

“Earth Not on Fire”



The Threat Posed by the EPA’s CO2 Endangerment Finding on the Individual and the Economy



June 2010

“Earth Not on Fire”

The Threat Posed by the EPA’s CO2 Endangerment Finding on the Individual and the Economy

Summary

Americans for Limited Government has undertaken an analysis of some of the implications of the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) carbon dioxide endangerment finding, which Senator Lisa Murkowski’s resolution would overturn.

S.J. Res. 26 would:

- Repeal the EPA’s endangerment finding against carbon dioxide.

The EPA’s Endangerment finding:

- Provides the foundation for the EPA to regulate, restrict, and eventually prohibit emissions of carbon dioxide by motor vehicles, industry, and even the air people exhale.
- Disregards the downward trend in global temperatures despite increases in carbon emissions.
- Ignores the failed projections of increased temperatures by the International Panel on Climate Change and other proponents of the man-made global warming hypothesis.
- Overlooks the impact of the Climategate scandal where it was revealed that global temperature data was manipulated and exaggerated by climatologists and utilizes data that has now been discredited.
- Understates the impact of significantly restricting carbon emissions on population sustainability and economic growth.

The Air We Breathe: Power to Regulate, Restrict and Prohibit Carbon Emissions

Americans for Limited Government is urging support of Senator Lisa Murkowski’s resolution “Disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the endangerment finding and the cause or contribute findings for greenhouse gases under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act” that would overturn the EPA’s recent carbon dioxide endangerment finding.

On December 7th, 2009, [the Environmental Protection Agency \(EPA\) issued its now-infamous endangerment finding against carbon dioxide as an air pollutant](#)¹, stating that its concentration in the atmosphere “threaten[s] the public health and welfare of current and future generations” based on erroneous findings that it will result in increased heat waves, more-intense hurricanes, floods, storm surges, rising sea levels, erosion, wildfires, drought, allergens and pathogens. The EPA also predicts the displacement of indigenous populations, the eventual decrease of food production and agriculture, and the reduction of forest productivity.

These alarmist prophecies form the foundation of the EPA’s endangerment finding. However, the science underpinning man-made global warming has of late come under increasing scrutiny and disrepute, calling into question the catastrophic predictions of the EPA. New light has recently been shed on the mistaken projections by climate scientists of increased temperatures, despite increased carbon emissions from the burning of fossil fuels.

[According to a paper compiled by Dr. Alan Carlin](#)², a PhD economist in EPA’s Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, the EPA’s “Technical Support Document for Endangerment Analysis for Greenhouse Gas Emissions under the Clean Air Act” (TSD) uses data that is out-of-date and ignores the decade-long decline in the earth’s temperature despite CO2 levels rising and CO2 emissions accelerating.

The EPA’s official findings, writes Carlin, are based largely on the International Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) AR4 report published in 2007. That report’s data, according to Carlin, “is at best three years out of date in a rapidly changing field.”

Carlin writes that the “IPCC [UN International Panel on Climate Change] projections for large increases [in temperature] are looking increasingly doubtful” in light of “recent substantial decreases in global temperatures”. According to Carlin, “Global temperatures have decline—extending the current downtrend to 11 years with a particularly rapid decline in 1907-8... At the same time atmospheric carbon dioxide levels have continued to increase and carbon dioxide emissions have accelerated.” Carlin also notes that the EPA and the IPCC ignore the role that solar variability plays in global temperature trends, citing research by Scafetta and West suggesting that “solar variability could account for up to 68% of the increase in Earth’s global temperatures.”

Unfortunately, Carlin’s paper was suppressed by the EPA, and had no impact upon the finding by the agency. [According to disclosed emails received by Carlin from his supervisor, National Center for Environmental Economics Director Al McGartland](#)³, Carlin was discouraged from submitting his comments to the agency. One email stated: “The [EPA] administrator and the administration has decided to move forward on endangerment, and your comments do not help the legal or policy case for this decision.” This insular attitude is endemic throughout the EPA’s finding, and clearly biases its findings.

A similar study critical of man-made global warming hypothesis from APS Physics, [“Climate Sensitivity Revisited,”](#)⁴ by Viscount Christopher Monckton also discredits the justification for capping carbon emissions. The Monckton study, which Dr. Carlin cites, proves that the UN International Panel on

¹ http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment/downloads/Federal_Register-EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0171-Dec.15-09.pdf

² <http://www.getliberty.org/files/Hidden%20EPA%20Report.pdf>

³ <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/06/29/sen-inhofe-calls-inquiry-suppressed-climate-change-report/?test=latestnews>

⁴ <http://www.aps.org/units/fps/newsletters/200807/monckton.cfm>

Climate Change's computer models greatly overstate the impact of carbon emissions on global temperatures.

In short, the whole hypothesis is not even based on actual observable data that can be confirmed. Yet, the American people are supposed to accept the EPA's carbon dioxide endangerment finding without any further examination of the phenomenon.

Moreover, increasing evidence has emerged via the [Climategate scandal that temperature modeling done on behalf of the IPCC has been doctored by those entrusted with providing impartial, scientific analysis of the data](#)⁵, which may have been manipulated by those seeking to exaggerate the impact of climate change. IPCC climate scientists also coordinated to suppress the publication of articles critical of the man-made global warming hypothesis in scientific journals.

Research by the American Thinker's Marc Sheppard reveals that the Climatic Research Unit of the University of East Anglia has [used sophisticated statistical software coding to manipulate their global temperature dataset](#)⁶: “[T]here are hundreds of IDL and FORTRAN source files buried in dozens of subordinate sub-folders... [Many] fall into the precarious range between highly questionable (removing MXD [maximum latewood density, the growth parameter commonly utilized by CRU scientists as a temperature proxy] data which demonstrate poor correlations with local temperature) to downright fraudulent (replacing MXD data entirely with measured data to reverse a disorderly trend-line)...”

Some programmers even attached warning notes about the data to the plotting programs. One reads: “The data after 1960 should not be used. The tree-ring density records tend to show a decline after 1960 relative to the summer temperature in many high-latitude locations. In this data set this ‘decline’ has been artificially removed in an ad-hoc way, and this means that data after 1960 no longer represent tree-ring density variations, but have been modified to look more like the observed temperatures.”

Sheppard rightly notes that “If a divergence exists between measured temperatures and those derived from dendrochronological data after (circa) 1960, then discarding only the post-1960 figures is disingenuous, to say the least. The very existence of a divergence betrays a potential serious flaw in the process by which temperatures are reconstructed from tree-ring density. If it's bogus beyond a set threshold, then any honest man of science would instinctively question its integrity prior to that boundary. And only the lowliest would apply a hack in order to produce a desired result.”

Indeed, that appears to be precisely what happened, wherein data was manipulated to show upward trends attributable to causes by humanity that are now being used to justify radical changes in economic and energy policy.

Although the EPA assures the public that “These findings do not themselves impose any requirements on industry or other entities” it is clear that the finding will most certainly become the foundation for the agency to regulate, restrict, and eventually prohibit emissions of carbon dioxide by motor vehicles and industry, and indeed, the very air we all exhale. In addition to being one of the primary emissions from the burning of fossil fuels, the fermentation of sugar, and other economic purposes, carbon dioxide is a natural, biological gas necessary for the existence of life on Earth.

⁵ <http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/Monckton-Caught%20Green-Handed%20Climategate%20Scandal.pdf>

⁶ http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/11/crus_source_code_climategate_r.html

To grant the EPA the power to restrict and reduce carbon dioxide is to enable it to restrict and reduce life itself.

Similarly, carbon emissions from the burning of fossil fuels, including petroleum, gasoline, diesel fuel, and coal, are necessary output for a modern industrial society to thrive. Without it, transportation of individuals, goods, and services throughout the nation — and around the world — would be crippled. Without it, hot water would not be widely available, nor would home-heating during the winter and air conditioning during the summer. Modern conveniences that the American people have come to take for granted would be severely restricted, their standard of living necessarily reduced, and the economic consequences predictably devastating.

In the least, the restriction of fossil fuels will necessarily result in price increases for energy across-the-board, hitting low- and middle-income Americans the hardest. As was seen in 2008 when oil reached nearly \$150/barrel, this can have a tremendous negative impact upon the U.S. economy.

As the population explosion of the past 200 years is entirely owed to the industrial revolution, the necessary consequence of reversing the sustainability of the current population based upon energy output and its implications on food production, medical advancement, and economic growth would be a significant decrease in the human population.

Therefore, the EPA's finding represents a dramatic reversal in the advancement of humanity from a small population to a thriving species of more than 6 billion, and itself constitutes a danger to humanity. The necessary outcome if the policies advocated by the EPA's finding are implemented — which will restrict the use of energy necessary to sustain the population — will be commensurate declines in population sustainability and economic growth.