

## *SPPI News Search*

6-20-08

### **Mythical UN IPCC ‘Consensus’ Continues to Crumble:**

<http://climatesci.org/2008/06/17/guest-weblog-by-dr-kiminori-itoh-of-yokohama-national-university/>

Top UN IPCC Japanese Scientist Turns on IPCC. Calls Warming Fears: ‘Worst scientific scandal in the history’

By Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an award-winning PhD environmental physical chemist who specializes in optical waveguide spectroscopy from the University of Tokyo. Itoh just released his new book *Lies and Traps in the Global Warming Affairs* (currently in Japanese only).

“We have described many topics in this book, including inaccurate temperature measurements (e.g., A. Watt’s work), ‘observations’ of climate sensitivity, many climate forcings such as colored-aerosol and vegetation (based on 2005 NRC report as Roger has so many times pointed out), and the effect of solar magnetic activity (including my own work),” Itoh wrote on June 17, 2008, on the weblog of former Colorado State Climatologist Dr. Roger Pielke, Sr. Itoh’s new book includes chapters calling man-made global warming fears “the worst scientific scandal in the history.” “I also cited the opinions of Dr. Akasofu (Professor Emeritus, University of Alaska) in the last part of the book. He sincerely advises us, ‘When people come to know what the truth is, they will feel deceived by science and scientists,’ and says, ‘IPCC should make appropriate comments before G8.’ I sincerely think he is correct,” Itoh wrote. Itoh concludes his book with six points: “1. The global temperature will not increase rapidly if at all. There is sufficient time to think about future energy and social systems. 2. The climate system is more robust than conventionally claimed. For instance, the Gulf Stream will not stop due to fresh water inflow. 3. There are many factors that cause the climate changes, particularly in regional and local scales. Considering only greenhouse gases is nonsense and harmful. 4. A comprehensive climate convention is necessary. The framework-protocol formulism is too old to apply to modern international issues. 5. Reconsider countermeasures for the climate changes. For instance, to reduce Asian Brown Cloud through financial and technical aid of developed countries is beneficial from many aspects, and can become a Win-Win policy. 6. The policy makers should be ‘Four-ball jugglers.’ Multiple viewpoints are inevitable to realize sustainable societies.”

\*\*\*\*\*

New CCSP Report Appears “Weather and Climate Extremes in a Changing Climate” - Unfortunately, Another Biased Assessment

Roger Pielke Sr.

There is another CCSP report that was made available yesterday. It is

CCSP, 2008: [Weather and Climate Extremes in a Changing Climate](#). Regions of Focus: North America, Hawaii, Caribbean, and U.S. Pacific Islands. A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research. [Thomas R. Karl, Gerald A. Meehl, Christopher D. Miller, Susan J. Hassol, Anne M. Waple, and William L. Murray (eds.)]. Department of Commerce, NOAA’s National Climatic Data Center, Washington, D.C., USA, 164 pp.

It is led by the same individual, Tom Karl, Director of the National Climate Data Center, who produced the CCSP Report “Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences”, in which I resigned from and detailed the reasons in

Pielke Sr., Roger A., 2005: [Public Comment on CCSP Report “Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences”](#). 88 pp including appendices.

This report perpetuates the use of assessments to promote a particular perspective on climate change, such as they write in the [Executive Summary](#)

*“It is well established through formal attribution studies that the global warming of the past 50 years is due primarily to human-induced increases in heat-trapping gases. Such studies have only recently been used to determine the causes of some changes in extremes at the scale of a continent. Certain aspects of observed increases in temperature extremes have been linked to human influences. The increase in heavy precipitation events is associated with an increase in water vapor, and the latter has been attributed to human-induced warming.”*

This claim conflicts with the 2005 National Research Council report

National Research Council, 2005: [Radiative forcing of climate change: Expanding the concept and addressing uncertainties](#). Committee on Radiative Forcing Effects on Climate Change, Climate Research Committee, Board on Atmospheric Sciences and Climate, Division on Earth and Life Studies, The National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., 208 pp where a diversity of human climate forcings were found to alter global average radiative warming, including from atmospheric aerosols and due to the deposition of soot on snow and ice. The claim of an increase in atmospheric water vapor conflicts with a variety of observations as summarized on Climate Science (e.g. [see](#)).

To further illustrate the bias in the report, the assessment chose to ignore peer reviewed research that raises serious questions with respect to the temperature data that is used in their report. As just one example, they ignored research where we have shown major problems in the use of surface air temperature measurements to diagnose long term temperature trends including temperature extremes. Our multi-authored paper

Pielke Sr., R.A., C. Davey, D. Niyogi, S. Fall, J. Steinweg-Woods, K. Hubbard, X. Lin, M. Cai, Y.-K. Lim, H. Li, J. Nielsen-Gammon, K. Gallo, R. Hale, R. Mahmood, S. Foster, R.T. McNider, and P. Blanken, 2007: [Unresolved issues with the assessment of multi-decadal global land surface temperature trends](#). J. Geophys. Res., 112, D24S08, doi:10.1029/2006JD008229,

should have been included in the CCSP assessment. It was ignored. Yet the papers that use this land surface temperature data to claim changes in the extremes were included; e.g.

Easterling, D.R., B. Horton, P.D. Jones, T.C. Peterson, T.R. Karl, D.E. Parker, M.J. Salinger, V. Razuvayev, N. Plummer, P. Jamison, and C.K. Folland, 1997: Maximum and minimum temperature trends for the globe. *Science*, 277(5324), 364-367.

Peterson, T.C., 2003: Assessment of urban versus rural in situ surface temperatures in the contiguous United States: No difference found. *Journal of Climate*, 16(18), 2941-2959.

Peterson, T.C., X. Zhang, M. Brunet-India, and J.L. Vázquez- Aguirre, 2008: Changes in North American extremes derived from daily weather data. *Journal Geophysical Research*, 113, D07113, doi:10.1029/2007JD009453.

**Since this assessment is so clearly biased, it should be rejected as providing adequate climate information to policymakers. There also should be questions raised concerning having the same individuals preparing these reports in which they are using them to promote their own perspective on the climate, and deliberately excluding peer reviewed papers that disagree with their viewpoint and research papers. This is a serious conflict of interest.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Glenn Beck: Movement to Drill now**

<http://www.glennbeck.com/content/articles/article/196/11519/>

**June 17, 2008 - 13:15 ET**

GLENN: Congressman John Peterson was on this program, I believe it was on Friday. Congressman, welcome to the program, sir. How are you?

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: Thanks for having us on.

GLENN: Sure. Now, you are the guy that last week proposed a bill that would open up the outer continental shelf.

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: That's right. 50 miles out, oil and gas, tremendous resources. In fact, the current calculation they are approaching \$11 trillion worth of oil out there alone.

GLENN: Wait, \$11 trillion or 11 trillion barrels?

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: \$11 trillion worth of oil.

GLENN: Okay. And the outer continental shelf alone, that makes us energy independent if we would pull this out for how long?

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: Well, now, I don't know that it makes us energy independent. It makes us less dependent. It's going to take -- natural gas we can be totally self-sufficient because we have lots of natural gas out there. But on oil it's helpful. We also need to do the shale oil and we need to do Alaska, we need to do coal-to-liquids, coal-to-gas. We need to do more nuclear. We need to do everything, all the renewables and conservation so that we can compete in the economy in the future.

GLENN: Yeah. Unfortunately none of that is happening in congress. Tell us what happened last week when you introduced this bill.

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: Well, surprise. In a subcommittee they don't like amendments and they talked the other amendments out. I decided we need to start this today and that's what we've done. Across the country. And now we're approaching 70% of the American public who support offshore production of energy and only 18% oppose and 15% are undecided. And I predict that when the rest of that 15% listen to the facts, we're going to be close to 85% support of energy offshore. Because Americans, you know, what America doesn't know yet is that natural gas yesterday was \$12.93. That's approaching \$13. If that continues to climb in the next month or two, we'll have a doubling of natural gas costs to heat homes this winter. We're putting that \$12.93 gas in the ground to heat homes because we start in the summer and then we burn it in the winter when it's cold. And last year at this time it was \$6.50 to \$7. It wouldn't take long to figure out we're soon going to be doubling natural gas prices and when that happens, I don't know how the middle class and poor in this country are going to drive their car and heat their homes.

GLENN: Barack Obama will tax the rich and then give it to the poor.

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: That's right. Our original bill, we take money, you know, the amount of royalty on this kind of wealth would be huge. And that's money the government doesn't have now and we would like to take a portion of that. So we have the money to support renewable and do all the research for solar and wind and hydrogen and electric cars and all this stuff, do all



**Related Story**

[Rep. Peterson: Congress needs to wake-up and Increase Domestic Energy Production](#)

the research that's needed to make it happen. But also to do the -- we're going to have to help poor people this winter. If we go offshore, we could take a small piece of the royalties for helping people insulate their homes and to pay for energy until we get affordable energy.

GLENN: Well, let me play devil's advocate here with you, congressman. You know, we are so very far behind the rest of the world when it comes to global warming. We are just -- the rest of the world looks at us in awe and says, goodness, I wish the United States would wake up and start to get on board with global warming. So name, if you will, congressman, all of the countries that have banned offshore oil exploration.

CALLER: Zero, nobody. Everybody in the world, you know, everybody gives Brazil credit for ethanol and being energy independent. Well, 15% of their energy's ethanol. The rest is offshore.

GLENN: No, you didn't understand the question. Because everybody else cares about global warming and they want to get off oil. The question was name the countries that have banned offshore oil. Because there must be a lot of them.

CALLER: No, there's not any. Because only the leaders, you know, the Gore-ites that are voting this global warming theory, the number one issue facing America, affordable energy, global warming is still a theory. It's computer models to say that there's a problem. The real facts do not prove that. And it's time the American public -- and I had a gentleman on a plane last week say to me, they talk like this global warming debate's over. He said, did I miss it? He said, I'm a pretty informed citizen. I don't know how we had the debate and I didn't know about it, he said, because I'm not convinced that's our number one issue. Our number one issue is available affordable energy.

GLENN: Clearly. Is there anyone in Washington that you know of that has ever run a business? I mean, it is so apparent to me that the clowns in Washington have no idea what it takes to run a household or what it takes to run a business because energy -- if we don't have energy -- and they all pretend like, oh, well, we're just, next week we're just going to have more energy. We don't have it.

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: China, China's increasing their use by about 15% a year. They are soon going to surpass us. And, you know, they are building a coal plant every five days, a nuclear plant a month, hydro dams, they are doing wind, solar, they are doing everything. We should do everything. There's nothing we shouldn't be doing that would give us more energy.

GLENN: Right. Do you believe in today's world we could actually build hydroelectric dam?

CALLER: No, but we have a lot of dams that have water coming out of them that could be harnessed for hydropower that we wouldn't build a dam. We have a lot of dams. Our government owns them.

GLENN: Right. But what I'm asking you is in today's America, if we wanted to go with the cleanest energy possible, you don't believe we could even build that?

CALLER: Absolutely not. We could not build a dam in this country, no. In fact, you know, they are trying to blame the oil companies for not building the refineries. Well, it's almost impossible. The refineries -- the oil companies are expanding existing refineries because they already have a permit. They don't think they can get through the permit process. I think there's one. I'm trying to think of the company. There's one coming online that's soon going to be built I think here in the near future but that's one.

GLENN: Are you thinking of one in South Dakota?

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: I think so.

GLENN: That's not going online anytime soon. The opponents say they have plenty in their bag of tricks to keep it tied up in court for years.

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: Well, that's the trouble. The ability to do unlimited, just presents so many things from happening. And that's how the liberals have won is turn the trial lawyers loose to sue every little --

GLENN: So why is natural gas going up?

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: Well, it's because we're using so much of it now. See, just 12 years ago we only made 7% of our electricity with natural gas. We only allowed it to be used for peak power, morning and evening, when we use that extra surge because a gas generator, you can just turn it on, turn it off. So it backs up wind, it backs up everything. So now we're 23% of our electricity's with natural gas and over the last six months we've turned down, our PUCs at the state level, the state environmental agencies have turned down between 50 and 70 coal plants. Those will all become natural gas plants because that's our only option.

GLENN: Wait, wait, wait. Why did we ban them in the first place? Why did we say we could only use them at peak times? If we have so much gas?

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: Originally people thought gas was too good a fuel, it was a poor use of natural gas. When you make electricity, you only use a small percentage of the BTU value. If you make your electricity in the middle of a city where you use the hot water to heat your city, then you use a lot of it. But unfortunately most of our power plants, we chill the water and put it back in the river or do something with it and we only use a small part of the energy. So making electricity out of natural gas -- see, natural gas is a commodity that 55% of petrochemicals is natural gas. But 60 to 70% of fertilizer is natural gas. Polymers and plastics, 45% of the cost of making them is natural gas because it's an ingredient. See, it's a substance that we use to make almost everything. And so being it's such an important product, they didn't think we should make electric out of it. Now we're making electric out of it. But we haven't opened up supply and there's -- you know, we cannot change world oil prices. We can only change dependence. But when we produce natural gas, we can change our price. We only import 17% of our natural gas, 15% from Canada and 2% from other foreign countries. But natural gas is the one that's really biting us because Dow Chemical spent \$8 billion in '02 for natural gas a year and they are now spending \$8 billion a quarter and they were 60% on shore. They are now 34% on shore. They had to go where gas was cheaper because we use so much of it.

GLENN: You know, on this program I warned a year ago about ethanol and how crazy that was.

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: Yes.

GLENN: Then before anybody else was talking about the price of food, I told people -- and everybody said I was crazy. I said, store up on food just as an investment because it is going to go up at such a high rate, you will gain money. It is a good investment, probably the best investment you can make is just putting food downstairs for your family just to offset the cost. I warned at the time, you haven't seen anything yet. God forbid our crops are wiped out in any way.

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: Well, we got \$7.50 for corn yesterday. That's the world record. And we have, I think someone said 40% of the corn's in trouble with water.

GLENN: We were looking at just the price of corn yesterday is the equivalent of going from \$80 a barrel oil to \$320 a barrel. They are talking now about rationing, et cetera, et cetera. Now, I've been warning the same thing about fuel and gas, that you think it's bad now. Buckle up because God forbid we have a hurricane or the war heats up or Iran gets nasty.

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: There's three issues that can spike prices overnight. One is a terroristic attack, when you have lines that are vulnerable. The Iraqi pipeline goes right by Iran. If

they blew up our sending station in a major country like Saudi Arabia, oil prices would double. So if we have terroristic attacks, a storm in the Gulf. In the last two years are the first years on record in a row that we had no major storm in the Gulf. Major storms in the Gulf can displace 20, 30, to 40% of our energy for several months. And that's energy we never get then because you produce energy, you know, 24/7. So you don't ever get that energy. Everybody's predicting a terrible storm this year for hurricane. We have a bad hurricane season, the Gulf gets hit, that will spike prices. And if you have any one of the sending countries, have a problem governmental-wise that all dictatorships, that one of them would topple and they are having civil war there for a period of time and instead of producing 8 million barrels, they are only producing 2 or 3, the system cannot stand those kind of oil losses. We're down to where there's only about a million barrels a day of extra and so if Country A produces 2 million barrels, that means we don't have enough that day. So that's why the price is so vulnerable. Some oil company executives -- and I don't talk to them often but I talked to them in a hearing in the house where I just asked them a simple question. I said, if we don't (inaudible), what would that do for prices? He said, well, it would take the fear out of the market because down the road we know we're going to have ample supply because we know there's lots out there and we can start moving towards. It will just take the fear factor out of it.

GLENN: Which takes the speculators down, which everybody's blaming speculators.

CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: That's right. And whenever the rumor goes out that China's going to buy scrap, scrap prices go through the roof. I mean, whatever is in short supply, the speculators make money on. That's always been our system. I don't know how you change that, but some want to. But that's stockpiling the problem. What takes it off the table is ample supply. So you have to produce. We have to conserve and produce, conserve and produce.

GLENN: I want to take a break here and then I want to come back. I want to ask you, what does the country look like in a year from now with none of those things happening. We're not gaining any ground on finding new energy. We're just at a stalemate here. But none of the bad things also happen. What does the price of everything look like a year from now. And what happens, what happens to the country if one of those things do hit us? What does that mean? What does the price of oil and energy and everything else look like? And then I want to talk to you about, okay, great, now what does the average person do besides grab a fork and a pitchfork. We'll be with you just a second. It's Congressman John Peterson from Pennsylvania. He is the guy who said last week, drill in the outer continental shelf and congress said no. He is reintroducing it tomorrow and your support is needed if you're interested in this. I can't imagine how you're not.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Rep. Peterson: Congress needs to wake-up and Increase Domestic Energy Production**

<http://www.glennbeck.com/content/articles/article/198/11504/>

**June 17, 2008 - 11:28 ET**

For 27 years, Congress and the last three Presidents have imposed ridiculous restrictions on offshore production of oil and natural gas - making America the only country in the world that does not harvest its offshore energy resources.

While some in Congress like to point the finger at OPEC and 'Big Oil' for the price at the pump - the reality is, the buck stops at the front steps of Capitol and the White House.

With our Canadian friends to the north drilling off the coasts of Maine and Washington, and our not-so-close-friend Cuba drilling 60 miles off the coast of Florida, America remains the laughing stock of the world when it comes to energy production.

Our deep-ocean resources belong to every American citizen, and rightly so.

This Wednesday, June 18, members of the House Appropriations Committee will have an opportunity to lift the Congressional Moratorium on offshore oil and natural gas production. I plan to offer an amendment to the Interior Department spending bill that will modify the ban and allow for environmentally responsible exploration and production to begin 50-200 miles off our coast - leaving the first 50 miles of coastline under moratoria.

Take a look at the column I penned for the New York Post for a complete picture of the national energy crisis:

AMERICA is in an energy crisis - not because of OPEC, but thanks to the policies of Congress and the last three presidents.

Since 1982, Congress has passed laws banning the production of oil and natural gas on our Outer Continental Shelf; the last three presidents went along. But the US Minerals Management Service estimates (conservatively) that the OCS holds 86 billion barrels of oil and 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas - the equivalent of 35 years of imported oil from OPEC and an 18-year supply of natural gas.

The United States is the only country in the world that prohibits exploitation of such offshore resources.

A recent Gallup poll found that nearly 60 percent of Americans support increased production of offshore oil and natural gas - but Congress has yet to get that message.

Access to our own energy shouldn't be a partisan issue. Yet last week, when I tried in a House committee to start opening up our vast offshore reserves, I lost on a party-line vote. Nine Democrats on the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee voted against the measure; six Republicans backed it.

I'll offer the same amendment when the full committee meets, and again on the House floor, in the weeks ahead. I want every member of Congress on record on the issue.

High energy prices are draining our wallets at an alarming rate. By pushing US companies overseas, where energy costs are lower, they also threaten our jobs.

Make no mistake, this mess is the result of Washington's foolish policy of restricting domestic energy production and discouraging investment in it.

All too often, Washington's energy debate revolves around the notion that support for increased domestic production of oil and natural gas means opposing renewable energy, conservation and sound environmental policy.

In fact, these shouldn't be competing priorities, but complimentary ones: America must produce more, conserve more and invest more in renewables.



For this country to remain a world leader in the global economy, Congress must develop a national energy policy that considers all means - including increased domestic production of oil and natural gas, on and offshore.

America depends on fossil fuels for 86 percent of our energy needs; wind, solar and geothermal power cover less than 1 percent. Renewable energy won't be available in sufficient quantity and at affordable prices for decades - so we have no other choice than to produce more of our own oil and natural gas - or further increase our dependence upon foreign sources.

And producing our own energy will create tens of thousands of jobs - and bring in hundreds of billions of dollars in royalties. That cash can be dedicated to renewable fuels R&D, carbon sequestration and environmental cleanup of our waters - as well as programs such as weatherization and energy assistance for those most in need. Billions more would go to the coastal states for their own use and to the US Treasury.

Gasoline prices now average over \$4 a gallon; natural gas is trading at nearly double last year's price. The time for Congress to act is now. Solving our energy crisis should be the No. 1 priority of Congress and the present and future occupant of the White House. As of today, it is not."

In order for this country to remain competitive, compete in the global economy, ease the bleeding of American jobs, and bring American energy to the market, Congress must act - now.

I encourage all those who read this newsletter to call your Congressman and Senator and demand that they support legislation that increases domestic production of American energy - not increased dependence on unstable foreign nations.

With your help, America can reduce its dependence on OPEC oil, and embark on a road to energy security with American resources.

Congressman John E. Peterson is a Republican from Pennsylvania.

\*\*\*\*\*

## OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING OPPONENTS ARE RETHINKING

Los Angeles Times, June 18, 2008

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-offshore18-2008jun18.0.3372420.story>

By Richard Simon and Bob Drogin, Los Angeles Times Staff Writers

WASHINGTON -- The environmental movement, only recently poised for major advances on global warming and other issues, has suddenly found itself on the defensive as high gasoline prices shift the political climate nationwide and trigger defections by longtime supporters.

Opposition to offshore drilling -- once ironclad in places like California and Florida -- has begun to soften. Gov. Charlie Crist of Florida on Tuesday eased his opposition to new energy exploration off the coast.

"Floridians are suffering, and when you're paying over \$4 a gallon for gas, you have to wonder whether there might be additional resources that we might be able to utilize to bring that price down," said Crist, a Republican.

At the same time, pressure to drill is mounting.

President Bush today is expected to call on Congress to lift the ban on new offshore drilling, and a House committee will consider a proposal to relax the moratorium.

John McCain, the presumed Republican presidential nominee, opposed new offshore drilling in his 2000 presidential campaign. He said Tuesday that he now supported lifting the long-standing ban.

"I believe it is time for federal government to lift these restrictions and put our own reserves to use," the Arizona senator said in a Houston speech on energy security.

Much of the nation's coastal waters are off-limits to new oil and gas leasing until 2012 under executive orders first issued by Bush's father, President George H.W. Bush, in 1991 and extended by President Clinton in 1998. In addition, Congress has taken action annually since 1981 to preclude drilling in coastal areas.

But high petroleum prices have caused policymakers to begin rethinking a variety of issues, including opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to energy exploration and imposing mandatory limits on greenhouse gas emissions from oil refineries and power plants.

"For years I have argued that we should avoid offshore drilling and tapping into underground reserves in ANWR until there was an emergency that left us with no choice," Rep. James T. Walsh (R-N.Y.), a longtime backer of the drilling ban, said recently. "That time has come."

The developments are the latest indication of the growing power of energy prices to overwhelm other priorities.

"We're seeing a large shift in public attitudes toward exploration," said C. Jeffrey Eshelman of the Independent Petroleum Assn. of America, expressing hope that McCain's change of heart "breaks ground for others to follow."

Environmentalists are increasingly concerned. Richard Charter of the Defenders of Wildlife Action Fund called this "the most risky year in 29 years" for the drilling ban.

In one sign of concern, an effort to pass a major climate-change bill stumbled this month amid complaints from Democrats as well as Republicans that it would drive up energy prices.

FULL STORY at <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-offshore18-2008jun18.o.3372420.story>

\*\*\*\*\*

ENERGY CRISIS: NEW BATTLEGROUND IN THE RACE FOR US PRESIDENT

BusinessWeek, 17 June 2008

[http://www.businessweek.com/bwdaily/dnflash/content/jun2008/db20080617\\_734947.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/bwdaily/dnflash/content/jun2008/db20080617_734947.htm)

Presidential opponents McCain and Obama go head-to-head with competing plans for reducing U.S. reliance on foreign oil

by John Carey

With gas prices rising and billions of additional dollars flowing to the Middle East to buy oil, energy policy is turning into a battleground in the race for President. On June 17, the presumptive Republican nominee, Arizona Senator John McCain, laid down the gauntlet with a speech in Houston, talking about his vision "to free America once and for all from our strategic dependence on foreign oil."

Of course, this is easier said than done. Every President since Jimmy Carter has vowed to break the U.S. addiction to imported oil, yet the country's dependence continues to grow.

#### McCain's Plan Includes Offshore Drilling

So, how would McCain do it?

**He wants to use more coal.** He proposes lifting restrictions on offshore drilling to boost domestic supplies of oil and gas. He wants a big increase in nuclear power. Over the long term, he says, technologies will come along "that one day will free us from oil entirely." But "in the short term, we must take the world as it is and our resources where they are."

And his Democratic rival, Illinois Senator Barack Obama, doesn't get it, McCain charges: "What is certain in energy policy is that we have learned a few clear lessons along the way. Somehow all of them seem to have escaped my opponent. He doesn't support new domestic production. He doesn't support new nuclear plants."

Republicans are hoping that this call for increased drilling will be politically powerful. Senator Pete Domenici (R-N.M.) says "a vast majority of Americans now support deep-sea exploration because they understand that the best way to reduce gas prices is to reduce our dependence on foreign oil." Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich says he's getting 30,000 to 50,000 signatures a day on a petition drive dubbed "Drill Here. Drill Now. Pay Less." When people realize that politicians are standing in the way of bringing down the cost of energy by limiting domestic exploration, "they're just incredulous," he said on a recent talk show.

"They think the country can't be this dumb."

Even before McCain delivered his speech, Obama and his surrogates were fighting back. Their main spin: McCain is on the side of Big Oil.

#### Democrats Want to Reduce Demand

"Time and time again, McCain has stood with the oil companies," charges Tom Vilsack, former governor of Iowa. "McCain does not represent the change we need. This is not a policy that would make us independent of foreign energy." There wouldn't even be any immediate relief at the gas pump, Democrats say. Even if the offshore areas were opened to drilling today, "Americans would not see any oil or reduction in gas prices until late in a second John McCain term," says former Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Carol Browner.

What makes this energy battle somewhat ironic is how many similarities there are between the aims of the Obama and McCain policies. The two candidates share the same basic goal of reducing U.S. oil imports. Obama, for instance, promises to put the country on the path to energy independence by 2030. Both men are also pushing alternatives to fossil fuels, as well as supporting caps on the emissions of global warming-causing greenhouse gases. Such caps will make renewable energy sources like wind and solar more attractive by raising the costs of burning oil and gas.

The crucial differences lie in how the two candidates would go about achieving these goals. When it comes to the current crisis over high oil prices, the new twist in McCain's June 17 speech is his plan to increase domestic supplies. The Democrats, in contrast, say that it's easier and quicker to tame high prices by lowering demand. Reducing "energy consumption-and not the mantra of drilling-is the solution to our energy crisis," says Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.). Plus, Senator Bill Nelson (D-Fla.) charges, McCain is flip-flopping on this issue since he used to be against additional offshore drilling.

FULL STORY at

[http://www.businessweek.com/bwdaily/dnflash/content/jun2008/db20080617\\_734947.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/bwdaily/dnflash/content/jun2008/db20080617_734947.htm)

\*\*\*\*\*

## OPINION: OFFSHORE DRILLING VS GLOBAL WARMING

TierneyLab, 18 June 2008

<http://tierneylab.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/06/18/offshore-drilling-v-global-warming/>

By John Tierney

Are environmentalists doing themselves - or the environment - any favor by denying states the right to decide whether there should be oil drilling off their shores?

My colleague Andy Revkin notes an interesting argument by Peter Maass in favor of offshore drilling here: better to do it under the strict environmental controls of America than to "outsource" the job to places like Nigeria. I'd like to look at it from a different perspective: How is this fight about offshore oil going to affect efforts to control greenhouse emissions?

If environmentalists and their allies (like Senator Barack Obama) prevail over those who want to drill (like President Bush and Senator John McCain), there would be a little less oil on the world market, which would keep prices a little higher and thereby discourage consumption. That would mean fewer greenhouse emissions. But this would be a minor effect, and it has to be balanced against the longterm damage to environmentalists' cause. Aside from being distraction from the serious new danger of global warming, the fight over offshore drilling makes them vulnerable to the old charge that they prefer hype to science.

Offshore drilling has made a photogenic enemy for environmentalists since the famous spill off Santa Barbara in 1969, but its risks have been greatly exaggerated. During the debate over allowing offshore drilling in 1984, the Times editorialized in support of the drilling and offered this response to the opponents:

Why risk populated or ecologically fragile coasts, they say, when oil is available elsewhere? There surely is some risk of damage. But the technology of containing spills and vigor of regulation have come a long way since Santa Barbara. No serious spill has marred the harvesting of four billion barrels from 12,000 drilling rigs in American waters since 1970. Statistically, tankers bearing imported oil now pose a much greater environmental danger.

Since then the risks have shrunk further. A 2003 report from the National Research Council noted that only 1 percent of oil that entered U.S. waters during the 1990s came from extraction operations (like the offshore platforms in the Gulf of Mexico). Even if you combined that amount with the oil spilled by tankers, it amounted to only 3 percent of the total - and only 1/20th as much oil as entered the water through natural seepage from the ocean floor.

Of course, an oil spill concentrated in one spot can harm the local environment, but banning offshore drilling doesn't lessen the risk of big oil spills - it simply makes it more likely there'll be a spill from a foreign tanker. In 1989, when Congress moved to ban drilling off the New Jersey coast, this ban was criticized by Lawrence Schmidt of the state's Department of Environmental Protection:

I think what's happening in Congress right now is a knee-jerk reaction to oil spills from tankers. The risks of an accident from a tanker carrying in either foreign crude or refined petroleum are many, many times greater than the risk of an oil spill from an offshore exploration or production platform.

In any case, since this kind of oil is mainly a local problem, what's wrong with letting the locals decide if they want to take the risk? Even if the federal ban is lifted, states would still have the right to forbid drilling off their coasts, and many have already promised to do just that.

Environmentalists made good arguments for states' rights when they fought against corporations and the federal government to allow state regulation of the greenhouse emissions from cars. But if states are competent enough to set their own policies on something as complex as global warming, why can't they decide if drilling rigs should be allowed to operate off their shores?

\*\*\*\*\*

#### CONGRESS CANNOT DEFLECT BLAME

Investor's Business Daily, 18 June 2008

<http://www.ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?secid=1501&status=article&id=298681932620367&secure=1&show=1&rss=1>

In this presidential election year, the Democrats really do seem to think they can fool most of the people all of the time. Gasoline prices have reached well over \$4 in much of the country, but instead of fulfilling the duties given to them by the voters in 2006 and allowing access to more domestic sources of oil and gas, Democrats have thrown a new headline-grabbing smear at Big Oil.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi complains that energy firms are "sitting on 68 million acres of federal lands they've already leased," but with which they are not producing oil and gas.

That same Democratic Party talking point was served up by Sen. Russ Feingold. He asked oil executives at a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing last month "to explain why their companies are only developing 12 (million) of the 42 million acres of federal lands that they are leasing" and "only developing 8 (million) of the 38 million acres of offshore leased areas."

According to Feingold, "the executives could not come up with a good explanation."

In fact, they did - it's the fault of Feingold, Pelosi, would-be president Barack Obama and every other member of Congress whose environmental extremism has prevented the oil industry from finding and extracting America's own supplies.

When oil companies spend big money leasing land, they are buying access to a great deal of territory, much of which has no oil and gas underfoot. They have to spend still more big money pinpointing the parts of that land where those energy resources are.

All the while, they have to weave their way through a labyrinth of environmental rules that Congress has imposed on them, plus defend themselves against bogus legal attacks from green extremists. Then, even when oil is found, it can take years to prepare to drill.

So when Pelosi and other congressional Democrats claim the oilmen are "sitting" on all that land, under which lies an ocean of crude they are gleefully keeping from consumers, those senators and representatives are lying through their well-sharpened political teeth.

In fact, these companies are spending fortunes surveying, building facilities on, and even drilling on much of this land, though it may officially be classified as nonproducing. The fact of the matter is that 94% of federal onshore lands remain unleased, while 97% of offshore areas are similarly off-limits to oil exploration.

Meanwhile the Communist regimes of China and Cuba collude to exploit the oil and gas resources off our own Gulf Coast. The blame here rests squarely on Congress, which could repeal its quarter-century-old offshore drilling moratorium tomorrow if it so chose.

Since Congress' enviro-driven 1982 moratorium, lease purchases have dwindled to a fraction of their previous level (see chart). Who, after all, wants permission to drill in a dry hole?

This incompetent, irresponsible and thoroughly politicized Democratic Congress is endangering our national security and economic well-being by locking up our own energy resources. It must not be allowed to blame the companies that spend billions supplying our energy needs for its own idiotic policies.

Copyright 2008, IBD

\*\*\*\*\*

ENERGY POVERTY ALERT: UK ENERGY BILLS MAY GO UP BY 40%

London Evening Standard, 19 June 2008

[http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/consumer/bills/article.html?in\\_article\\_id=443283&in\\_page\\_id=510&in\\_page\\_id=510](http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/consumer/bills/article.html?in_article_id=443283&in_page_id=510&in_page_id=510)

Sean Poulter, Daily Mail

A rise in tariffs of up to 40% is expected to be signalled when British Gas's parent company, Centrica, issues a trading statement to the City. Analysts believe that British Gas may need to push up prices by 30% before Christmas. Some are forecasting the industry will force through a rise of 40% over the next 12 months.

The first of several price increases could be announced within a matter of weeks, analysts say. Centrica recently issued a veiled warning on prices when it pledged to take 'necessary action' to protect its profit margins from soaring wholesale gas prices.

The industry's costs have rocketed because the wholesale price of gas is linked to that of oil, which has risen to more than \$130 a barrel in recent weeks.

The price of wholesale gas for delivery this winter passed the £1 a therm mark for the first time last week and has more than doubled compared with a year ago.

Analysts at Cazenove have forecast that British Gas, which supplies energy to 16million customers, will have to put up tariffs by 30 per cent in the next six months.

The current dual fuel household bill for gas and electricity is around £980 a year, however this seems likely to climb to around £1,400.

The warning comes as families struggle to cope with large increases in the cost of living. The Daily Mail Cost of Living Index shows food prices are rising by 19.8% a year.

FULL STORY at

[http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/consumer/bills/article.html?in\\_article\\_id=443283&in\\_page\\_id=510&in\\_page\\_id=510](http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/consumer/bills/article.html?in_article_id=443283&in_page_id=510&in_page_id=510)

\*\*\*\*\*

Three Cheers For Ann

[http://web.mac.com/sinfonia1/Global\\_Warming\\_Politics/A\\_Hot\\_Topic\\_Blog/Entries/2008/6/19\\_Three\\_Cheers\\_For\\_Ann.html](http://web.mac.com/sinfonia1/Global_Warming_Politics/A_Hot_Topic_Blog/Entries/2008/6/19_Three_Cheers_For_Ann.html)

I have always liked [Ann Widdecombe](#) [above], the Conservative Member of Parliament for Maidstone and The Weald, and a Privy Counsellor. She is unquestionably a character, and she is undoubtedly her own woman. How we need such people in our lemming-like PC politics of today, in which the Ministry of Truth can so dangerously hold sway. Ann is also a thoughtful Christian, and she is often politically brave. I was thus not surprised to read her splendid article in

yesterday's Daily Express challenging the political orthodoxy on 'global warming' [[Yes, I am a heretic on global warming](#)], Daily Express, June 18]:

"Much has been made of my voting with the Government to allow the police to detain terror suspects for 42 days, rather than 28, in special cases.

Yet there was a more important vote last week, in which I was one of only three Members of Parliament to vote against the might of all parties and defy the Climate Change Bill which will cost Britain hundreds of billions of pounds, will not mean any other country has to follow suit and, as we are responsible for only two per cent of the world's carbon emissions, will make no difference to the climate or to global warming."

Just so.

'Thought-Police'

But, it is what Ann records next in her article that should send an Orwellian shiver down the spine:

"Climate change has become a religion, with anyone who dares to throw out a question or two instantly accused of heresy.

I have had my doubts for some time, and certainly about major unilateral action on the part of the UK, but these have crystallised since reading Nigel Lawson's book *An Appeal To Reason*, subtitled *A Cool Look At Global Warming*.

Appallingly, this gem could not find a British publisher because none was brave enough. One wrote: 'My fear with this cogently argued book is that it flies so much in the face of prevailing orthodoxy that it would be very difficult to find a wide market.'

Grief! I am surprised that someone didn't recommend Nigel Lawson be taken away for 're-education' following his 'thoughtcrimes'. You can just sense the two-way television-surveillance society. But it is all too correct. Until recently, the 'thought-police' in the UK have worked especially hard to silence critics of 'global warming', exactly as Ann exemplifies. It is precisely why I believe that 'Global Warming Politics' is a vital site to host.

Moreover, worldwide, the efforts to drown out such important critics as Bjørn Lomborg have been some of the most disgraceful I have ever witnessed. And, even I have experienced, if to a much lesser degree, attempts to close down debate, one group of engineers, for example, receiving e-mails stating that I should not be allowed to speak to their society. Needless to say, the engineers in question were encouragingly robust in their response. Unfortunately, the resort to ad hominem abuse has been a particular speciality of the 'thought-police'.

Thus, in the UK, 'global warming' was allowed to burgeon into an authoritarian and intolerant monster, one threatening freedom of thought and debate, and undermining critical journalism and politics.

Better Sense Of Proportion

Luckily, however, over the last year or so, this has begun to alter as climate change has failed to play ball with the 'global warming' gamers; as economic and political realities have started to bite; as the public have grown wary of the political abuse of 'global warming' to raise taxes and costs; and, as the often breathtaking hypocrisy of the 'global warming' zealots, from the UN via the EU to individual politicians, celebrities, and journalists, has been revealed in all its tawdry double standards.

Yet, thank goodness, there have been strong people out there, folk like Ann Widdecombe and Nigel Lawson, who strive to tell it as it is:

“I am most certainly not prepared to vote to commit Britain to a course of action which will make not a jot of difference to global temperatures but which could change our way of life and leave us unable to compete with those countries that keep a better sense of proportion.”

And, although Ann is currently in a minority, I think I can detect that her stance will be increasingly vindicated. I happen to know that there are vast swaths of Conservative supporters, including MPs and Lords, who believe exactly what Ann argues, but who are holding their tongues until David Cameron is elected.

I also believe that economic and political realities will prove remarkably powerful in focusing minds afresh.

But, we should never forget that Ann was one of the few souls in public life bold enough to speak out well before the Party time-servers start to jump ship from the SS ‘Global Warming’. So it is:

“3 Cheers for Ann!  
(For Who?)  
For Ann -  
(Why what did she do?)  
I thought you knew;  
She voted GW down the pan!”