



THE WEEKLY CLOSER

U.S. SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
MAJORITY PRESS OFFICE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 02, 2006

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 25

THE WEEK IN REVIEW...

[Senate Passes Inhofe-Feinstein Bi-Partisan Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act](#)

[Inhofe Applauds Passage Of Chemical Security Legislation](#)

[Democrats Continue To Obstruct National Security Legislation](#)

[Floor Speech: America Reacts To Speech Debunking Media Global Warming Alarmism](#)

[WRDA Passage On Hold Until November](#)

[Floor Speech: Hot & Cold Media Spin Cycle: A Challenge To Journalists Who Cover Global Warming](#)

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

[Call for TVNZ Balance on 'Alarmist Doomcasting', Press Release: New Zealand Climate Science Coalition, September 26, 2006](#)

[WorldNet Daily, Climate Hype Outstrips Climate Facts, September 30, 2006](#)

QUOTE OF THE WEEK...

“There are enough scientists to fill a fleet of Humvees who can express skepticism over global warming, despite Gore's claims that the matter has been resolved in favor of his conclusions. But none has the forum a U.S. senator can command. With rare exceptions, scientists can marshal media attention on the climate change issue only by spouting the party line that man-made emissions are causing Earth to warm. That's the sort of stuff the press laps up like a starving dog.”

*Editorial: Cooling Down the Climate Scare
Investor's Business Daily
September 29, 2006*

SENATE PASSES INHOFE-FEINSTEIN BI-PARTISAN ANIMAL ENTERPRISE TERRORISM ACT

Senator Inhofe together with Sen. Diane Feinstein (D-Cal.), a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, on Saturday hailed Senate passage of bi-partisan legislation that will enhance the effectiveness of the U.S. Department of Justice's response to recent trends in the animal rights terrorist movement. The Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act (AETA) was drafted with technical assistance from counter-terror experts at the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Sen. Inhofe Statement:

“The Senate last night provided law enforcement the tools they need to adequately combat radical animal rights extremists' who commit violent acts against innocent people because they work with animals. This bill is an important step in the effort to combat animal rights extremists' increasingly violent tactics. We can no longer tolerate criminally based activism regardless of the cause it allegedly advances. This is terrorism and must be stopped.”

Senator Feinstein Statement:

“Passage of this act will help put an end to the deplorable actions of animal rights extremists and help ensure that eco-terrorists do not impede important medical progress in California and across the country.”

Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act:

EPW RESOURCES

- [Majority Press Releases](#)
- [Speeches](#)
- [Fact of the Day Archive](#)
- [Weekly Closer Archive](#)
- [Schedule](#)
- [Past Hearings](#)
- [Multimedia](#)

The AETA gives needed protection to scientists, medical researchers, ranchers, farmers, and any other industry involving animals by expanding current law to address violent tactics used by animal rights extremists to frighten law abiding citizens away from their work.

Prohibiting the animal rights extremists' violent tactics will ensure that important animal enterprises, like biomedical industries, stay in California for example, rather than go to India or China.

The AETA gives law enforcement the tools they need to adequately combat radical animal rights extremists' who commit violent acts against innocent people because they work with animals. This is terrorism and cannot be tolerated.

- The AETA was introduced after the EPW Committee held two hearings on the issue.
- The AETA has express first amendment protections.
- The AETA has a staggered penalty structure to meet varying levels of violent offenses.
- The AETA carries a penalty of life imprisonment for the death of an individual resulting from animal rights extremists' dangerous tactics.

[Return to the top ↑](#)

INHOFE APPLAUDS PASSAGE OF CHEMICAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Senator Inhofe on Friday applauded passage of chemical security provisions included in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) appropriations conference bill. Since becoming Chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, the EPW Committee has twice passed chemical security legislation in Committee. Many of the provisions included in the appropriations conference bill are based upon previous legislation before the EPW Committee. Senator Inhofe worked closely with his Senate colleagues to reach a compromise to ensure passage of a chemical security bill this year.

“The American people are safer today thanks to chemical security legislation passed last night in the United States Senate,” Senator Inhofe said. “As chairman of the EPW Committee, I have made national security my top priority and consistently supported reasonable chemical security legislation that provides DHS with the authority it needs to protect chemical facilities from terrorists without extraneous environmental mandates. I believe this compromise language achieves that balance.

“I am pleased that this language specifically excludes water utilities from coverage and clarifies DHS does not have the authority to regulate chemicals. To have included water utilities in this language would have imposed an enormous unfunded mandate on our local partners and the

authority to regulate chemicals has been expressly given to EPA and other departments and agencies through our nation's environmental laws.

"I believe the conference language achieves what those of us who have been working on this issue for years have been trying to do---it provides strong authorities to DHS to reasonably regulate private sector entities without being hijacked by concepts inappropriate in a national security debate."

SENATE FLOOR STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF CHEMICAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I rise in support of the chemical security provisions included in the DHS appropriations conference bill. I have worked on this issue since 2002 and have always supported reasonable chemical security legislation that provides DHS with the authority it needs to protect chemical facilities from terrorists without overreaching. I believe this compromise language achieves that balance.

I am pleased that this language specifically excludes water utilities from coverage and focuses the efforts of DHS on private chemical companies. The Nation's drinking water and wastewater systems are arms of local government, not for-profit industries. We in Congress recognized the fundamental difference between the for-profit private sector and local government entities when we passed the Unfunded Mandates Act. To have included water utilities in this language would have imposed an enormous unfunded mandate on our local partners in violation of that Act.

Many here in Washington assume that local governments need to be forced to protect their citizens. As a former mayor, I can tell you that is simply not true. Local water utilities have been making investments in security consistently since 9/11 and continue to do so. I have offered a bill on wastewater facility security that provides tools, incentives and rewards, not mandates, for local governments to continue to upgrade security. My legislation passed the Environment and Public Works last Congress with a bipartisan vote and again this Congress by voice vote. However, this week, for the second straight Congress, when I tried to bring the measure before the full Senate, the minority objected even to its consideration. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are holding this legislation up because it does NOT impose needless mandates and does NOT include extraneous environmental provisions.

For these same reasons, many will rise in opposition to the chemical security compromise language included in the conference report. They will argue that the bill needs to allow the federal government to tell companies how to manufacture their products by requiring facilities to switch the chemicals they use or change their operating practices. This concept, known as "inherently safer technology," is not, nor has it ever been, about security. IST is an environmental concept that dates back more than a decade when the extremist environmental community were seeking bans on chlorine – the chemical that is used to purify our nation's water. It was only

after 9/11 that they decided to play upon the fears of the nation and repackage IST as a panacea to all of our security problems.

I find it very interesting that those arguing most vehemently for IST in security legislation are NOT security experts, but rather, environmental groups. This only underscores the fact that IST is not a security measure; it is a backdoor attempt at increasing the regulation of chemicals operating under the guise of security.

The legislation before us does not include these extraneous environmental mandates but instead properly focuses efforts on security. The language explicitly clarifies that the new regulatory authorities given to the Department of Homeland Security do NOT include any authorities to regulate the manufacture, distribution, use, sale, treatment or disposal of chemicals. These authorities have been properly provided to the US Environmental Protection Agency and other agencies and departments under numerous environmental and workplace safety laws, such as the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act and a host of others.

I believe the conference language achieves what those of us who have been working on this issue for years have been trying to do---it provides strong authorities to DHS to reasonably regulate private sector entities without being hijacked by extraneous concepts that have no place in the security debate.

[Return to the top](#) 

DEMOCRATS CONTINUE TO OBSTRUCT NATIONAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

On Thursday night, Senator Inhofe called on the United States Senate to vote on S. 2781, the Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act of 2006 co-sponsored by Senators Inhofe, Chafee and Murkowski. Despite overwhelming bi-partisan support of similar legislation in the House, Senate Democrats continue to object to this critical national security legislation.

“Once again, Senate Democrats obstruct legislation to bolster our security at wastewater treatment plants all across the country,” Senator Inhofe said. “My bill seeks to work with local governments and wastewater treatment plants to provide needed support and additional tools to help ensure these facilities are secure from a potential terrorist attack and able to respond to, and recover quickly from, natural disasters.”

“S. 2781 would simply provide towns with resources to conduct vulnerability assessments and to secure their facilities. It provides funds to research the means to secure the collection systems that are made up of the miles of underground pipes. There are logistical and financial problems with trying to secure these systems that need to be addressed, particularly before imposing an unfunded federal mandate on the nation’s towns. My bill would support the already on-going activities of many of the national wastewater associations and

the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop assessment tools and industry security standards as well as conduct security trainings. The national water associations make up the Security Coordinating Council and regularly meet with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Agency charged with overseeing security at POTWs. The SCC and EPA are developing a Sector Security Plan to, among other things, establish measures of security improvements.”

“Let me be clear. This is an important security bill and I regret that for the second Congress in a row, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are obstructing it. Members of the minority have criticized the chemical security legislation for not covering these facilities. This legislation has basically passed the House of Representative twice. The minority party in the Senate is blocking this important security bill.”

FLOOR STATEMENT ON THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT WORKS SECURITY ACT

Mr. President, I would like to discuss the urgent need for this legislation. The nation’s wastewater treatment works (POTWs) provide a vital service to our nation. They ensure that municipal and industrial waste is cleaned to a level safe enough to be released back into the nation’s waterways.

After the tragic events of September 11, 2001, much more focus was placed on the nation’s water and wastewater facilities. POTWs not only release treated effluent in to the nation’s waters but also consist of miles of pipes that run underground and are often large enough for someone to stand in. They are literally underground roadways.

In the 107th Congress, the House of Representatives passed by voice vote legislation (H.R. 5169) to provide POTWs with the resources they needed to conduct vulnerability assessments and secure their facilities. The bill (H.R. 866) was again introduced in the 108th Congress and passed by a vote of 413-2, with every Democrat who voted supporting the bill. I was pleased to introduce the companion to this legislation, S.1039 with my colleague and then subcommittee Chairman, Mike Crapo. Last year, despite reporting the bill on a bipartisan vote of 13 to 6, members of the Senate minority objected to Senate consideration of S. 1039.

S. 2781 is a variation of S. 1039 with some important improvements, like the addition of site security plans and a more streamlined grant-making progress. Senator Lincoln Chafee, Chairman of the Fisheries, Wildlife and Water Subcommittee and Senator Lisa Murkowski, a distinguished member of the EPW Committee joined me in sponsoring S. 2781.

Our bill passed the EPW Committee on a voice vote. Unfortunately, once again, my colleague from Vermont has objected to consideration of wastewater security legislation by the full Senate.

My colleagues in the minority argue that my bill is insufficient because it does not impose on POTW’s unfunded federal mandates and because it does not

assume that local officials are ignoring the security of their facilities.

POTWs are arms of local government. They are largely owned and operated by the nation's cities and towns. In 1995 Congress passed the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act in which we pledged not to impose costly regulatory burdens on our partners in local government. Just as it is our obligation as U.S. Senators to serve the public good, preserve the public trust and protect the citizenry, so it is the obligation of locally elected, appointed and employed officials.

Why do so many of my colleagues assume that we at the federal level care more about the citizens of the nation's towns than the locally elected officials do? Why do so many of them assume that they know more about how to evacuate citizens, secure local treatment plants and protect local citizens than the very people who live in those towns whose jobs it is to protect them?

S. 2781 would simply provide towns with resources to conduct vulnerability assessments and to secure their facilities. It provides funds to research the means to secure the collection systems that are made up of the miles of underground pipes. There are logistical and financial problems with trying to secure these systems that need to be addressed, particularly before imposing an unfunded federal mandate on the nation's towns. My bill would support the already on-going activities of many of the national wastewater associations and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop assessment tools and industry security standards as well as conduct security trainings. The national water associations make up the Security Coordinating Council and regularly meet with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Agency charged with overseeing security at POTWs. The SCC and EPA are developing a Sector Security Plan to, among other things, establish measures of security improvements.

My colleagues will argue that this is not enough. Local governments cannot be trusted to proceed on their own with a little federal guidance because to date, they really have not done anything to secure their facilities. However, one needs look no further than a March 2006 GAO report to see how much in fact they are doing. According to GAO, 74 percent of the largest 206 treatment works had completed or were in the process of completing a vulnerability assessment. Further, the majority of treatment works had made significant improvements to the physical security of their facility. They did so after careful review of their individual communities' needs. Most importantly, they have done so out of concern for their citizens not in response to a federal mandate.

My colleagues will also turn this discussion not into one about security but one about chlorine. Chlorine is by far the most effective disinfectant available and it is the least expensive. During these times of aging systems, growing federal regulations and limited resources, cost is an important consideration. Washington, D.C.'s treatment works, Blue Plains, spent \$12.5 million to change technologies. San Jose, CA spent \$5 million to switch from gaseous chlorine to sodium hypochlorite. The City of Wilmington, DE spent \$160,000 to switch. However, there is much more to their story than that cost figure. Wilmington already had in place a sodium hypochlorite system that was serving as backup to its gaseous chlorine system. Further, Wilmington will spend

hundreds of thousands of dollars more each year in operations and maintenance costs.

There are other considerations that must be factored in as well, such as downstream effects of a chlorine alternative. For example, the switch from chlorine to chloramines in Washington, DC's drinking water system was found to cause lead to leach out of service pipes and into the faucets of homes and businesses. Thus, decisions about chlorine must be fully evaluated and must be site-specific. Many POTWs are already undergoing these evaluations. After careful review of cost, technical feasibility and safety considerations, and without the presence of a federal mandate on technology, 116 of the 206 largest POTWs do not use gaseous chlorine. According to the GAO report, another 20 plants plan to switch to a technology other than chlorine. To sum, nearly two-thirds of the nation's largest POTWs are not using or will soon stop using chlorine. Those who continue to use chlorine have taken steps to ensure the chlorine is secure. My bill would provide POTWs who decide for themselves to switch treatment technologies with grant money to make the switch. However, my bill maintains trust in local officials who know best their water, the community and their security needs.

Let me be clear. This is an important security bill and I regret that for the second Congress in a row my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are obstructing it. Members of the minority have criticized the chemical security legislation for not covering these facilities. This legislation has basically passed the House of Representative twice. The minority party in the Senate is blocking this important security bill.

[Return to the top](#) 

SENATE FLOOR SPEECH: AMERICA REACTS TO SPEECH DEBUNKING MEDIA GLOBAL WARMING ALARMISM

Thursday, September 28, 2006

This past Monday, I took to this floor for the eighth time to discuss global warming. My speech focused on the myths surrounding global warming and how our national news media has embarrassed itself with a 100-year documented legacy of coverage on what turned out to be trendy climate science theories.

Over the last century, the media has flip-flopped between global cooling and warming scares. At the turn of the 20th century, the media peddled an upcoming ice age -- and they said the world was coming to an end. Then in the 1930s, the alarm was raised about disaster from global warming -- and they said the world was coming to an end. Then in the 70's, an alarm for another ice age was raised -- and they said the world was coming to an end. And now, today we are back to fears of catastrophic global warming -- and again they are saying the world is coming to an end.

Today I would like to share the fascinating events that have unfolded since my

floor speech on Monday.

This morning, CNN ran a segment criticizing my speech on global warming and attempted to refute the scientific evidence I presented to counter climate fears.

First off, CNN reporter Miles O'Brien inaccurately claimed I was "too busy" to appear on his program this week to discuss my 50 minute floor speech on global warming. But they were told I simply was not available on Tuesday or Wednesday.

I did appear on another CNN program today -- Thursday -- which I hope everyone will watch. The segment airs tonight on CNN's Glenn Beck Show on Headline News at 7pm and repeats at 9pm and midnight Eastern.

Second, CNN's O'Brien falsely claimed that I was all "alone on Capitol Hill" when it comes to questioning global warming.

Mr. O'Brien is obviously not aware that the U.S. Senate has overwhelmingly rejected Kyoto style carbon caps when it voted down the McCain-Lieberman climate bill 60-28 last year – an even larger margin than its rejection in 2003.

Third, CNN's O'Brien, claimed that my speech earlier contained errors regarding climate science. O'Brien said my claim that the Antarctic was actually cooling and gaining ice was incorrect. But both the journals Science and Nature have published studies recently finding – on balance – Antarctica is both cooling and gaining ice.

CNN's O'Brien also criticized me for saying polar bears are thriving in the Arctic. But he ignored that the person I was quoting is intimately familiar with the health of polar bear populations. Let me repeat what biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor from the Arctic government of Nunavut, a territory of Canada, said recently:

"Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number. They are not going extinct, or even appear to be effected at present." CNN's O'Brien also ignores the fact that in the Arctic, temperatures were warmer in the 1930's than today.

O'Brien also claimed that the "Hockey Stick" temperature graph was supported by most climate scientists despite the fact that the National Academy of Sciences and many independent experts have made it clear that the Hockey Stick's claim that the 1990's was the hottest decade of the last 1000 years was unsupportable.

So it seems my speech struck a nerve with the mainstream media. Their only response was to cherry pick the science in a failed attempt to refute me.

It seems that it is business as usual for many of them. Sadly, it looks like my challenge to the media to be objective and balanced has fallen on deaf ears.

Despite the traditional media's failed attempt to dismiss the science I presented

to counter global warming alarmism, the American people bypassed the tired old traditional media by watching CSPAN or clicking on the Drudge Report and reading the speech online.

From the flood of overwhelming positive feedback I received, I can tell you the American people responded enthusiastically to my message.

The central theme was not only one of thanks, but expressing frustration with the major media outlets because they knew in their guts that what they have been hearing in the news was false and misleading.

Here is a brief sampling:

Janet of Saugus, Massachusetts: "Thank you Senator Inhofe. Finally someone with the guts to stand up and call it what it is -- a sham. I think you have taken over Toby Keith's place as my favorite Oklahoman!!"

Al of Clinton, Connecticut writes: "It's about time someone with a loud microphone spoke up on the global warming scam. You have courage - if only this message could get into the schools where kids are being brow-beaten with the fear message almost daily."

Kevin of Jacksonville, Florida writes: "I'm so glad that we have leaders like you who are willing to stand up against the onslaught of liberal media, Hollywood and the foolish elected officials on this topic. Please keep up the fight!"

Steven of Phoenix, Arizona writes: "As a scientist, I am extremely pleased to see that there is at least one member of congress who recognizes the global warming hysteria for what it is. I am extremely impressed by the Senator's summary and wish he was running for President."

Craig of Grand Rapids, Michigan writes: "As a meteorologist I strongly agree with everything you said."

My speech ignited an internet firestorm. So much so, that my speech became the subject of a heated media controversy in New Zealand. Halfway across the globe, a top official from the New Zealand Climate Science Coalition challenging New Zealand's television station to balance what he termed "alarmist doom-casting" and criticized them for failing to report the views of scientists in their own country that I cited here in America.

As the controversy in New Zealand shows, global warming hysteria has captured more than just the American media.

The reaction to my speech keeps coming in: Just this morning, The Pittsburgh Tribune-Review newspaper wrote an editorial calling my speech "an unusual display of reason" on the Senate floor.

I would also like to give credit to another publication, Congressional Quarterly, or CQ for short. On Tuesday, CQ's Toni Johnson took the issues I raised seriously and followed up with phone calls to scientist-turned global warming pop star James Hansen's office. CQ wanted to ask Hansen about his partisan

financial ties to the left wing Heinz Foundation, whose money originated from the Heinz family ketchup fortune. But he was unavailable to respond to their questions, which is highly unusual for a man who finds his way into the media on an almost daily basis. Mr. Hansen is always available when he is peddling his increasingly dire predictions of climate doom.

I have been engaged in this debate for several years and believe there is a growing backlash of Americans rejecting what they see as climate scare tactics. And as a result, global warming alarmists are becoming increasingly desperate.

Perhaps that explains why the very next day after I spoke on the floor, ABC News's Bill Blakemore on Good Morning America prominently featured James Hansen touting future scary climate scenarios that could / might / possibly happen.

The segment used all the well worn tactics from the alarmist guidebook -- warning of heat waves, wildfires, droughts, melting glaciers, mass extinctions unless mankind put itself on a starvation energy diet and taxed emissions.

But that's no surprise -- Blakemore was already on the record that there was no scientific debate about manmade catastrophic global warming.

You have to be a pretty poor investigator to believe that. Why would 60 prominent scientists this last spring have written Canadian Prime Minister Harper that "If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary."

I believe it's these kinds of stories which explain why the American public is growing increasingly skeptical of the hype. Despite the enormous 2006 media campaign to instill fear into the public, the number of people who believe that weather naturally changes -- is increasing.

A Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg poll in August found that most Americans do not attribute the cause of recent severe weather events to global warming, and the portion of Americans who believe that climate change is due to natural variability has increased over 50% in the last five years.

Given the diminishing importance of the mainstream media, I expect that trend to continue.

I hope my other colleagues will join me on the floor and start speaking out to debunk hysteria surrounding global warming. This issue is too important to our generation and future generations to allow distortions and media propaganda to derail the economic health of our nation.

[Return to the top ↑](#)

WRDA Passage On Hold Until November

On Thursday, Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Chairman of the Environment & Public Works Committee and Sen. Kit Bond (R-Mo.), Chairman of the

subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, together with U.S. Rep. Don Young (R-Alaska), Chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and U.S. Rep. John J. Duncan, Jr. (R-TN), Chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, released a joint statement today regarding WRDA negotiations. With time running out before Congress adjourns this week, and a few remaining issues unresolved, conferees will return in November ready to pass WRDA .

Senator Inhofe:

"Despite significant progress made and the hard work by all involved, time simply ran out to pass a bill by the end of September. Everyone involved knew we faced a limited time frame and worked tirelessly to pass WRDA before the end of the month, but a few issues just could not be resolved in time. I look forward to returning in November to work with my colleagues to pass WRDA as soon as possible. A WRDA bill is long overdue and I have every intention of completing the bill this year."

Senator Bond:

"Both members and staff on the conference committee have worked very hard to accomplish a difficult task. We have made tremendous progress, we just need a little more time. During the October recess we will continue to work towards completion and I hope to get this much needed and long overdue bill passed in November."

Congressman Young:

"We made a great deal of progress and there was a lot of good faith compromise and negotiation involved. We just ran out of time. But we're all committed to completing a comprehensive WRDA bill when we return after the November elections. In the meantime, we've instructed our staffs to continue to meet throughout the recess to address many of the unresolved issues."

Congressman Duncan:

"It is better to do a conference bill well than to do it quickly. This bill will authorize projects that are investments in America. These are navigation projects that keep our ports and waterways open to commercial traffic, flood damage reduction projects that protect our homes and businesses, and environmental restoration projects that enhance our quality of life."

[Return to the top](#) 

OPENINGS STATEMENT: LEGISLATION HEARING ON S. 3871

September 28, 2006

As a former Mayor, I know all too well how federal requirements can effectively tax local and state governments. Federal requirements should be flexibly applied so that each state can implement them in the ways most efficient for them. The paper manifest system under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act was not flexibly applied in the last two and a half decades.

The bill that Sen. Thune has sponsored and that I am proud to co-sponsor with the ranking member seeks to change that.

This legislation seeks to reduce time, staffing, and financial burdens on states as they comply with federal requirements by transforming the manner in which hazardous waste data is collected, stored, and accessed.

Frankly, I am disappointed that the Federal government needs legislation to do something that seems so obvious in this day and age.

For those concerned about how much paper is used for this inefficient and burdensome requirement –

According to EPA, the paper manifest system generates up to 156 tons of paper per year. It takes roughly 17 trees to create a ton of paper. This means that RCRA's supposed environmental purpose requires 2,652 trees per year.

Rather than benefit from the efficiencies that computers can provide, current regulations require a paper manifest system comprised of six-carbon copies which must be filled out and signed by each person who handles the waste. Those copies must not only accompany the waste as it is transported but must be mailed to generators and state agencies and kept on file by each regulated entity.

EPA estimates that roughly 146,000 regulated entities track between 2.5-5 million manifests each year.

The current system is far too burdensome on all parties, especially the private sector and state managers.

I sincerely hope that we can pass this non-controversial bill quickly.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses.

[Return to the top ↑](#)

FLOOR SPEECH: HOT & COLD MEDIA SPIN CYCLE: A CHALLENGE TO JOURNALISTS WHO COVER GLOBAL WARMING

Monday, September 25, 2006

Speech Web link:

<http://www.epw.senate.gov/speechitem.cfm?party=rep&id=263759>

[Click here to watch](#)

[Click here to listen to the speech](#)

I am going to speak today about the most media-hyped environmental issue of

all time, global warming. I have spoken more about global warming than any other politician in Washington today. My speech will be a bit different from the previous seven floor speeches, as I focus not only on the science, but on the media's coverage of climate change.

Global Warming -- just that term evokes many members in this chamber, the media, Hollywood elites and our pop culture to nod their heads and fret about an impending climate disaster. As the senator who has spent more time educating about the actual facts about global warming, I want to address some of the recent media coverage of global warming and Hollywood's involvement in the issue. And of course I will also discuss former Vice President Al Gore's movie "An Inconvenient Truth."

Since 1895, the media has alternated between global cooling and warming scares during four separate and sometimes overlapping time periods. From 1895 until the 1930's the media pedaled a coming ice age.

From the late 1920's until the 1960's they warned of global warming. From the 1950's until the 1970's they warned us again of a coming ice age. This makes modern global warming the fourth estate's fourth attempt to promote opposing climate change fears during the last 100 years.

Recently, advocates of alarmism have grown increasingly desperate to try to convince the public that global warming is the greatest moral issue of our generation. Just last week, the vice president of London's Royal Society sent a chilling letter to the media encouraging them to stifle the voices of scientists skeptical of climate alarmism.

During the past year, the American people have been served up an unprecedented parade of environmental alarmism by the media and entertainment industry, which link every possible weather event to global warming. The year 2006 saw many major organs of the media dismiss any pretense of balance and objectivity on climate change coverage and instead crossed squarely into global warming advocacy.

SUMMARY OF LATEST DEVELOPMENTS OF MANMADE GLOBAL WARMING HOCKEY STICK

First, I would like to summarize some of the recent developments in the controversy over whether or not humans have created a climate catastrophe. One of the key aspects that the United Nations, environmental groups and the media have promoted as the "smoking gun" of proof of catastrophic global warming is the so-called 'hockey stick' temperature graph by climate scientist Michael Mann and his colleagues.

This graph purported to show that temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere remained relatively stable over 900 years, then spiked upward in the 20th century presumably due to human activity. Mann, who also co-publishes a global warming propaganda blog reportedly set up with the help of an environmental group, had his "Hockey Stick" come under severe scrutiny.

The "hockey stick" was completely and thoroughly broken once and for all in

2006. Several years ago, two Canadian researchers tore apart the statistical foundation for the hockey stick. In 2006, both the National Academy of Sciences and an independent researcher further refuted the foundation of the “hockey stick.” <http://epw.senate.gov/pressitem.cfm?party=rep&id=257697>

The National Academy of Sciences report reaffirmed the existence of the Medieval Warm Period from about 900 AD to 1300 AD and the Little Ice Age from about 1500 to 1850. Both of these periods occurred long before the invention of the SUV or human industrial activity could have possibly impacted the Earth’s climate. In fact, scientists believe the Earth was warmer than today during the Medieval Warm Period, when the Vikings grew crops in Greenland.

Climate alarmists have been attempting to erase the inconvenient Medieval Warm Period from the Earth’s climate history for at least a decade. David Deming, an assistant professor at the University of Oklahoma’s College of Geosciences, can testify first hand about this effort.

Dr. Deming was welcomed into the close-knit group of global warming believers after he published a paper in 1995 that noted some warming in the 20th century. Deming says he was subsequently contacted by a prominent global warming alarmist and told point blank “We have to get rid of the Medieval Warm Period.” When the “Hockey Stick” first appeared in 1998, it did just that.

END OF LITTLE ICE AGE MEANS WARMING

The media have missed the big pieces of the puzzle when it comes to the Earth’s temperatures and mankind’s carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions. It is very simplistic to feign horror and say the one degree Fahrenheit temperature increase during the 20th century means we are all doomed. First of all, the one degree Fahrenheit rise coincided with the greatest advancement of living standards, life expectancy, food production and human health in the history of our planet. So it is hard to argue that the global warming we experienced in the 20th century was somehow negative or part of a catastrophic trend.

Second, what the climate alarmists and their advocates in the media have continued to ignore is the fact that the Little Ice Age, which resulted in harsh winters which froze New York Harbor and caused untold deaths, ended about 1850. So trying to prove man-made global warming by comparing the well-known fact that today’s temperatures are warmer than during the Little Ice Age is akin to comparing summer to winter to show a catastrophic temperature trend.

In addition, something that the media almost never addresses are the holes in the theory that CO₂ has been the driving force in global warming.

Alarmists fail to adequately explain why temperatures began warming at the end of the Little Ice Age in about 1850, long before man-made CO₂ emissions could have impacted the climate. Then about 1940, just as man-made CO₂ emissions rose sharply, the temperatures began a decline that lasted until the

1970's, prompting the media and many scientists to fear a coming ice age.

Let me repeat, temperatures got colder after CO2 emissions exploded. If CO2 is the driving force of global climate change, why do so many in the media ignore the many skeptical scientists who cite these rather obvious inconvenient truths?

SIXTY SCIENTISTS

My skeptical views on man-made catastrophic global warming have only strengthened as new science comes in. There have been recent findings in peer-reviewed literature over the last few years showing that the Antarctic is getting colder and the ice is growing and a new study in Geophysical Research Letters found that the sun was responsible for 50% of 20th century warming.

Recently, many scientists, including a leading member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, predicted long-term global cooling may be on the horizon due to a projected decrease in the sun's output.

A letter sent to the Canadian Prime Minister on April 6 of this year by 60 prominent scientists who question the basis for climate alarmism, clearly explains the current state of scientific knowledge on global warming.

The 60 scientists wrote:

<http://www.canada.com/nationalpost/financialpost/story.html?id=3711460e-bd5a-475d-a6be-4db87559d605>

"If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary."

The letter also noted:

"'Climate change is real' is a meaningless phrase used repeatedly by activists to convince the public that a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause. Neither of these fears is justified. Global climate changes occur all the time due to natural causes and the human impact still remains impossible to distinguish from this natural 'noise.'"

COMPUTER MODELS THREATEN EARTH

One of the ways alarmists have pounded this mantra of "consensus" on global warming into our pop culture is through the use of computer models which project future calamity. But the science is simply not there to place so much faith in scary computer model scenarios which extrapolate the current and projected buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and conclude that the planet faces certain doom.

Dr. Vincent Gray, a research scientist and a 2001 reviewer with the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has noted,

"The effects of aerosols, and their uncertainties, are such as to nullify completely the reliability of any of the climate models."

Earlier this year, the director of the International Arctic Research Center in Fairbanks Alaska, testified to Congress that highly publicized climate models showing a disappearing Arctic were nothing more than “science fiction.”

In fact, after years of hearing about the computer generated scary scenarios about the future of our planet, I now believe that the greatest climate threat we face may be coming from alarmist computer models.

This threat is originating from the software installed on the hard drives of the publicity seeking climate modelers.

It is long past the time for us to separate climate change fact from hysteria.

KYOTO: ECONOMIC PAIN FOR NO CLIMATE GAIN

One final point on the science of climate change: I am approached by many in the media and others who ask, “What if you are wrong to doubt the dire global warming predictions? Will you be able to live with yourself for opposing the Kyoto Protocol?”

My answer is blunt. The history of the modern environmental movement is chock full of predictions of doom that never came true. We have all heard the dire predictions about the threat of overpopulation, resource scarcity, mass starvation, and the projected death of our oceans. None of these predictions came true, yet it never stopped the doomsayers from continuing to predict a dire environmental future.

The more the eco-doomsayers’ predictions fail, the more the eco-doomsayers predict.

These failed predictions are just one reason I respect the serious scientists out there today debunking the latest scaremongering on climate change. Scientists like MIT’s Richard Lindzen, former Colorado State climatologist Roger Pielke, Sr., the University of Alabama’s Roy Spencer and John Christy, Virginia State Climatologist Patrick Michaels, Colorado State University’s William Gray, atmospheric physicist S. Fred Singer, Willie Soon of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Oregon State climatologist George Taylor and astrophysicist Sallie Baliunas, to name a few.

But more importantly, it is the global warming alarmists who should be asked the question -- “What if they are correct about man-made catastrophic global warming?” -- because they have come up with no meaningful solution to their supposed climate crisis in the two decades that they have been hyping this issue.

If the alarmists truly believe that man-made greenhouse gas emissions are dooming the planet, then they must face up to the fact that symbolism does not solve a supposed climate crisis.

The alarmists freely concede that the Kyoto Protocol, even if fully ratified and complied with, would not have any meaningful impact on global temperatures. And keep in mind that Kyoto is not even close to being complied with by

many of the nations that ratified it, including 13 of the EU-15 nations that are not going to meet their emission reduction promises.

Many of the nations that ratified Kyoto are now realizing what I have been saying all along:

The Kyoto Protocol is a lot of economic pain for no climate gain.

Legislation that has been proposed in this chamber would have even less of a temperature effect than Kyoto's undetectable impact. And more recently, global warming alarmists and the media have been praising California for taking action to limit CO₂. But here again: This costly feel-good California measure, which is actually far less severe than Kyoto, will have no impact on the climate -- only the economy.

Symbolism does not solve a climate crisis.

In addition, we now have many environmentalists and Hollywood celebrities, like Laurie David, who have been advocating measures like changing standard light bulbs in your home to fluorescents to help avert global warming. Changing to more energy-efficient light bulbs is a fine thing to do, but to somehow imply we can avert a climate disaster by these actions is absurd.

Once again, symbolism does not solve a climate crisis.

But this symbolism may be hiding a dark side. While greenhouse gas limiting proposals may cost the industrialized West trillions of dollars, it is the effect on the developing world's poor that is being lost in this debate.

The Kyoto Protocol's post 2012 agenda which mandates that the developing world be subjected to restrictions on greenhouse gases could have the potential to severely restrict development in regions of the world like Africa, Asia and South America -- where some of the Earth's most energy-deprived people currently reside.

Expanding basic necessities like running water and electricity in the developing world are seen by many in the green movement as a threat to the planet's health that must be avoided.

Energy poverty equals a life of back-breaking poverty and premature death.

If we allow scientifically unfounded fears of global warming to influence policy makers to restrict future energy production and the creation of basic infrastructure in the developing world -- billions of people will continue to suffer.

Last week my committee heard testimony from Danish statistician Bjorn Lomborg, who was once a committed left-wing environmentalist until he realized that so much of what that movement preached was based on bad science. Lomborg wrote a book called "The Skeptical Environmentalist" and has organized some of the world's top Nobel Laureates to form the 2004 "Copenhagen Consensus" which ranked the world's most pressing problems.

<http://www.copenhagenconsensus.com/Default.aspx?ID=158>

And guess what?

They placed global warming at the bottom of the list in terms of our planet's priorities. The "Copenhagen Consensus" found that the most important priorities of our planet included: combating disease, stopping malaria, securing clean water, and building infrastructure to help lift the developing nations out of poverty.

I have made many trips to Africa, and once you see the devastating poverty that has a grip on that continent, you quickly realize that fears about global warming are severely misguided.

I firmly believe that when the history of our era is written, future generations will look back with puzzlement and wonder why we spent so much time and effort on global warming fears and pointless solutions like the Kyoto Protocol.

French President Jacques Chirac provided the key clue as to why so many in the international community still revere the Kyoto Protocol, who in 2000 said Kyoto represents "the first component of an authentic global governance."

Furthermore, if your goal is to limit CO2 emissions, the only effective way to go about it is the use of cleaner, more efficient technologies that will meet the energy demands of this century and beyond.

The Bush administration and my Environment and Public Works Committee have been engaged in these efforts as we work to expand nuclear power and promote the Asia-Pacific Partnership. This partnership stresses the sharing of new technology among member nations including three of the world's top 10 emitters -- China, India and North Korea -- all of whom are exempt from Kyoto.

MEDIA COVERAGE OF CLIMATE CHANGE:

Many in the media, as I noted earlier, have taken it upon themselves to drop all pretense of balance on global warming and instead become committed advocates for the issue.

Here is a quote from Newsweek magazine:

"There are ominous signs that the Earth's weather patterns have begun to change dramatically and that these changes may portend a drastic decline in food production-- with serious political implications for just about every nation on Earth."

A headline in the New York Times reads: "Climate Changes Endanger World's Food Output."

Here is a quote from Time Magazine:

“As they review the bizarre and unpredictable weather pattern of the past several years, a growing number of scientists are beginning to suspect that many seemingly contradictory meteorological fluctuations are actually part of a global climatic upheaval.”

All of this sounds very ominous. That is, until you realize that the three quotes I just read were from articles in 1975 editions of Newsweek Magazine and The New York Times, and Time Magazine in 1974. <http://time-proxy.yaga.com/time/archive/printout/0,23657,944914,00.html>

They weren't referring to global warming; they were warning of a coming ice age.

Let me repeat, all three of those quotes were published in the 1970's and warned of a coming ice age.

In addition to global cooling fears, Time Magazine has also reported on global warming. Here is an example:

“[Those] who claim that winters were harder when they were boys are quite right... weathermen have no doubt that the world at least for the time being is growing warmer.”

Before you think that this is just another example of the media promoting Vice President Gore's movie, you need to know that the quote I just read you from Time Magazine was not a recent quote; it was from January 2, 1939.

Yes, in 1939. Nine years before Vice President Gore was born and over three decades before Time Magazine began hyping a coming ice age and almost five decades before they returned to hyping global warming.

Time Magazine in 1951 pointed to receding permafrost in Russia as proof that the planet was warming.

In 1952, the New York Times noted that the “trump card” of global warming “has been the melting glaciers.”

BUT MEDIA COULD NOT DECIDE BETWEEN WARMING OR COOLING SCARES

There are many more examples of the media and scientists flip-flopping between warming and cooling scares.

Here is a quote from the New York Times reporting on fears of an approaching ice age.

“Geologists Think the World May be Frozen Up Again.”

That sentence appeared over 100 years ago in the February 24, 1895 edition of the New York Times. Let me repeat. 1895, not 1995.

A front page article in the October 7, 1912 New York Times, just a few months after the Titanic struck an iceberg and sank, declared that a prominent

professor “Warns Us of an Encroaching Ice Age.”

The very same day in 1912, the Los Angeles Times ran an article warning that the “Human race will have to fight for its existence against cold.”

An August 10, 1923 Washington Post article declared: “Ice Age Coming Here.”

By the 1930's, the media took a break from reporting on the coming ice age and instead switched gears to promoting global warming:

“America in Longest Warm Spell Since 1776; Temperature Line Records a 25-year Rise” stated an article in the New York Times on March 27, 1933.

The media of yesteryear was also not above injecting large amounts of fear and alarmism into their climate articles.

An August 9, 1923 front page article in the Chicago Tribune declared:

“Scientist Says Arctic Ice Will Wipe Out Canada.”

The article quoted a Yale University professor who predicted that large parts of Europe and Asia would be “wiped out” and Switzerland would be “entirely obliterated.”

A December 29, 1974 New York Times article on global cooling reported that climatologists believed “the facts of the present climate change are such that the most optimistic experts would assign near certainty to major crop failure in a decade.”

The article also warned that unless government officials reacted to the coming catastrophe, “mass deaths by starvation and probably in anarchy and violence” would result. In 1975, the New York Times reported that “A major cooling [was] widely considered to be inevitable.”

These past predictions of doom have a familiar ring, don't they? They sound strikingly similar to our modern media promotion of former Vice president's brand of climate alarmism.

After more than a century of alternating between global cooling and warming, one would think that this media history would serve a cautionary tale for today's voices in the media and scientific community who are promoting yet another round of eco-doom.

Much of the 100-year media history on climate change that I have documented here today can be found in a publication titled “Fire and Ice” from the Business and Media Institute.

http://www.businessandmedia.org/specialreports/2006/fireandice/fireandice_timeswarns.asp

MEDIA COVERAGE IN 2006

Which raises the question: Has this embarrassing 100-year documented legacy of coverage on what turned out to be trendy climate science theories made the media more skeptical of today's sensational promoters of global warming?

You be the judge.

On February 19th of this year, CBS News's "60 Minutes" produced a segment on the North Pole. The segment was a completely one-sided report, alleging rapid and unprecedented melting at the polar cap.

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/02/16/60minutes/main1323169.shtml> It even featured correspondent Scott Pelley claiming that the ice in Greenland was melting so fast, that he barely got off an ice-berg before it collapsed into the water.

"60 Minutes" failed to inform its viewers that a 2005 study by a scientist named Ola Johannessen and his colleagues showing that the interior of Greenland is gaining ice and mass and that according to scientists, the Arctic was warmer in the 1930's than today.

On March 19th of this year "60 Minutes" profiled NASA scientist and alarmist James Hansen, who was once again making allegations of being censored by the Bush administration.

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/03/17/60minutes/main1415985.shtml>

In this segment, objectivity and balance were again tossed aside in favor of a one-sided glowing profile of Hansen.

The "60 Minutes" segment made no mention of Hansen's partisan ties to former Democrat Vice President Al Gore or Hansen's receiving of a grant of a quarter of a million dollars from the left-wing Heinz Foundation run by Teresa Heinz Kerry. There was also no mention of Hansen's subsequent endorsement of her husband John Kerry for President in 2004.

Many in the media dwell on any industry support given to so-called climate skeptics, but the same media completely fail to note Hansen's huge grant from the left-wing Heinz Foundation.

The foundation's money originated from the Heinz family ketchup fortune. So it appears that the media makes a distinction between oil money and ketchup money.

"60 Minutes" also did not inform viewers that Hansen appeared to concede in a 2003 issue of Natural Science that the use of "extreme scenarios" to dramatize climate change "may have been appropriate at one time" to drive the public's attention to the issue. http://naturalscience.com/ns/articles/01-16/ns_jeh6.html

Why would "60 Minutes" ignore the basic tenets of journalism, which call for objectivity and balance in sourcing, and do such one-sided segments?

The answer was provided by correspondent Scott Pelley. Pelley told the CBS

News website that he justified excluding scientists skeptical of global warming alarmism from his segments because he considers skeptics to be the equivalent of “Holocaust deniers.”

<http://www.cbsnews.com/blogs/2006/03/22/publiceye/entry1431768.shtml>

This year also saw a New York Times reporter write a children’s book entitled “The North Pole Was Here.” The author of the book, New York Times reporter Andrew Revkin, wrote that it may someday be “easier to sail to than stand on” the North Pole in summer. So here we have a very prominent environmental reporter for the New York Times who is promoting aspects of global warming alarmism in a book aimed at children.

TIME MAGAZINE HYPES ALARMISM

In April of this year, Time Magazine devoted an issue to global warming alarmism titled “Be Worried, Be Very Worried.”

<http://www.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,20060403,00.html>

This is the same Time Magazine which first warned of a coming ice age in 1920’s before switching to warning about global warming in the 1930’s before switching yet again to promoting the 1970’s coming ice age scare.

The April 3, 2006 global warming special report of Time Magazine was a prime example of the media’s shortcomings, as the magazine cited partisan left-wing environmental groups with a vested financial interest in hyping alarmism.

Headlines blared:

“More and More Land is Being Devastated by Drought”

“Earth at the Tipping Point”

“The Climate is Crashing,”

Time Magazine did not make the slightest attempt to balance its reporting with any views with scientists skeptical of this alleged climate apocalypse.

I don’t have journalism training, but I dare say calling a bunch of environmental groups with an obvious fund-raising agenda and asking them to make wild speculations on how bad global warming might become, is nothing more than advocacy for their left-wing causes. It is a violation of basic journalistic standards.

To his credit, New York Times reporter Revkin saw fit to criticize Time Magazine for its embarrassing coverage of climate science.

<http://orient.bowdoin.edu/orient/article.php?date=2006-04-28§ion=1&id=7>

So in the end, Time’s cover story title of “Be Worried, Be Very Worried,” appears to have been apt. The American people should be worried --- very worried -- of such shoddy journalism.

AL GORE INCONVIENIENT TRUTH

In May, our nation was exposed to perhaps one of the slickest science propaganda films of all time: former Vice President Gore's "An Inconvenient Truth." In addition to having the backing of Paramount Pictures to market this film, Gore had the full backing of the media, and leading the cheerleading charge was none other than the Associated Press.

On June 27, the Associated Press ran an article by Seth Borenstein that boldly declared "Scientists give two thumbs up to Gore's movie." The article quoted only five scientists praising Gore's science, despite AP's having contacted over 100 scientists. http://www.usatoday.com/weather/news/2006-06-27-inconvenient-truth-reviews_x.htm

The fact that over 80% of the scientists contacted by the AP had not even seen the movie or that many scientists have harshly criticized the science presented by Gore did not dissuade the news outlet one bit from its mission to promote Gore's brand of climate alarmism.

<http://epw.senate.gov/pressitem.cfm?party=rep&id=257909>

I am almost at a loss as to how to begin to address the series of errors, misleading science and unfounded speculation that appear in the former Vice President's film

Here is what Richard Lindzen, a meteorologist from MIT has written about "An Inconvenient Truth."

"A general characteristic of Mr. Gore's approach is to ignore the fact that the earth and its climate are dynamic; they are always changing even without any external forcing. To treat all change as something to fear is bad enough; to do so in order to exploit that fear is much worse."

<http://www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110008597>

What follows is a very brief summary of the science that the former Vice President promotes in either a wrong or misleading way:

- He promoted the now debunked "hockey stick" temperature chart in an attempt to prove man's overwhelming impact on the climate
- He attempted to minimize the significance of Medieval Warm period and the Little Ice Age
- He insisted on a link between increased hurricane activity and global warming that most scientists believe does not exist.
- He asserted that today's Arctic is experiencing unprecedented warmth while ignoring that temperatures in the 1930's were as warm or warmer
- He claimed the Antarctic was warming and losing ice but failed to note, that is only true of a small region and the vast bulk has been cooling

and gaining ice.

- He hyped unfounded fears that Greenland's ice is in danger of disappearing
- He erroneously claimed that ice cap on Mt. Kilimanjaro is disappearing due to global warming, even while the region cools and researchers blame the ice loss on local land-use practices
- He made assertions of massive future sea level rise that is way out side of any supposed scientific "consensus" and is not supported in even the most alarmist literature.
- He incorrectly implied that a Peruvian glacier's retreat is due to global warming, while ignoring the fact that the region has been cooling since the 1930s and other glaciers in South America are advancing
- He blamed global warming for water loss in Africa's Lake Chad, despite NASA scientists concluding that local population and grazing factors are the more likely culprits
- He inaccurately claimed polar bears are drowning in significant numbers due to melting ice when in fact they are thriving
- He completely failed to inform viewers that the 48 scientists who accused President Bush of distorting science were part of a political advocacy group set up to support Democrat Presidential candidate John Kerry in 2004

Now that was just a brief sampling of some of the errors presented in "An Inconvenient Truth." Imagine how long the list would have been if I had actually seen the movie -- there would not be enough time to deliver this speech today.

TOM BROKAW

Following the promotion of "An Inconvenient Truth," the press did not miss a beat in their role as advocates for global warming fears.

ABC News put forth its best effort to secure its standing as an advocate for climate alarmism when the network put out a call for people to submit their anecdotal global warming horror stories in June for use in a future news segment.

<http://abcnews.go.com/International/story?id=2094224&CMP=OTC-RSSFeeds0312>

In July, the Discovery Channel presented a documentary on global warming narrated by former NBC anchor Tom Brokaw. The program presented only those views of scientists promoting the idea that humans are destroying the Earth's climate. <http://epw.senate.gov/fact.cfm?party=rep&id=258659>

You don't have to take my word for the program's overwhelming bias; a Bloomberg News TV review noted "You'll find more dissent at a North Korean political rally than in this program" because of its lack of scientific objectivity.

Brokaw also presented climate alarmist James Hansen to viewers as unbiased, failing to note his quarter million dollar grant from the partisan Heinz Foundation or his endorsement of Democrat Presidential nominee John Kerry in 2004 and his role promoting former Vice President Gore's Hollywood movie.

Brokaw, however, did find time to impugn the motives of scientists skeptical of climate alarmism when he featured paid environmental partisan Michael Oppenheimer of the group Environmental Defense accusing skeptics of being bought out by the fossil fuel interests.

The fact remains that political campaign funding by environmental groups to promote climate and environmental alarmism dwarfs spending by the fossil fuel industry by a three-to-one ratio. Environmental special interests, through their 527s, spent over \$19 million compared to the \$7 million that Oil and Gas spent through PACs in the 2004 election cycle.

I am reminded of a question the media often asks me about how much I have received in campaign contributions from the fossil fuel industry.

My unapologetic answer is 'Not Enough,' -- especially when you consider the millions partisan environmental groups pour into political campaigns.

ENGINEERED 'CONSENSUS'

Continuing with our media analysis: On July 24, 2006 The Los Angeles Times featured an op-ed by Naomi Oreskes, a social scientist at the University of California San Diego and the author of a 2004 Science Magazine study. Oreskes insisted that a review of 928 scientific papers showed there was 100% consensus that global warming was not caused by natural climate variations. This study was also featured in former Vice President Gore's "An Inconvenient Truth,"

<http://epw.senate.gov/fact.cfm?party=rep&id=259323>

However, the analysis in Science Magazine excluded nearly 11,000 studies or more than 90 percent of the papers dealing with global warming, according to a critique by British social scientist Benny Peiser.

Peiser also pointed out that less than two percent of the climate studies in the survey actually endorsed the so-called "consensus view" that human activity is driving global warming and some of the studies actually opposed that view.

But despite this manufactured "consensus," the media continued to ignore any attempt to question the orthodoxy of climate alarmism.

As the dog days of August rolled in, the American people were once again hit

with more hot hype regarding global warming, this time from The New York Times op-ed pages. A columnist penned an August 3rd column filled with so many inaccuracies it is a wonder the editor of the Times saw fit to publish it.

For instance, Bob Herbert's column made dubious claims about polar bears, the snows of Kilimanjaro and he attempted to link this past summer's heat wave in the U.S. to global warming – something even alarmist James Hansen does not support. <http://epw.senate.gov/fact.cfm?party=rep&id=261382>

POLAR BEARS LOOK TIRED?

Finally, a September 15, 2006 Reuters News article claimed that polar bears in the Arctic are threatened with extinction by global warming. The article by correspondent Alister Doyle, quoted a visitor to the Arctic who claims he saw two distressed polar bears. According to the Reuters article, the man noted that “one of [the polar bears] looked to be dead and the other one looked to be exhausted.”

The article did not state the bears were actually dead or exhausted, rather that they “looked” that way.

Have we really arrived at the point where major news outlets in the U.S. are reduced to analyzing whether or not polar bears in the Arctic appear restless?

How does reporting like this get approved for publication by the editors at Reuters?

What happened to covering the hard science of this issue?

What was missing from this Reuters news article was the fact that according to biologists who study the animals, polar bears are doing quite well. Biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor from the Arctic government of Nunavut, a territory of Canada, refuted these claims in May when he noted that

“Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number. They are not going extinct, or even appear to be affected at present.” http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Article_Type1&c=Article&cid=1146433819696&call_pageid=970599119419

Sadly, it appears that reporting anecdotes and hearsay as fact, has now replaced the basic tenets of journalism for many media outlets.

ALARMISM HAS LED TO SKEPTICISM

It is an inconvenient truth that so far, 2006 has been a year in which major segments of the media have given up on any quest for journalistic balance, fairness and objectivity when it comes to climate change. The global warming alarmists and their friends in the media have attempted to smear scientists who dare question the premise of man-made catastrophic global warming, and as a result some scientists have seen their reputations and research funding dry up.

The media has so relentlessly promoted global warming fears that a British group called the Institute for Public Policy Research – and this from a left leaning group – issued a report in 2006 accusing media outlets of engaging in what they termed “climate porn” in order to attract the public’s attention.

Bob Carter, a Paleoclimate geologist from James Cook University in Australia has described how the media promotes climate fear:

“Each such alarmist article is larded with words such as ‘if’, ‘might’, ‘could’, ‘probably’, ‘perhaps’, ‘expected’, ‘projected’ or ‘modeled’ - and many involve such deep dreaming, or ignorance of scientific facts and principles, that they are akin to nonsense,” professor Carter concluded in an op-ed in April of this year.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2006/04/09/do0907.xml&sSheet=/news/2006/04/09/ixworld.html>

Another example of this relentless hype is the reporting on the seemingly endless number of global warming impact studies which do not even address whether global warming is going to happen. They merely project the impact of potential temperature increases.

The media endlessly hypes studies that purportedly show that global warming could increase mosquito populations, malaria, West Nile Virus, heat waves and hurricanes, threaten the oceans, damage coral reefs, boost poison ivy growth, damage vineyards, and global food crops, to name just a few of the global warming linked calamities.

Oddly, according to the media reports, warmer temperatures almost never seem to have any positive effects on plant or animal life or food production.

Fortunately, the media’s addiction to so-called ‘climate porn’ has failed to seduce many Americans.

According to a July Pew Research Center Poll, the American public is split about evenly between those who say global warming is due to human activity versus those who believe it’s from natural factors or not happening at all. This is down from 85 percent just a year ago.

In addition, an August Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg poll found that most Americans do not attribute the cause of recent severe weather events to global warming, and the portion of Americans who believe global warming is naturally occurring is on the rise.

Yes -- it appears that alarmism has led to skepticism.

The American people know when their intelligence is being insulted. They know when they are being used and when they are being duped by the hysterical left.

The American people deserve better -- much better -- from our fourth estate. We have a right to expect accuracy and objectivity on climate change coverage.

We have a right to expect balance in sourcing and fair analysis from reporters who cover the issue.

Above all, the media must roll back this mantra that there is scientific “consensus” of impending climatic doom as an excuse to ignore recent science. After all, there was a so-called scientific “consensus” that there were nine planets in our solar system until Pluto was recently demoted.

Breaking the cycles of media hysteria will not be easy since hysteria sells -- it's very profitable. But I want to challenge the news media to reverse course and report on the objective science of climate change, to stop ignoring legitimate voices this scientific debate and to stop acting as a vehicle for unsubstantiated hype.

[Return to the top](#) 

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

CALL FOR TVNZ BALANCE ON 'ALARMIST DOOMCASTING'

Press Release: New Zealand Climate Science Coalition
New Zealand Climate Science Coalition

26 September 2006

A challenge to TVNZ to balance what he termed “alarmist doomcasting” in its Tuesday evening 6 pm OneNews, has been issued by the secretary of the New Zealand Climate Science Coalition, Terry Dunleavy.

“TVNZ chose to broadcast a hugely exaggerated claim about global warming by an American supporter of global warming, James Hansen, on precisely the same day that Mr Hansen was being denounced in the U.S. Senate, by Senator James Inhofe, chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. I challenge TVNZ to balance the record with the following except from Senator Inhofe’s speech,” said Mr Dunleavy:

“On March 19 of this year ‘60 Minutes’ profiled NASA scientist and alarmist James Hansen, who was once again making allegations of being censored by the Bush administration. In this segment, objectivity and balance were again tossed aside in favour of a one-sided glowing profile of Hansen.

“The ‘60 Minutes’ segment made no mention of Hansen’s partisan ties to former Democrat Vice President Al Gore or Hansen’s receiving of a grant of a quarter of a million dollars from the left-wing Heinz Foundation run by Teresa Heinz Kerry. There was also no mention of Hansen’s subsequent endorsement of her husband John Kerry for President in 2004.

“Many in the media dwell on any industry support given to so-called climate skeptics, but the same media completely fail to note Hansen’s huge grant from the left-wing Heinz Foundation.

“The foundation’s money originated from the Heinz family ketchup fortune. So it appears that the media makes a distinction between oil money and ketchup money.

“‘60 Minutes’ also did not inform viewers that Hansen appeared to concede in a 2003 issue of Natural Science that the use of ‘extreme scenarios’ to dramatize climate change ‘may have been appropriate at one time’ to drive the public’s attention to the issue.

“Why would ‘60 Minutes’ ignore the basic tenets of journalism, which call for objectivity and balance in sourcing, and do such one-sided segments? The answer was provided by correspondent Scott Pelley. Pelley told the CBS News website that he justified excluding scientists skeptical of global warming alarmism from his segments because he considers skeptics to be the equivalent of ‘Holocaust deniers.’ “

Mr Dunleavy said that the foregoing excerpt from the Senator’s speech should serve as a warning that news media should check validity of those whose views on global warning they choose to feature.

“It is galling to us to read that Senator Inhofe saw fit to quote from two members of our New Zealand coalition, Dr Vincent Gray on Upper Hutt, and Professor Bob Carter, of James Cook University in Townsville and a graduate of Otago University, when we seem unable to have their opinions on global warning accepted by New Zealand news media.

“I challenge all news media in New Zealand to publish the website link where anyone interested can read the full text of Senator Inhofe’s speech, probably the most comprehensive and compelling summary of arguments yet made against the notion of catastrophic global warming. That link is:
<http://www.epw.senate.gov/speechitem.cfm?party=rep&id=263759>

“Here is a chance for New Zealand news media to demonstrate that there is no basis for the claim that they as one-sided on the issue of global warming and climate change as Senator Inhofe has accused the media in his country,” said Mr Dunleavy.

Click here for the full text of the article:

<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0609/S00306.htm>

New Zealand Climate Science Coalition: <http://www.climatescience.org.nz/>

[Return to the top](#) 

WORLDNET DAILY

CLIMATE HYPE OUTSTRIPS CLIMATE FACTS

September 30, 2006

When gasoline prices hit \$3 per gallon, everyone screamed for the government

to "do something." The only thing to do to really solve the problem is to increase the supply of domestic petroleum, while continuing to develop affordable alternative energy sources. Both the administration, and the House of Representatives set out to do this by enacting legislation to expand offshore petroleum production and to open a tiny portion of the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge.

Even before gasoline prices began to fall, environmental organizations, and their congressional benefactors, took steps to "monkey wrench" the legislation.

"Liberal Lamar" Alexander, as the junior senator from Tennessee is known, introduced a bill that would confiscate \$450 million per year for five years from offshore oil revenue, for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This has become a slush-fund that the feds use to provide grants to states and to environmental organizations to buy up private property that all too often gets added to the bloated government land inventory. "Liberal Lamar" has blocked passage of the offshore drilling legislation until his provision is included.

Environmental organizations quickly increased the frequency of their TV ads that show ANWR to be lush, pristine wilderness, full of cuddly animals and beautiful flowers. The ads deliberately mislead, claiming the ANWR reserves equal only about six months of petroleum usage. They fail to say that this would be true only if there were no other source for energy. In reality, pumping all that the Alaska pipeline could handle, the ANWR supply would last about 30 years.

Interestingly, "Liberal Lamar" joined his colleagues, Ted Kennedy and John Kerry, in opposing the development of alternative energy sources – windmills – off the coast of Cape Cod. This could be, according to [Washington Watcher, Mike Hardiman](#), because Lamar also has a summer vacation home in the area.

Almost as if coordinated, when efforts to expand domestic energy production began to gain momentum, the media were awash with reports of "new studies" that forecast doom-and-gloom consequences of global warming. Headlines screamed: "[Hottest in a million years.](#)" NASA's Jim Hansen headed this most recent study. He is the same Jim Hansen who first announced global warming at a Senate hearing conducted by then-Sen. Al Gore. He is the same Jim Hansen whose studies have been funded by the Heinz Foundation, headed by John Kerry's wife, and the same Jim Hansen who endorsed John Kerry for president.

Sen. James Inhofe, R-Okla., went to the Senate floor and delivered a [scathing rebutta](#), documenting not only the science that contradicts Hansen's study but also pointing to the cyclic nature of the media's reporting about global warming and global cooling over the years.

Inhofe provides direct quotes from major media that warned of an imminent "Ice Age," in the 1970s. These same media now are proclaiming the earth is hotter than it's been in 12,000 years, and that by 2050, it will be hotter than it has ever been – one degree hotter than it is today.

Only a few months ago, climate experts were predicting that this year would produce even worse, and more hurricanes than last year – because of global warming. Obviously, they were wrong. These same climate experts are not embarrassed, they just offer forecasts that cannot be proven wrong for 50 years – as their 1970s forecasts about global cooling have proven wrong.

The climate debate is job security for bureaucrats and compliant scientists, a fund-raising source for environmental organizations and very expensive entertainment for the observers. The reality of here and now requires policies that affect the here and now – not the pipe dreams of people who can't know what the future may hold.

The reality is that the United States government is denying its citizens the use of their own vital resources, namely, petroleum that lies offshore and in reserves in ANWR and throughout the country. Consequently, the nation is dependent upon the likes of Iran's Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Venezuela's Hugo Chavez to supply its critical energy needs. Billions of U.S. dollars flow to these countries for oil, instead of flowing to Americans. How stupid is this policy?

Americans should demand that Congress override "Liberal Lamar" and the rest of the Kennedy-Kerry crowd that has blocked expanded oil production for years. Petroleum fuels the nation's economy; there is plenty of it available in U.S.-controlled territory. It is absolutely ridiculous not to use it, thereby remaining dependent upon our enemies for this vital commodity.

Click here for the full article:

http://worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=52223

[Return to the top ↑](#)

INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

EDITORIAL: COOLING DOWN THE CLIMATE SCARE

September 29, 2006

Environment: The country is drowning in wild alarms warning of impending doom due to global warming. Yet there has risen — from the U.S. Senate, of all places — a lone voice of rational dissent.

While Al Gore drifts into deeper darkness on the other side of the moon, propelled by such revelations as cigarette smoking is a "significant contributor to global warming," Sen. James Inhofe is becoming a one-man myth-wrecking crew.

Inhofe, a Republican from Oklahoma, took to the Senate floor two days last week to expose the media's role in the global warming hype. This is a man who more than three years ago called the global warming scare "the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people" and has made a habit of

tweaking the left-leaning environmental lobby.

One member of the media, Miles O'Brien of CNN, responded last week to Inhofe's criticism of the media with a piece criticizing Inhofe and challenging his arguments. If anything, it seems that O'Brien's reply simply motivated Inhofe to continue his effort to undress the media's complicity and bring light to the issue.

We hope so. The "science" on global warming and the media's propaganda campaign need to be picked apart.

The assumptions made by gloomy theorists should be revealed for what they are: mere conjecture.

The lies and carefully crafted implications, many of them discharged like toxic pollutants by a former vice president, deserve a thorough and lasting deconstruction.

What the public needs — and deserves — is a credible voice to counter the sermons from Gore, on whose behalf cigarettes were distributed in 2000 to Milwaukee homeless people who were recruited by campaign volunteers to cast absentee ballots. Inhofe could be that voice.

He's no John the Baptist crying out in the wilderness. What he is, in fact, is a thrice-elected senator, a former member of the House and, before that, a state senator and representative.

For those not impressed by a political background — after all, Gore, far out of proportion to his qualifications, rose to the second most powerful position on Earth — consider that Inhofe is an Army veteran and longtime pilot, and has actually worked in the private sector.

Unlike most in the Senate, Inhofe is willing to stand on a soapbox and expose his head to his opponents' rhetorical stones. Name another in that august body who would dare label as a hoax the premise that undergirds the day's most trendy pop cult. Is there anyone there who would want to try to stand up to the likes of O'Brien?

O'Brien's biased report is not exactly the type of exposure global warming skeptics hope for, though. The goal, say the skeptics, should be to teach and inform, to provide an alternative to the flood of hyperbole and intentionally misleading thunder that's passed off as settled science.

There are enough scientists to fill a fleet of Humvees who can express skepticism over global warming, despite Gore's claims that the matter has been resolved in favor of his conclusions. But none has the forum a U.S. senator can command. With rare exceptions, scientists can marshal media attention on the climate change issue only by spouting the party line that man-made emissions are causing Earth to warm. That's the sort of stuff the

press laps up like a starving dog.

Without the wind of a compliant media at his back, Inhofe nevertheless got his message out to America, primarily through C-Span and the Drudge Report, which linked to his speeches at the Web site of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Among those responding to Inhofe's first speech included a scientist and a meteorologist. Both hold views on global warming that are in line with the senator's — which puts them at odds with the environmental lobby's assertions of "consensus" that have been relentlessly beaten into the masses for more than a decade.

The most important audience, though, is among the Americans who have no links to science. They're the ones who have a lot to learn and will benefit the most from someone who has mass access to the public and is willing to challenge the widely — and often uncritically — accepted claims about climate change.

Click here for the full text of the editorial:

<http://www.investors.com/editorial/editorialcontent.asp?secid=1501&>

Marc Morano, Communications Director
Matt Dempsey, Press Secretary