and produces less carbon dioxide per unit energy released. For an equivalent amount of heat, burning natural gas produces about 30% less carbon dioxide than burning petroleum and about 45% less than burning coal. Combined cycle power generation using natural gas is thus the cleanest source of power available using fossil fuels, and this technology is widely used wherever gas can be obtained at a reasonable cost. Fuel cell technology may eventually provide cleaner options for converting natural gas into electricity, but as yet it is not price-competitive. Natural gas now provides 23% of the electricity generated in our country but that is due to increase because of the increase in supply which leads to a decrease in the cost of natural gas. In addition, the push to reduce carbon dioxide and other pollution from coal is leading to the use of more natural gas.

Natural gas is supplied to homes where it is used for such purposes as cooking in natural gas-powered ranges and ovens, natural gas-heated clothes dryers, heating/cooling and central heating. Home or other building heating may include boilers, furnaces, and water heaters. CNG is used in rural homes without connections to piped-in public utility services, or with portable grills. Natural gas is also supplied by independent natural gas suppliers through Natural Gas Choice programs throughout the United States. However, due to CNG being less economical than LPG, LPG (propane) is the dominant source of rural gas.

Compressed natural gas (methane) is a cleaner alternative to other automobile fuels such as gasoline (petrol) and diesel. As of 2008 there were 9.6 million natural gas vehicles worldwide, led by Pakistan (2.0 million), Argentina (1.7 million), Brazil (1.6 million), Iran (1.0 million), and India (650,000). The energy efficiency is generally equal to that of gasoline engines, but lower compared with modern diesel engines. Gasoline/petrol vehicles converted to run on natural gas suffer because of the low compression ratio of their engines, resulting in a cropping of delivered power while running on natural gas (10%-15%). CNG-specific engines, however, use a higher compression ratio due to this fuel's higher octane number of 120–130.

It is surprising that the environmentalists have not pushed the use of natural gas in automobiles or trucks for it is cleaner than gasoline which they seem to hate. Hydro power

Globally, hydro power provides about 16% of the electricity generated and in the U.S. about 7%. Mother Earth worshippers have objected to the development of hydro power because of their love of fish and the resulting long waits for federal permits have interfered with more development. There can also be some high capital costs involved with some of hydro power facilities. The Electric Power Research Institute believes that drawing power from water could add 40,000 megawatts to the grid by 2025 which is the equivalent of putting two dozen nuclear power plants online. The Department of Energy has now allocated $50 million to hydro power research this year although nothing had been allocated before. The DOE estimates that a new hydro project in 2016 would generate power at a cost of $120 per megawatt-hour which is still cheaper than wind or solar.

There are about 80,000 existing dams which do not have hydroelectric capacity and the addition of that could add lots to our electric power supply. We have had this Department of Energy for some years and it must be totally incompetent to not have investigated this before. Here we have a clean source of power and very little has been done to develop it.

Nuclear Power

The following is taken from the Department of Energy EIA.

The demand for energy in the United States is rising. By the year 2030, domestic demand for electrical energy is expected to grow to levels of 16 to 36 percent higher than 2007 levels. Nuclear energy today provides about 20 percent of U.S. electricity, and 70 percent of its carbon-free electricity. It does not produce greenhouse gases, and so does not contribute to climate change. Nuclear energy produces large quantities of continuous, affordable electricity. Today in the United States, 104 nuclear reactors provide carbon-free electricity to help drive the American economy.

Globally, nuclear energy is undergoing renewed growth, with 13 countries constructing 53 new nuclear power units and 27 countries in the planning stages for an additional 142 units. In the United States, a renewed interest in nuclear energy has resulted in blueprints for the first new nuclear power plants in over 30 years. Combined Construction and Operating license applications have been submitted for 28 new U.S. nuclear power plants, with 8 more expected.

Over the past 15 years, consolidation of plant ownership to a smaller number of excellent operators has made the operation of U.S. plants: safer; more cost-effective; and more reliable. Efficiency improvements and power uprates have allowed existing U.S. nuclear plants to produce more energy than in previous decades, adding the equivalent of nearly 5 to 6 new nuclear reactors to the electrical grid. U.S. nuclear plants, which were available to produce energy only 70 percent of the time on average in the early 1990s, are now producing power around 92 percent of the time. Nuclear power plants do not release air pollutants or carbon dioxide in the production of electricity, providing an important option for improving air and environmental quality. As a result of this success, essentially all U.S. nuclear plants are expected to apply for renewed licenses that will keep most plants in operation into the middle of the century.

As of 2007, Watts Bar 1, which came on-line on February 7, 1996, was the last U.S. commercial nuclear reactor to go on-line. This is often quoted as evidence of a successful worldwide campaign for nuclear power phase-out. However, even in the U.S. and throughout Europe, investment in research and in the nuclear fuel cycle has continued, and some nuclear industry experts] predict electricity shortages, fossil fuel price increases, global warming and heavy metal emissions from fossil fuel use, new technology such as passively safe plants, and national energy security will renew the demand for nuclear power plants.

According to the World Nuclear Association, globally during the 1980s one new nuclear reactor started up every 17 days on average, and by the year 2015 this rate could increase to one every 5 days. Many countries remain active in developing nuclear power, including China, India, Japan and Pakistan (all actively developing both fast and thermal technology), South Korea and the United States (developing thermal technology only), and South Africa and China, (developing versions of the Pebble Bed Modular Reactor [PBMR]). Several EU member states actively pursue nuclear programs, while some other member states have bans on nuclear energy use. Japan has an active nuclear construction program with new units brought on-line in 2005. In the U.S., three consortia responded in 2010 to the U.S. Department of Energy's solicitation under the Nuclear Power 2010 Program and were awarded matching funds—the Energy Policy Act of 2005 authorized loan guarantees for up to six new reactors, and authorized the Department of Energy to build a reactor based on the Generation IV Very-High-Temperature Reactor concept to produce both electricity and hydrogen. However, as of 2011 nothing is being done.

As of the early 21st century, nuclear power is of particular interest to both China and India to serve their rapidly growing economies—both are developing fast breeder reactors. In the energy policy of the United Kingdom it is recognized that there is a likely future energy supply shortfall, which may have to be filled by either new nuclear plant construction or maintaining existing plants beyond their programmed lifetime.

China plans to build more than 100 plants, while in the US the licenses of almost half its reactors have already been extended to 60 years, and plans to build more than 30 new ones are under consideration. China may achieve its long-term plan of having 40,000 megawatts of nuclear power capacity four to five years ahead of schedule.

Further, the U.S. NRC and the U.S. Department of Energy have initiated research into Light water reactor sustainability which is hoped will lead to allowing extensions of reactor licenses beyond 60 years, in increments of 20 years, provided that safety can be maintained, as the loss in non-CO2-emitting generation capacity by retiring reactors "may serve to challenge U.S. energy security, potentially resulting in increased greenhouse gas emissions, and contributing to an imbalance between electric supply and demand." In 2008, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) predicted that nuclear power capacity could double by 2030, though that would not be enough to increase nuclear's share of electricity generation.

In the U.S. there have been no new nuclear power plants built in the last 30 years nor have any refineries been constructed. The reason for the lack of constructions is that the government dictated that the nuclear plant to be constructed had to be reviewed and approved before construction could start and then a separate approval was required to operate the plant. Naturally, no sensible company would start a project and spend millions and then wait for a government agency to rule on whether it was capable of running the plant that had been built.

The effect of the environmentalists and asinine rules and regulations is shown by examining the Millstone and the Shoreham power stations. In 1970 the 660 MW Millstone 1 nuclear power station was licensed and began operating in January, 1971. The cost was about $65 million. The Shoreham reactor was a near twin sister to it and was to be built on Long Island. Between the county, the city, the state and the federal government honoring all of the complaints of the environmentalists the cost of the Shoreham rose to over $6 billion plus $186 million for decommissioning it. It never did operate.

Much of the above problems are due to our government’s obedience to environmental groups and abolishing the EPA will also benefit this area.

The Department of Energy has contributed to the problems by their issuance of rules and regulations concerning the construction of nuclear plants and refineries. It is obvious that the rules that existed 30 years ago were excellent for the record for operation of the nuclear power plants is excellent.

We are falling behind the rest of the world in nuclear power. France now obtains 70% of their power from nuclear and the rest of Europe is far ahead of us in the use of nuclear power. We have 103 nuclear power plants producing 20% of our power. Nuclear power is the cleanest, the cheapest, the most efficient and the most environmental friendly form of power and we are woefully behind the rest of the world in our use of it.

President Obama has promised an $8.3 billion loan guarantee to build two nuclear reactors in Georgia. However, they are meaningless in the absence of regulatory certainty. The loan guarantee has now been increased to $54 billion

but that will not help without the removal of other impediments. The interference with the construction of nuclear power plants has come from the environmentalists and exposes their real purposes. They wish to impede all progress and return us to the "horse and buggy days' for if they really were for clean, safe energy they would be promoting the use of nuclear energy.

On October 8, 2010 Constellation Energy gave up trying to persuade the government to reduce its proposed fee for a loan guarantee for a planned nuclear plant on Chesapeake Bay. The company said, "The governments price would clearly destroy…the economics of any nuclear project". Experts now predict the project, a joint venture with EDF, a French state-controlled electricity giant, will die.

Currently, just two nuclear plants are under construction in America, neither yet with full regulatory approval. One is being built near Waynesboro, GA by Southern Company and the other is being built in South Carolina by Scana. It is competing for a loan guarantee with NRG Energy which has plans to build in Texas.

The rest of the world is adding to their nuclear power and we are still debating what to do. Our bureaucrats are being led by the environmentalists who really don't care if we ever build. The Obama administration acts as if they are in support of nuclear power but there is nothing being done at this time to prove that. In order to build a nuclear plant in our country it takes about ten years – four years to get approvals, two years to answer all of the environmentalists law suits and four year to build. China has four nuclear power plants under construction and anticipates constructing one in four years. We have the knowledge, the operating history and are prevented by our government from adding to our nuclear capacity.

OIL

We have been blessed with material resources but our main problem in developing and using them has been our government. Our trucks and cars move on our highways fueled by oil and gasoline. We can speculate and dream about "renewables" but right now the reality is that we are totally dependent upon oil for our transportation. We have to have oil and if we do not produce it here then we will have to buy it. Which is what we are doing for we are importing around two thirds of our petroleum needs.

The reason we have had gas prices up to $4.00 per gallon is our government. The reason we are dependent upon foreign countries for oil is because of our government. It seems that a Department of Energy would have helped us overcome this dependency but in fact they and the Congress are the cause of the problem.

The Federal Energy Information Administration expects world oil demand to grow significantly over the next 30 years, from 80 million barrels per day in 2003 to 98 million barrels per day in 2015 and then to 118 million barrels per day by 2030. With that information the logical action would be to do those things that would develop our own oil and reduce our dependence on foreign countries. Especially should that be considered a problem when we evaluate the countries that have that oil. Would Iran be a threat today if the price of oil was cut in half? Or Russia or Venezuela? When we see China working with Cuba to develop oil wells just 75 miles off our coast shouldn't that lead us to question our own policies? And, when we consider the present unrest in the Middle East and the likely disruption in the oil supply and the probable rise in gas prices it would seem proper to add to our oil refineries and oil supply as soon as possible. In fact, we should be treating this as an emergency.

China has secured oil supply deals totaling $41 billion with Russia, Brazil and Venezuela and are preparing for their future oil supply for the next ten years. We may be left out of the future oil supply and are not taking steps to develop our own supply.

The Federal Bureau of Land Management has just released its inventory of oil and natural gas deposits on federal land. That report indicates we have onshore holdings of an astounding 187trillion cubic feet of natural gas and 21 billion barrels of oil. In addition, another federal study calculates that an additional 83 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and 19.1 billion barrels of oil lie beneath federally controlled territorial waters and there are 660 million acres of government owned land in the west and on military installations which are off limits to oil and gas leasing. Less than 29% of government owned land is available for exploration and development.

The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners finds that the U.S. has more than 200 billion of oil and 2,000 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that are recoverable with today's technology. If fully developed it would eliminate our 10 million barrel diet of foreign oil for 50 years. In other words we have enough oil and gas to handle our own needs for many, many years. Since exploration is not taking place on federal land (only 17% is available for exploration) the amounts available may be much higher.

Just 3% of onshore federal oil and 13% of onshore federal gas are accessible under standard leasing terms. Restrictions such as a ban on surface occupancy tie up 46% of the onshore federal oil and 60% of the onshore federal gas. The rest – 51% of the oil and 27% of the gas – are completely off-limits to development. Off limits because of government laws or regulations. We should open up the barren wasteland of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and our own offshore waters to oil and natural gas drilling.

It is hard to understand why our government is unwilling to drill for oil. Denmark, Great Britain, and Norway are supposedly very friendly to the environment and yet they have oil wells in the North Sea off of their coasts. Australia has had oil wells in their coastal waters for over thirty years. Brazil has a very large oil field in the ocean and has just announced the discovery of another large oil field in the Atlantic ocean. Cuba and China have formed a joint venture to drill for oil just 75 miles off the coast of Florida. Every one else has off shore mining and our decisions to not drill do not effect the mining and use of oil. It only effects us and keeps us dependent on others for our oil.

In 1981 there were 325 oil refineries in the US with a capacity of 18.6 million barrels a day. Today there are 148 refineries with a

capacity of about 17 million barrels though demand has increased by over 20%.

Refineries have had to spend some $37 billion to meet the demands of the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Oil Pollution Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the National Environmentally Policy Act and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act. That has led to the reduction in the number of refineries and our present condition. Congress could help considerably by waiving all of these environmental rules and regulations as they pertain to oil refineries, oil drilling or nuclear power plants. They could but it is unlikely that they will do so. It would also help to remove the requirement for environmental impact studies.

Meeting the requirements of the above environmental regulations is bad enough but in addition we have the lawsuits instituted by the environmental groups. There are good reasons why there have been no new refineries built and once again it is the government. One of the major hurdles to overcome is the lawsuits instituted by environmental groups that are designed to stop production of new plants. Those who would build are faced with long delays and large legal fees and this could be solved by having Congress pass laws preventing law suits that are instituted to stop construction and limiting the law suits invoking the environmental laws to existing or operating facilities or exempting the oil companies from complying with the environmental rules and regulations.

With the present regulations oil companies are not going to build any new refineries. While they can predict their costs for construction they can not estimate the legal costs they will incur from law suits from environmental groups trying to stop construction. These law suits are not instituted to halt pollution. They are instituted to stop our refining oil. The present oil refineries are meeting all of the environment laws and they obviously can build other refineries to meet those laws. Thus, the logical conclusion is that the environmentalists want to stop adding new refineries. They actually want to harm our country. They want to keep our gasoline prices high and increase our dependence on foreign oil. With the situation in the middle east where most of the oil exists makes that dependence a security threat.

Oil companies also can not predict the actions that the EPA may take to stop them nor do they know what the Congress might do next. Those legal costs have and could mount to millions of dollars and the oil companies are not going to build in the face of that possible cost. IF we really want new refineries the Congress will have to exempt the oil companies from those rules, regulations and laws or in some manner pass laws preventing law suits designed to stop them from construction.

Presidential executive orders issued by the President George Bush (41) existed to stop offshore drilling on our Outer Continental Shelf until 2012. (President Bush -43- has finally rescinded that) A recent House bill would allow us to drill for natural gas off the US coast but that hasn't received final approval.

A bill was passed by the Republican Congress in 1995 to permit drilling for oil and gas but President Clinton vetoed it. We can not get a bill through the Senate that permits drilling for oil in Alaska. In 2008 the Democratic Congress passed a bill permitting drilling for oil and claimed they had solved the problem. However, that bill permitted drilling 100 miles off the coast or between 50 and 100 miles if adjacent states permitted. Thus, drilling within 50 miles of the coast was prohibited and that is where the oil companies have explored. That effectively stops any drilling for another several years.

The Bush administration had a plan for leasing the energy – rich Outer Continental Shelf but within a month after Obama took office, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar halted leasing by extending the public comment period by six months. It has not yet released a summary of the comments. The ban has been extended to 2012 and according to House Natural Resources Committee Ranking Member Doc Hastings (R-WA), "The Obama administration has no intention of opening up new areas for offshore drilling during his four years in office".

In the meantime the Dept.of Interior cancelled oil and gas leases on 77 parcels of federal land Utah and also stopped eight parcels from a lease sale in Wyoming. Shell oil has just announced they are postponing their plan to drill for oil in Arctic waters off Alaska because the Environmental Appeals Board invalidated its air quality permit. The permit had already been issued but the Board changed its mind. It was estimated that 54,700 jobs would have been created and that a payroll of 145 billion dollars would have occurred due to that project. Shell had already spent $4 billion ($2.4 billion was for permits and leases) over the last five years in preparation and now is forced to stop.

Several leaked Interior Department memos disclosed that Mr. Obama planned to use executive power to designate 10 million acres of western land as "monuments" which would put them off-limits to energy developments and could stop current timber and mining work.

President Obama revealed a plan to open more acreage to exploratory oil and gas drilling but the plan creates reduces more acreage than it adds. Some choice sites in Alaska were removed and the ones that were added have to have environmental studies before a lease sale can be held. Then there would have to be seismic surveys and federal air permits obtained before drilling could start. The net result is a removal of acreage for the near future.

Rep. Trent Franks (AZ-R), said, " the ironic reality is that the administration's new policy actually closes more offshore drilling sites than it opens. Had the administration done nothing, a lease plan was already set to take effect that would have opened vast expanses of the Outer Continental Shelf, drastically increasing our nation's ability to tap into our domestic energy supply".

The National Petroleum Reserve- Alaska (NPR-A) was a 23 million stretch of Alaska's North Slope set aside by President Warren Harding for the purpose of supplying our country with oil and gas. It is estimated to hold 12 billion barrels of oil and 73 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. For more than five years the state of Alaska has worked with energy companies, local communities and Native

Alaska corporations on a balanced plan to open NPR-A to drilling in a site known as CD-5. In February, the U. S. army Corps reversed course and denied the issuance of a critical permit for the site. As Alaska senator, Lisa Murkowski stated in a recent address, “For heavens sake, if we can’t drill in the National Petroleum Reserve – an area specifically designated by Congress for oil and gas production – where can we drill?”

This has even greater importance than it appears for the production from the North Slope is starting to slow down. In 1988 the Alaska pipeline carried about two million barrels a day and now only about 670,000 barrels a day which is about 13% of the U.S. production. As the amount flowing through the pipeline slows down there is much concern that the slower flow will result in the oil freezing or forming into a waxy mass and thus raise the risk of interruptions and spills. NPR-5 would add the oil flow needed to solve that problem and since NPR-5 is almost adjacent to the pipeline it would require very little infrastructure to join to the pipeline. To add to the problem the moratorium issued due to the Gulf oil spill has also stopped drilling in Alaska. Royal Dutch Shell was awaiting Interior Department approval to start drilling five offshore wells this year but the moratorium will move that into 2011 because of the winter weather.

Which brings us to the Gulf oil spill. The blowup occurred on April 20th and by the 22nd the oil started flowing from the well. It was not capped until July 15. The lack of action by President Obama was amazing. Other countries had experienced spills before and many had special equipment for spills. Thirteen counties offered to send “skimmer” ships to help skim up the oil and Obama refused their help which meant the oil kept flowing with inadequate measures to stop it and much of the Gulf coast was contaminated from the oil.

The only real decisive measure taken by Obama was to issue a moratorium that stopped all drilling – everywhere - claiming that the action was taken after having reviewed a study from seven experts on oil drilling. "The decision to impose a temporary moratorium on deep-water drilling was made by the secretary, following consultation with colleagues including the White House."

After one of the reviewers complained, the Interior Department promptly issued an apology during a conference call, in a formal letter and during a personal meeting in June.

All seven experts asked to review the Interior Department's work expressed concern about the change made by the White House, saying that it differed in important ways from the draft they had approved.

"We believe the report does not justify the moratorium as written, and that the moratorium as changed will not contribute measurably to increased safety and will have immediate and long-term economic effects," the scientists wrote earlier this year to Louisiana Gov. Bobby Jindal and Sens. Mary Landrieu and David Vitter. "The secretary should be free to recommend whatever he thinks is correct, but he should not be free to use our names to justify his political decisions."

On June 22, US District Judge Martin Feldman ruled that the moratorium, which halted drilling at 33 deepwater sites in the Gulf of Mexico in the wake of the Gulf oil spill, was overly broad and did not rely on "the facts.” But the administration is ready to fight both arguments in its bid to win a temporary suspension of Judge Feldman's order, pending a full appeal of the injunction itself.

So, the Obama instituted a new moratorium with “ better reasons”. (subsequently, in February,2011, Judge Feldman cited the Department of the Interior as being in “contempt of court”). Finally, on October 12, the moratorium was lifted by the Interior Department and we will soon be able to assess the damage done by that moratorium. We know that 23,000 high paying jobs were lost during that time and we don’t yet know how many drilling rigs were moved to other locations. We also don’t know yet the effects of the new rules placed on drilling by the Interior Department but those rules will not facilitate oil drilling. Bureau Director Michael Bromwich is estimating it will take four to six weeks for his agency to ensure that drillers have complied with those rules and inspected their platforms. Mr. Bromwich has told the industry that he won’t succumb to “political pressure” to speed up this process and that a slow rate of permits approval is the “cost of improving safety”. He has “not succumbed” and no drilling has been approved as of February 18, 2011 and so Judge martin Feldman has ordered the Obama administration to grant a set of five permits for deep-water drilling in the Gulf within thirty days. He deemed the administration’s inaction as “ increasingly inexcusable”. The judge said the ,”government’s continuous delays are intentional’, part of an effort t use last year’s BP oil spill as an excuse to limit fossil fuel extraction. The idled 33 drilling rigs have been operating for years without safety problems and the new rules are just another opportunity for the government to reduce our oil output.

Several leaked Interior Department memos disclosed that Mr. Obama planned to use executive power to designate 10 million acres of western land as “monuments” which would put them off-limits to energy developments and could stop current timber and mining work.

President Obama revealed a plan to open more acreage to exploratory oil and gas drilling but the plan creates reduces more acreage than it adds. Some choice sites in Alaska were removed and the ones that were added have to have environmental studies before a lease sale can be held. Then there would have to be seismic surveys and federal air permits obtained before drilling could start. The net result is a removal of acreage for the near future.

Rep. Trent Franks (AZ-R), said, “ the ironic reality is that the administration’s new policy actually closes more offshore drilling sites than it opens. Had the administration done nothing, a lease plan was already set to take effect that would have opened vast expanses of the Outer Continental Shelf, drastically increasing our nation’s ability to tap into our domestic energy supply”.

Mr. Salazar acknowledged that the new plan cancels five potential lease sales that had been scheduled to go forward in the next two years. The Institute for Energy Research, an industry-backed think tank said the areas with cancelled leases could hold up to 77 billion barrels of oil or more than three times the country’s total proven reserves.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal by Kimberley Strassel states, " In March of last year, Mr. Obama reversed or scaled back nearly every major offshore oil opportunity that has come about since the price spike of 2008 – effectively reimposing a moratorium on drilling off the coasts. His administration has killed leases in developmentally crucial areas of Alaska. His EPA has refused to issue permits. The White House used the BP oil spill as an excuse to also shut down the deep-water Gulf. Onshore, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar has evoked oi-and-gas leases. The EPA is suffocating the coal industry with regulations…. The White House's energy policy, says Dan Kish of the Institute for Energy Research, is "embargoing our own energy supplies to drive up their costs". Is that insane?

President Obama's 2011 budget imposes $36 billion in new taxes on the oil and gas industry and this will further discourage domestic production. One of those new taxes has existed since 1926 and permits a percentage depletion allowance and the other has existed since 1913 and permits deductions for intangible drilling costs. These two deductions recognize the costs incurred by companies in drilling and mining. He has already stated that he would propose to "study" development in the Southern Atlantic but that he would delay development off Virginia's coast.

It is frustrating to realize that we have oil and the capability of mining it and refining it and yet we import two thirds of our needs. We have oil off of both coasts, in the Gulf, in Alaska, on federal owned lands and in the shale in Wyoming. Since we can't explore in most of the federal owned lands there may be even more available there. Our congress has passed laws that permit (encourage?) environmentalists to interfere with our production and makes us pay much more for gasoline and place our country at risk because of their actions.

Our Congress should pass laws that prevent law suits from being instituted against non-existent facilities. Existing, operating plants should meet environmental standards but it is ridiculous to honor law suits complaining that refineries or plants that do not exist should have to prove before they are constructed that they will meet environmental .requirements. such law suits are not meant to protect the environment. The environment is not endangered by a plant that does not exist. The purpose of those law suits is to stop us from becoming independent of foreign energy. Congress can pass a law that limits law suits to existing plants. That would speed- up the construction process and save us lots of money and would not have a detrimental effect on our environment.

Coal

The following is from the Department of Energy.

"Coal is one of the true measures of the energy strength of the United States. One quarter of the world's coal reserves are found within the United States, and the energy content of the nation's coal resources exceeds that of all the world's known recoverable oil. Coal is also the workhorse of the nation's electric power industry, supplying more than half the electricity consumed by Americans.

Coal-fired electric generating plants are the cornerstone of America's central power system. Coal is also one of the least expensive ways to generate electricity. Only natural gas is cheaper".

Coal does produce carbon dioxide and is therefore considered undesirable. There are other gases and coal ash as well so coal is looked upon with disfavor by all environmentalists in spite of the economics. As stated before, carbon dioxide is very desirable but coal will never be accepted as a good energy source. Because of the pressure from environmentalists many coal fired electric facilities are being shut down.

The Tennessee Valley authority has recently announced a 20 year development plan that emphasizes nuclear and gas and includes fewer coal units. The TVA has agreed to mothball 18 coal -fired boilers and spend as much as $5 billion on new pollution controls. In August, Xcel Energy notified regulators it wants to close a plant in Boulder , CO and convert four units at its Cherokee plant in Denver to burn natural gas instead of coal.

Calpine Corp. Houston, says it will convert to gas some of the coal-fired plants in Delaware and New Jersey that it is buying from Pepco Holdings. Progress Energy Inc. of Raleigh, NC intends to close our coal – burning plants an replace them with gas.

That is not the case with India and China (the world's largest coal producer). Both of them have an abundant supply of coal and intend to develop and use it in the future. The International Energy Agency (IEA) estimates that China, which generates more that 70% of its electricity with coal, will build 600 gigawatts of coal fired power in the next 25 years. It expects Indian coal fired power to grow too – though more slowly.

The EPA is opposed to the development of coal mining and is also involved in a fight over Mountain Top Removal (MTR).

Mountaintop/Mountain-top/Mountain top removal mining is a form of surface mining that involves the mining of the summit or summit ridge of a mountain. Entire coal seams are removed from the top of a mountain, hill or ridge by removing the so-called overburdened soil, lying above the economically desired resource). After the coal is extracted, the removed material is put back onto the ridge to approximate the mountain's original contours.[2] Any overburden the mining company considers excess (that which it's not able to place back onto the ridge top) is moved into neighboring valleys.[3] Mountaintop removal is most closely associated with coal mining in the Appalachian Mountains in the eastern United States.

. Mountain Top Removal (MTR) counted for less than 5% of U.S. coal production as of 2001. In some regions, however, the percentage is higher, for example MTR provided 30% of the coal mined in West Virginia in 2006.

.Here is a news release from CHARLESTON, W.VA. -- Here in coal country, President Obama's ambitious Environmental Protection

Agency has met its first big mess.

On Inauguration Day, the EPA began a crackdown on "mountaintop" coal mines. The agency has scrutinized about 175 proposed mines, where peaks would be blasted off and valleys filled in with the rubble. It has signed off on only 48.

EPA officials -- repeating a refrain from a fast-marching first year in which they also took on greenhouse gases and the seemingly eternal problems of the Chesapeake Bay -- say they're just following the law. That, they say, means keeping poisonous things from the inside of a mountain out of streams on the surface.

But to many people in Appalachia, the orders coming out of Washington, especially one this month, have appeared contradictory and mysterious, signing off on some mines and blocking others. Environmentalists are unhappy because they fear federal officials are losing their nerve to take on the powerful coal industry. The coal industry is unhappy because it thinks the administration is on the brink of giving in to the green crowd.

"They didn't have a well-thought-out plan whenever they did this. And that's really been the basis of the uproar," said Randy Huffman, secretary of West Virginia's Department of Environmental Protection, which EPA officials say has not been tough enough on mines in the past.

So, we have the local EPA in disagreement with the EPA from Washington. It seems probable that the local group would be more familiar and competent in a matter that is near to them. The Washington pointy-heads are following an agenda that appears to be to reduce MTR in spite of the logic involved. This is an excellent example of why we should abolish the federal EPA and let the local EPA take over. The EPA recently proposed to significantly restrict or prohibit mountaintop mining at the Spruce No. 1 surface mine in Logan County, W. Va. Attempts at dialogue with the company failed to ensure a significant decrease of environmental and water quality impacts from the project. The Spruce No. 1 mine, as proposed, would bury more than seven miles of headwater streams, directly impact 2,278 acres of forestland, and degrade water quality in streams adjacent to the mine. The project was permitted in 2007 and subsequently delayed by litigation. In January, 1911 the EPA revoked the permit for the Spruce No. 1 mine which was the first time that the EPA had revoked a previous permit.

If the project has previously had been permitted why was it stopped now? A new, environmentally friendly administration rather than a reasonable one?

“Industry officials believe they face a hostile administration that could seriously harm their business with a range of new federal regulations on greenhouse gas emissions, mountaintop removal mining, air pollution, coal ash disposal and mine safety.

“It certainly is critical,” Michael J. Quillen, chairman of the board of Alpha Natural Resources, a major national coal producer, said of Tuesday’s election. “We’ve got Congress in play. We need a Congress that can balance environmental issues with jobs and national security. We can’t work in an environment where Congress and the administration are antibusiness.” And from all appearances the Obama administration seems to be antibusiness.

Conclusion

As we review this chapter on real energy it is obvious that the government is intent on curtailing our energy. While they are promoting the use of “green energy” which supplies about 5% of our energy needs they are actively stopping the real energy sources. Hydro energy has just now been started to be looked at but nothing has really been done to start it. There has been talk about promoting nuclear energy but as of November 2010 there have been no permits or approvals issued to start anything. In fact, the one program that was proceeding has now been stopped.

The government has interfered with drilling for oil and has stopped previously approved leases. He government has stopped oil drilling in the Gulf. Coal is demonized and according to the North American Electric Reliability Corporation the plans of the EPA will cause a reduction of about 7.2% of our generating capacity- mostly from coal.

As Ronald Reagan said, “ the government is not the solution, the government is the problem.

Chapter 11

Reflections

As I look back over what is in this book it seems almost impossible. In the 1970’s the temperature cooled and led some “scientists” to conclude that we were heading into a very bad – even cataclysmic – cold temperature that would be devastating to us. Ten years later as the climate warmed a group of scientists started speculating about global warming. Someone must have recognized an opportunity for making money and In 1988 an organization was formed within the United Nations. (That seems appropriate for the U.N. is about as phony as you can get.)

But, that organization had little effect as a climate change organization. It needed some scientific authorities who would project catastrophic conditions that would happen due to global warming. Those “scientists” would need to be capable of lying and ignoring some factual data and they did. And they would need to have governmental power to establish rules and laws that would require action. And, they would need a lot of gullible people and corrupt politicians to support ridiculous claims.

Records at that time showed that the warmest year in the past century occurred in 1934 and the third warmest was in 1921. NASA, a supposedly realizable source, stated that 1998 was the warmest year on record and only corrected that much later after much damage was done. The facts were bad for the group for If 1934 was the warmest and no dire, terrible consequences had happened then there would be no problem to be solved. The "scientists" continued their program for their livelihood depended upon it and they forecast a continuing warming.

However, the planet started to cool slightly and after 1998 there was no discernable sign of warming. That did not stop them for they continued to predict that the globe would warm drastically. Even now, without any factual indication that the globe is warming they continue their programs and plans to solve this "terrible" problem.

However, global warming is not enough. In order for it to be useful for the alarmists it was necessary for them to have something to blame on people. So, carbon dioxide became the real problem. Carbon dioxide was ideal for several purposes. First, it is easily identifiable. It is created by burning coal and wood, exhaust fumes from gasoline, exhalation from humans and animals and even release from decaying plants. They could not use the most prevalent part of the atmosphere – water vapor – but carbon dioxide is the next most prevalent gas (about 4% of the atmosphere) and generally attributed to mankind so it was chosen.

There was one big problem with that for carbon dioxide is extremely beneficial for mankind. In fact, so beneficial that it is absolutely necessary for our existence.

But, it was the only thing they had so knowing that they had tremendous influence over the media they selected and demonized carbon dioxide.

The result is hard to believe. Now they turned to the governments who passed laws to limit carbon dioxide emissions and that led to cap and trade legislation and the transferring of money from big operations to smaller ones with a small percent being given to the exchanges set up to handle such transfers.

Then, subsidies were given to those who manufactured "clean" energy. Wind towers, solar panels, electric cars, biomass operations and etc.. Subsidies were necessary for none of those are economical feasible.(I do enjoy electric vehicles on the golf course – the one place where they do make sense).

A submittal in the Wall Street Journal by Bjorn Lomborg, director of the Copenhagen Consensus on November 12, 2010 summarizes it well. Writing about the next scheduled climate change summit he says, " Attendees in Cancun will be singing the same tune they did last year: Nations must commit themselves to drastic , immediate carbon cuts. This ignores both the economic reality and 20 years of experience that tells us that this policy choice is incredibly expensive, utterly ineffective and ultimately politically unsellable. How did we get to the point where we have fixated on a response to climate change that would do so little good for such a high cost?"

Mr. Lomborg is one who believes that climate change is a problem but recognizes that the approach restricting carbon dioxide is not the answer.

He's right about carbon dioxide restriction not being the answer but he's also wrong about global warming being a problem. This old earth has existed for a few thousand years and is doing quite well and it seems logical to predict that it will continue to do so. We are too puny to have much effect on it even if it was a problem.

There have been fortunes made from this made - up catastrophe. A whole industry has been developed. Carbon cap and trade has led to the transfer of lots of money. Manufactures of various devices have been given subsidies and have produced very expensive items – wind tunnels, electric cars and solar panels and stuff. Those manufacturers have employed lobbyists to influence stupid legislators and the list of people employed goes on and on. There is no doubt that billions of dollars (maybe a $ trillion) have been spent on this and there has been no, repeat no economical benefit from this and since there is no global warming and since carbon dioxide is not a problem there is also no climate benefit produced. Because of government intervention many of the perpetrators of this scheme have gotten rich (remember Al Gore?). They are crooks and our government is stupid or insane.

Chapter 12

Obama

As this was being compiled it became obvious that our new president was very much involved in all of the above. He has always indicated his concern over global warming and the environment and his actions have borne this out. President Obama, himself, a few days after taking office issued new CAFÉ rules that raised the mileage requirements for cars and quickly followed that with directing

federal regulators on to move on an application by California and 13 other states to set strict limits on greenhouse gases from cars and trucks. He also ordered the Transportation Department to begin drawing up rules imposing higher fuel-economy standards on cars and light trucks.

The directives made good on an Obama campaign pledge and were reversal of Bush administration policy.

Obama then directed the Environmental Protection Agency to reconsider the Bush administration's past rejection of the California application. The president also directed the Transportation Department to draw up rules to implement a 2007 law requiring a 40

percent improvement in gas mileage for autos and light trucks by 2020. The Bush administration failed to write any regulations to enforce the new law.

In the previous chapter on the Environmental Protection Agency it was reported

about their actions which stopped the Toll Bros. from reclaiming an area that was distressed; about continuing a drought by keeping water away from the San Joaquin Valley in California, about reactivating a 2006 investigation of Atrazine, about stopping the Arch Co. from coal mining, about issuing new standards on arsenic, about attempting to institute a new tax, about being sued by the state of Texas, and about implementing CAP and TRADE.

In February, 2011 both the Senate and the House introduced legislation to remove the authority from the EPA to regulate greenhouse gases and so we see that the Congress is aware that the EPA must be regulated and controlled.

It was bad enough before but now it is obvious that the EPA should be abolished. Obama will not only ignore the EPA. He will promote what it is intending to do.

In the previous chapter concerning Real Energy it was reported that the Constellation corp. had given up trying to start a nuclear power plant due to this administration. The same situation exists with coal. Permits to mine that were previously granted have now been rescinded and Mountain Top Removal is being held up in West Virginia. Coal has been demonized by this administration and as a result many companies are planning to change from coal to natural gas which is quite costly.

It was also reported that the administration had placed a moratorium on drilling in the Gulf leading to 23,000 people losing their jobs and that when Judge Martin Feldman ordered that the moratorium be lifted that the administration ignored the order which led the judge to cite them for contempt of court. Judge Feldman has now ordered (Feb.21, 2011)the administration to issue permits on five areas within 30 days.

Previously approved leasing was halted on the Outer Continental Shelf, oil and gas leases were halted in Utah and lease sales of eight parcels were stopped in Wyoming. In that same chapter it is reported that drilling sites in Alaska were stopped and, of course, Anwar is still off limits in Alaska. Also in Alaska the approved drilling in NPR-A was stopped.

He is not against drilling for he has approved loaning Brazil $2 billion to help them develop their deep-water oil field and has even indicated he would issue a permit for them to drill in our Gulf. He is only against our drilling. He makes “cute” statements like “ use it or lose it” referring to the fact that oil companies are not drilling where the administration has approved drilling leases. The oil companies only drill where they think oil exists and not where the government issues leases.

So then we have Obama and our energy problems. There have been many announcements made about energy and most of them have been deliberately confusing. Obama has announced that the government was extending loan guarantees to build nuclear plants. Good. However, the same regulatory hurdles are still there and loan guarantees are only a way to sound like something good is happening.

The conclusion is that President Obama has no intention of doing anything that will help us have more energy – from nuclear power, from oil or from coal. In fact we are able to conclude that he will actually take action that will reduce our energy supply.

He is directing the U. S. government to invest billions of dollars in solar and wind energy and electric cars and that money will be wasted. The Cap and Trade legislation, which he supported would have added around $850 billion to the costs of the private sector and the total environmental tab would have been in excess of a trillion dollars. He realized that costs would increase substantially for consumers but that does not bother him and now the EPA has announced that it will implement Cap & Trade.

It is accurate to say that Obama is a dedicated environmentalist. He believes in global warming and that carbon dioxide is real problem. That seems to be his reason for stopping oil drilling and coal mining. In spite of what is now known from Europe about wind energy he continues to advocate spending huge sums to develop that and also throws lots of money into solar energy development.

There are no attempts to build more oil refineries and with the volatile situation in the mid east this could quickly become a national security problem. Even though he verbally supports nuclear power the government’s recent action has stopped the most promising proposal.

He is clearly a socialist and does not understand that the capitalist economic system continually produces more wealth, year after year, and that this system then continually provides the greatest prosperity to the most people. That system also distributes income approximately in proportion to the contribution made by individuals in that system. As former president John Kennedy stated, “ A rising tide lifts all boats”.

The logical conclusion is that President Obama is an environmental-wacko who is actually willing to reduce our energy supply and waste money on fantasy energy projects that will not help us.

Another logical conclusion is that he is not blessed with great intelligence. As a Senator in Illinois he made no contribution to laws and as a U.S. senator he did not author any legislation. He has only held two press conferences in over two years in office and did not do well in either one – which is probably why he has not held more. His absolute, total, complete dependence on the teleprompter also indicates a lack of intelligence and unwillingness to ad lib or even try to speak impromptu (he really has a good speech writer). His belief in global warming is another indication of not being too smart. He has stated that we only have 2% of the worlds’ “proven reserves” as if that indicated we did not have enough oil to be developing. Has he never heard of Anwar, of shale deposits, and does he deny the existence of off shore oil? Or is he not very smart?

He does not realize that our constitution defines the best government in the world and adherence to it would solve our financial problems. He believed that stimulus programs would fix our economy. He promoted Obamacare with false statements and does not realize yet that it is a terrible piece of legislation. The administration has already issued hundreds of waivers to big businesses (no small businesses) and unions and to four states. There has never been an enactment where 26 states sued to have a law repealed and now other states are suing to get him to protect our borders and stop illegal immigration.

He is setting records for the number of vacations taken, for the number of times played golf, for the number of speeches made and for the most time spent away from Washington. And, the worst record of all is that in his first two years in office he has added $4 trillion to our debt.

There is also this to ponder:

In Dinesh D'Souza's book, The Roots of Obama's Rage, on page 199 he states, "Obama is on a systematic campaign against the colonial system that destroyed his father's dreams. With a kind of suppressed fury, he is committed to keep going until he has brought that system down. And according to his father's anti-colonial ideology, which Obama has internalized for himself, that system is the military and economic power of the United States of America.

We have a real problem with President Obama.

Chapter 13

The Fix

There is a solution. There is way out. It will take Congressional action but there is a way to fix this mess.

Repeal the Endangered Species Acts and void all of the rules and regulations issued for them. Each state can adopt whatever rules they want to apply to their own state.

Abolish the Environmental Protection Agency and void all of the rules and regulations issued by the department. Each state has an EPA and can adopt whatever it wants.

Abolish the Department of Energy. Transfer the nuclear operations to the Department of the Interior and close the rest of the department.

Pass a law that will limit the law - suits placed invoking the various environmental laws to existing and operating facilities. Obviously, a facility that is not operating is not causing a problem. The suits placed before a facility is in operation are not supposed to reduce pollution. They are placed to stop construction of needed facilities. They delay construction and add to the costs of construction and should be eliminated. Environmental impact studies should be eliminated. When a facility is constructed and operating it can be evaluated and made to comply with the laws. This would enable us to construct nuclear power plants and oil refineries in an economical and expeditious manner.

Article 1, Section 8 of our Constitution does not provide for ownership of land by the federal government except as a "seat of government" or for the "erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-yards and other needful buildings". In reading, The Constitution of the United States by former Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story (page 167-169) there is an implication that the states own all of the land not occupied by the federal government. The federal government owns 29% of all the country, 55.5% of the land in the 11 western states and 66.7% of the land in Alaska as well as lesser amounts in the other states. Article iv, section 3, clause 2 reads," The Congress shall have Power to dispose of … the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States".

The federal government should auction all of the land it owns that is not authorized and what it is unable to sell should then be given to the states. The sale of the land should bring lots and lots of money to the federal government and enable it to start paying down the national debt. The land sold could then be taxed by the states and generate income for them. Land given to the states could be leased by the states and generate income for them from that. The states would control the land within their borders and could determine its use. With the Endangered Species Act rescinded and the Environmental Protection Agency abolished that should allow the states to allow logging, drilling for oil, mining coal, mining shale for oil, constructing nuclear power plants and oil refineries and fixing our energy problems. We have a tremendous asset in our undeveloped land and this could turn it into productive land.

All subsidies that are awarded for "green projects" should be stopped. That would include subsidies for wind towers, solar panels, electric cars, ethanol and any other project. Gasoline companies should have the requirement removed that forces them to include ethanol in their products.

While the above recommendations would benefit us there is a hindrance to their adoption. In the previous chapter it was suggested that President Obama is a problem. Because of his anti- energy programs and because he would very probably veto all of my recommendations it is recommended that President Obama should be impeached and removed from office. Then we could start to fix our energy problems.

###