



THE WEEKLY CLOSER

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

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2006

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 2

THE WEEK IN REVIEW...

- [Statement On New Mexico Senators' Climate Change Report](#)

IN THE NEWS...

- [A Global Warming Worksheet](#) (*The Wall Street Journal*, Holman W. Jenkins, Jr.)
- [Extremism on Trial: Criminal Activities Against Medical Research Rising Dramatically; Six Animal Terrorists Await Trial](#) (release from the Foundation for Biomedical Research – excerpt)

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

- [Green Goons & 'Rights' Loons](#) (*The New York Post*, editorial)

EPW RESOURCES

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

QUOTE OF THE WEEK...

“Nobody doubts, for instance, that when Bill Clinton asserts global warming is the greatest threat to mankind, he’s consulting not the science but a purported ‘consensus’ of scientists. A layman asks himself: What can ‘consensus’ mean if it asserts a judgment nobody is equipped to confidently make?”

Holman W. Jenkins, Jr.
“A Global Warming Worksheet”
The Wall Street Journal
February 1, 2006

STATEMENT ON NEW MEXICO SENATORS' CLIMATE CHANGE REPORT

“[W]e have already seen the utter failure of mandatory market-based systems for regulating greenhouse gas emissions.”

Senator Inhofe yesterday weighed in on a report released by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee leadership discussing steps for developing “mandatory market-based systems” for regulating greenhouse gas emissions based on the Sense of the Senate offered last year by Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.).

“We on the Environment and Public Works Committee, of course, welcome others to the climate debate, but would remind those interested that our committee exercises jurisdiction over legislative action related to climate change and emissions,” Senator Inhofe said. “I appreciate the interest of my two friends from New Mexico, and look forward to future conversations on this and other related topics.

“I would also remind those interested in this issue that we have already seen the utter failure of mandatory market-based systems for regulating greenhouse gas emissions. The overwhelming majority of nations participating in the Kyoto Protocol, for example, are not only missing their targets, but are, in fact, increasing their emissions. That irony aside, we still have seen no firm scientific evidence that mandatory actions, which would be implemented at great expense to the economy, are necessary. Sixty of our colleagues recognized that last year when they opposed action to implement mandatory caps on carbon dioxide. The majority of the Senate also rejected a Sense of the Senate offered by the junior senator from Massachusetts expressing the ‘need

NEXT WEEK...

February 8, 2006

Full committee informational hearing on pending nominations.

9:30 am

SD-628 (*note change*)

February 9, 2006

Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety hearing on the impact of clean air regulations on natural gas prices.

9:30 am

SD-628 (*note change*)

for the United States to address global climate change through comprehensive and cost-effective national measures and through the negotiation of fair and binding international commitments.’ Further, the stipulations in the Sense of the Senate offered by the ranking member of the Energy Committee that helped it pass the Senate would likely preclude what is being discussed today in their report from being approved and implemented.

“If we want to discuss the need for reducing emissions, we should discuss ways to reach an agreement on our Clear Skies bill, legislation that would cut real air pollution from power plants 70 percent without impeding the growth of our economy or killing American jobs.”

Last year, the Senate rejected an amendment to the Energy Policy Act of 2005 offered by Senators John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Joe Lieberman (D-Conn.) that would have implemented mandatory caps on carbon dioxide from the nation’s power plants.

The McCain-Lieberman amendment, according a Charles River Associates (CRA) study, would have:

- cost more than one million American jobs over the next 15 years,
- imposed an additional cost of \$810 dollars a year on households,
- increased already high gasoline prices by 55 cents a gallon,
- increased electricity prices 20% by 2020,
- increased the cost of natural gas by 47%, and
- averted only 0.029°C in temperature – assuming climate alarmists are correct about causation.

Another amendment had been considered by Senator Bingaman but was not offered due to a lack of support from either side of the climate debate. This amendment, based on the recommendations of the National Commission on Energy Policy, would have cost taxpayers \$27 billion annually according to CRA, and would have resulted in virtually no benefit to justify such costs – the aversion of 0.008°C in temperature by 2050.

[Return to the top ↑](#)

IN THE NEWS...

The Wall Street Journal

A Global Warming Worksheet

Holman W. Jenkins, Jr.

February 1, 2006

As used by the media, “global warming” refers to the theory not only that the earth is warming, but doing so because of human industrial activity.

How can a reasonably diligent citizen assess this claim? Measuring average global temperature is not an easy matter. It’s a big planet, with lots of ways and places to take its temperature. Scientists, naturally, have to rely on record keepers in decades past, using different instruments, to produce what has become the conventionally accepted estimate of a one-degree rise over the past century.

But even if a change is measured, how do we know it’s manmade? Giant, mile-thick sheaths of ice have come and gone from North America in recent millennia. In our unstable and evolving planet, temperature is often either rising or falling. Who knows whether a trend is the product of human activity or natural?

The answer is nobody. All we have is hypothesis. Let’s be honest: A diligent and engaged citizen judges these matters based on the perceived credibility of public figures who affiliate themselves with one view or another. Less engaged citizens, whose views are reflected in polls showing a growing public concern about global warming, are simply registering the prevalence of media mentions of global warming.

In both cases, it may be rational to assume there wouldn’t be so much noise about global warming unless responsible individuals had validated the scientific claims. This is a rational assumption, but not necessarily a reliable one. Politicians adopt views that are popular in order to be popular. Scientists subscribe to theories that later are proved to be wrong. There are “belief” processes at work even in the community of climate researchers.

So how else might an intelligent layperson judge the matter?

Well, he could begin by evaluating the claim that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has increased from 0.028% to 0.036% without necessarily taking the measurements himself. This finding is so straightforward, it’s reasonable to assume it would have been widely debunked if unreliable.

Next, the claim that this should lead to higher temperatures because of the heat-absorbing qualities of the CO₂ molecule. A reasonable person might be tempted to take this finding on faith too, for a different reason: because even ardent believers in global warming accept that this fact alone wouldn’t justify belief in manmade global warming.

That’s because all things are not equal: The climate is a vast, complex and poorly understood system. Scientists must resort to elaborate computer models to address a multiplicity of variables and feedbacks before they can plausibly suggest (choice of verb is deliberate here) that the net effect of increased carbon dioxide is the observed increase in temperature.

By now, a diligent layperson is equipped to doubt any confident assertion that

manmade warming is taking place. Models are not the climate, and may not accurately reflect the workings of the climate, especially when claiming to detect changes that are small and hard to differentiate from natural changes.

Note this doesn't make our conscientious citizen a global warming "denier." It makes him a person who recognizes that the case isn't proved and probably can't be proved with current knowledge.

He's also entitled to turn his attention now to the nonscientific factors affecting public professions of certainty about manmade global warming.

Nobody doubts, for instance, that when Bill Clinton asserts global warming is the greatest threat to mankind, he's consulting not the science but a purported "consensus" of scientists. A layman asks himself: What can "consensus" mean if it asserts a judgment nobody is equipped to confidently make?

Likewise, a study that made news worldwide last month purported to show the death of frogs from warming. It did not show the death of frogs from manmade warming -- the study contributed zero evidence one way or another on a human role in climate change. You would have thought otherwise from the media reports. Ditto Al Gore, who offers a traveling slide show (now a movie) in which he catalogs possible dire consequences of global warming in non sequitur fashion to persuade audiences that climate change is caused by human activity and would yield to human action.

Myanna Lahsen, an anthropologist who spent several years observing and interviewing staff at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, shows in a new paper that even climate modelers themselves, who appreciate better than anyone the limits of their work, nonetheless slip into unwarranted certainty in public. She quotes one: "It is easy to get caught up in it; you start to believe that what happens in your model must be what happens in the real world. And often that is not true."

Click [here](#) for the full text of the column.

[Return to the top](#) ↑

Extremism on Trial: Criminal Activities Against Medical Research Rising Dramatically; Six Animal Terrorists Await Trial

(Press Advisory from the Foundation for Biomedical Research - excerpt)

February 2, 2006

A report released today by the Foundation for Biomedical Research (FBR) reveals a dramatic increase in the number and severity of attacks by eco and animal extremists in the last 25 years. The report comes as six members of SHAC, a radical animal rights group, await federal trial Feb. 6 on charges relating to a campaign of intimidation and harassment against Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS), a medical research laboratory with its U.S. headquarters in

New Jersey.

“The trend is clear -- the number, severity and scope of these attacks are growing,” said FBR President Frankie L. Trull, who made the report public in light of Monday’s scheduled trial in U.S. District Court in Trenton, N.J. The defendants are all members of a radical animal liberation group, whose goal is to drive Huntingdon Life Sciences out of business. They are facing myriad criminal charges, including conspiracy to terrorize HLS and interstate stalking, all relating to a long and vicious campaign of intimidation and harassment against HLS.

SHAC has organized events against hundreds of companies with ties to HLS including customers, suppliers, bankers, brokers, market makers, insurance providers, janitorial, laundry and courier services. Last year, the New York Stock Exchange capitulated to threats from SHAC and refused to list the HLS parent company on the big board -- only moments before it was scheduled to do so.

Known as “tertiary targeting,” the practice of harassing those that do business with research facilities is at the heart of SHAC’s campaign and a chief cause for the dramatic rise in dangerous and destructive attacks. . . .

[Return to the top](#) 

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

The New York Post

Green Goons & ‘Rights’ Loons

January 28, 2006

So, will the American Civil Liberties Union apologize to the FBI?

Just last month, the ACLU screamed bloody murder that the FBI was “using counterterrorism resources to monitor and infiltrate domestic political organizations, despite a lack of evidence that the groups are engaging in or supporting violent action.”

What will they say now - following a 65-count federal indictment of 11 members of the radical “environmental” groups, Earth Liberation Front and Animal Liberation Front? ...

Their fellow travelers doubtless will say that, indictments aside, the FBI’s surveillance of groups such as PETA or Greenpeace were unwarranted because they haven’t engaged in violent behavior.

Any political movement can have extremists - but both PETA and Greenpeace have themselves engaged in behavior that crosses the line.

Greenpeace’s attempts over the years to physically block whaling and nuclear

testing has gotten it placed on various European nations' terrorist lists.

PETA has contributed money to ELF/ALF and refuses to condemn their eco-terrorist tactics.

Just three years ago - after a donkey loaded with explosives was used on an unsuccessful attack - PETA head Ingrid Newkirk wrote to Yasser Arafat, urging the Palestinian Authority not to use animals to kill Israelis. Note that she didn't condemn the attacks against Israeli civilians, explaining, "It is not my business to inject myself into human wars."

As FBI Director Robert Mueller said recently: "Terrorism is terrorism."

None can be tolerated.

It's good that the feds moved against ELF now - before someone dies.

It's also a good thing that the FBI is keeping an eye on some of the other environmental domestic groups.

And, no, we're not expecting the ACLU to be offering an apology anytime soon.

Click [here](#) for the full text of the editorial (online registration required)

Bill Holbrook, Communications Director
Matt Dempsey, Deputy Press Secretary