

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 19 - Issue 3

March 2013

Real sustainability *versus* activist sustainability

Activist sustainability concepts don't meet environmental, humanitarian or sustainability tests

By Paul Driessen

Companies everywhere extol their sustainable development programs and goals. Sustainability drives UN programs like Agenda 21, EU and US green energy initiatives, and myriad manufacturing, agricultural, forestry and other efforts. But what is sustainability? What is – or isn't – sustainable?

Former Prime Minister of Norway Gro Harlem Brundtland said sustainability means we may develop ... and meet the needs of *current* generations ... only to the extent that doing so “will not compromise the ability of *future* generations to meet *their* needs.”

At first blush, that sounds logical, perhaps even ethical. But on closer examination, it is neither. It's right out of Alice's encounter with an anthropomorphic egg in Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking-Glass*.

“When I use a word,” Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, “it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less.”

“The question is,” said Alice, “whether you can make words mean so many different things.” “The question is,” Humpty Dumpty replied, “who is to be master. That's all.”

Obama presidential science advisor John Holdren has said we cannot talk about sustainability without talking about politics, power and control. That troubling reality is at the core of growing debates about Washington, DC central power versus state federalism, individual rights and liberties, United Nations and European Union attempts to

make decisions for sovereign nations, and the growing power and influence of activist nongovernmental organizations on energy, environmental, economic and other matters.

Because those who define the terms of debate increasingly determine public policies, they also determine who is to be master: those who must live with the consequences of their personal choices, or unaccountable mandarins who impose policies, regulations, decisions and consequences on others.

Putting that vital discussion aside for another day, one can discern three kinds of sustainability.

The public relations variety promotes corporate images and inspires flattering ads and press releases, but is largely devoid of real substance. A favorite example is a consulting company's annual sustainability report, which boasted of having reduced the number of – paper cuts among employees.

Real sustainability seeks constantly improving technologies and practices: conserve energy, be more efficient, cut costs, to keep companies profitable and employees employed; tune up cars, keep tires inflated, and improve traffic light sequencing, to move traffic along, increase gas mileage and reduce pollution; use high yield farming to get the most crops per acre, reduce water use and improve nutrition.

This is *tikun olam* (repair of the world); the precept that you are not obligated to complete the task, but neither are you free to abandon it; the Boy Scout prescription that we must leave our world better than we found it; the Judeo-Christian principle of

Continued to Page 2

Real sustainability *Continued from Page 1*

stewardship of creation: or Robert Kennedy's declaration: I dream things that never were and say, Why not?

This brings us back to sustainability *à la* Gro Brundtland, the UN, Rio+20 and environmental activists: We may meet the needs of *current* generations only to the extent that doing so "will not compromise the ability of *future* generations to meet *their* needs." The concept is inherently unworkable and inequitable.

No one predicted, certainly not years in advance, that the Hearthstone House in Appleton, Wisconsin would suddenly be lit with hydroelectric power, or that electricity would safeguard and enhance our lives and economy in the numerous ways it does today. No one foresaw widespread natural gas use for electricity generation and home heating, ubiquitous laptop computers, flash drives, fiber optic cables replacing copper, or little mobile phones with far more power than a 1990 desktop computer.

Today, the pace of technological change has become mind-numbing. And yet, under sustainability dogma, we are supposed to predict *future* technologies – and ensure that today's development activities will somehow not compromise those technologies' unpredictable energy and raw material requirements.

Sustainability dogma also demands that we base policy decisions on knowing how many years energy, metal or other resource deposits will last, and to determine whether developing and using them will be sustainable. But what if new technologies let us find and develop new deposits, or make existing deposits last decades or centuries longer: 3-D and HD seismic, deepwater drilling and production, instant metallic mineral analysis gear in a backpack, or horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, for instance? How long must those *expanded* reserves last, before using *them*

won't be sustainable? And who decides?

How can politicians, regulators and environmental activists decree that oil and gas are not sustainable – even as seismic, fracking, drilling and other technologies unlock a century of new deposits? And then insist that corn ethanol *is* sustainable, even though this year's US ethanol quota requires 40% of our corn crop, on an area the size of Iowa, billions of gallons of water, huge quantities of hydrocarbon-based pesticides, fertilizers and tractor fuel, vast amounts of natural gas to run the distilleries, and perpetual subsidies ... to produce a fuel that drives up food prices and gets one-third less mileage per gallon than gasoline?

How can they decree that wind energy is sustainable, despite killing millions of birds and bats every year?

How is it sustainable, ethical or "environmental justice" for the United States to use so many of the world's oil, gas, rare earth, platinum, gold and other resources – because we refuse to allow exploration and development of our own vast energy, metallic and other deposits right here in the United States?

How is it ethical to safeguard the needs of future generations, even if it means ignoring or compromising the needs of *current* generations – including the needs, aspirations, health and welfare of the most impoverished, energy-deprived, malnourished, politically powerless people on Earth? How much longer must 700 million Africans, 400 million Indians and another 300 million people in other countries continue to live without electricity and all its countless blessings, because eco-activists obsess about global warming, insist on wind and solar, and oppose coal, gas, nuclear and hydroelectric power plants?

How long must billions of people remain destitute, diseased and malnourished, because environmental activists and UN

Continued to Page 7

DeWeese Report

Vol. 19, No. 3
March 2013

Published by
The American Policy
Center

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/
Fulfillment
Lola Jane Craig
Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout
CJ Scrofani
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report
PO Box 129
Remington, VA
22734

Web Page:
www.deweese-report.com

Copy Right
2013 The American
Policy Center
Issn 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

Permission to photocopy,
Reprint and quote articles
from the DeWeese Report
is
hereby granted, provided
full acknowledgment is
included. All reprinted
articles must say:
"Written
by Tom DeWeese, Editor
of DeWeese Report
(unless
another author is listed).
All reprints must carry the
DeWeese Report address
and phone number.
Samples of the reprint
must be provided to the
DeWeese Report

Obama fails climate science in his State of the Union address -- Climate Depot's point-by-point rebuttal to the President's global warming claims

Disputing Obama's State of the Union quotes with real facts from real scientists, Marc Morano, head of Climate Depot.com, and a one man wrecking crew on the lie of Global Warming, clearly shows that Barack Obama is scare-mongering to push through his dangerous "climate change" policy that will destroy the American economy. Obviously, facts are getting in Obama's way.

QUOTES

By Marc Morano – Climate Depot

QUOTES

The President offered up nothing more than the usual incorrect global warming platitudes during his speech. No wonder the speech brought a "smile" to Al Gore's face. The president could not have been more wrong in claiming "extreme weather" was "now more frequent and intense" and he failed to note that global temperatures have not increased in 16 years.

Climate Depot's Point-by-Point rebuttal:

President Obama: *'But for the sake of our children and our future, we must do more to combat climate change'*

Climate Depot Reaction: Our children do not need politicians in Washington posturing and pretending they can control global temperatures and make storms less severe or less frequent. Climatologist Dr. Tim Ball: *'Future generations will curse why we allowed a few political bullies to undermine development & progress with the false claim that human CO2 is causing climate change' Future generations 'will wonder how people could write such misinformed, hysterical, commentary.'*

MIT's Dr. Lindzen: *'Future generations will wonder in bemused amazement that the early 21st century's developed world went into hysterical panic over a globally averaged temperature increase of a few tenths of a degree, and, on the basis of gross exaggerations of highly uncertain computer projections combined into implausible chains of inference, proceeded to contemplate a roll-back of the industrial age.'*

President Obama: *'Yes, it's true that no single event makes a trend. But the fact is, the 12 hottest years on record have all come in the last 15'*

Climate Depot Response: Obama is ignoring the climate elephant in the room. Global temperatures have essentially been flat lining for 16 years now. The halt in global temperatures has shown up in multiple data sets and peer-reviewed literature.

Trying to cite "hottest year" claims as "proof" of man-made global warming is preposterous when you consider that such claims are purely political. -- Even NASA's

Hansen admits *'hottest year' claims are 'not particularly important'*.

Top Swedish Climate Scientist Dr. Lennart Bengtsson Says Warming Not Noticeable: *'The warming we have had last a 100 years is so small that if we didn't have climatologists to measure it we wouldn't have noticed it at all.'*

What about Obama's claim of "hottest decade"? German Climate Professor Werner Kirstein Slams 'Climate Religion': Refutes claims of 'hottest decade' as 'a joke' -- *'Determining a global avg. is a tricky business and in the end is only a theoretical value'*

President Obama: *'Heat waves, droughts, wildfires, and floods – all are now more frequent and intense'*

Climate Depot Response: Sorry Mr. President, you are not entitled to your own set of facts. Meteorologist Dr. Ryan Maue: *'Are climate scientists bothered that President's speech on 'extreme weather' climate change doesn't jive with the last IPCC SREX report?'*

Drought: Study: Drought Trends, Estimates Possibly Overstated Due To Inaccurate Science – Journal Nature study 'suggests that there has been little change in drought over the past 60 years' -- *'The major 2012 drought obscures the fact that U.S. has seen a decline in drought over past century'*

Floods: Prof. Pielke Jr. : *'Are US Floods Increasing? The Answer is Still No' -- 'A new paper out today shows flooding has not increased in U.S. over records of 85 to 127 years'*

Continued to Page 6

News from the Center on Consumer Freedom

National Soft Drink Prohibition Proposed

Today, food police from the Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI) and potato scaremonger Walter Willett introduced a proposal that would ban every regular soft drink in existence, whether it is a soda, a sweet tea, a lemonade, or a sweetened fruit drink. CSPI claims that sugar and high fructose corn syrup, two nutritively equivalent sweeteners used in soft drinks, should be struck from the list of ingredients Generally Recognized as Safe.

If struck from the list, federal government regulators would dictate how sugar could be used in soft drinks and other foods. CSPI proposes a limit that would prohibit today's regular sodas. If you thought we were being unfair by claiming that food police activists wanted soda Prohibition, we told you so.

Unlike the Anti-Saloon League, which at least had the decency to use normal democratic processes to pass alcohol Prohibition, CSPI prefers to petition regulators—in this case the Food and Drug Administration.

That aside, the proposal is lunacy for several reasons. First, government data show that beverages provide only seven percent of the calories in the average American diet, demonstrating that CSPI's attack on soda is arbitrary. In fact, people — including children, according to a Centers for Disease Control report — get more added sugars, supposedly the biggest demon, from foods than they do from beverages. (Strike two for CSPI's misguided crusade.) And consumption of added sugars is in decline. Beverage companies have responded to consumers' health concerns by offering a wider selection of drinks.

That's not enough for CSPI, which still labels zero-calorie sweeteners as “avoid” ingredients in its Chemical Cuisine report. The Prohibitionist then, and the soda Prohibitionist today, has but one ham-handed solution: Prohibition, come hell or high (sweetened) water. ●

Cupcake Cops Crash Camden

MeMe Roth, paging your office: The Junior Anti-Sweets Leagues are assembling in Camden, New Jersey. The local Board of Education decided to ban all bake sales in schools in the city. One activist who supported the measure said, “The cheesecakes and pizza, we want them to get away from that.” (Life without cheesecake would probably be about as worth living as life without bacon. Anti-food activists want that, too.)

This continues a tradition among America's food police. Recently, Massachusetts proposed a ban and provoked an outcry that forced the governor to retract the proposal. Texas's one-time self-appointed “food czarina” Susan Combs saw her cupcake prohibition shot down by the legislature after wide-scale outrage and evasion an Austin American-Statesman reporter memorably billed “Willy-Wonka-Meets-Casablanca.”

Of course, these intrusions into longstanding celebratory traditions won't change obesity. A recent study found that “weight gain has nothing to do with the candy, soda, chips, and other junk food they can purchase at school.”

So, Camden's new ban won't slim its children, but it will make people angry. When schools in suburbs of the nation's capital enacted treat bans, one parent responded by making cupcakes at home “for the first time in her life.” Ineffectiveness and outrageousness: It's practically a food activist “secret recipe.”

10 Reasons to Avoid Regional Plans

By John Anthony
Sustainable Freedom Lab

Planning is not a one-size-fits-all exercise. Yet, that is exactly what regional plans attempt, while gradually silencing local officials and the public.

Here are 10 reasons to avoid implementing regional plans and councils. Cleaner Greener NY [1], also called the Capital Region Sustainability Plan [2], is a model of why community members and local public officials must work together and say “NO” to regionalization and regional planning.

See how many apply to your region’s proposal.

1. Planners gain miniscule community participation when forming the regions, the plans or the councils

There over 1 million residents in the proposed Capital Region Sustainability Plan (CRSP). Despite claims of “stakeholder engagement” (CRSP p26), less than 300 participated in planners’ workshops. In CRSP surveys, only 96 people, or less than .0001 percent of residents participated. (CRSP Appendix 16, p11)

2. Plans are prepackaged and do not represent unique community needs.

In spite of claims to the contrary, most plans encompass the same government sponsored top-down “livability” control features. CRSP includes the same “livable communities” (p99), fewer vehicle miles traveled (p128), and increased compact living (p105) as most regional plans. Cleaner Greener NY (CGNY) further promises the government and non-governmental organization pushed (NGO) standbys of virtually every plan: confiscation of open spaces (p75), forced environmental justice (p58), hi-speed rails (p63), and dilution of privately controlled farmland interests through conservation easements (p90).

3. Plans do not protect individual property rights.

Few regional plans mention the potential individual property rights infringements, tax increases or loss of potential wealth accumulation inherent in most proposals. None offers any method for protection against such losses. The CRSP contains no enforceable landowner protections.

4. Plans fail to protect communities against onerous regulations passed by regional councils.

Once installed, regional councils or consortiums, have immense power to pass regulations with minimal or no local input. The CRSP offers a seat for council representatives. However, having a community representative sitting on a larger multi-county consortium is not the same as making planning decisions with local citizens and local public officials working together in your hometown. (CRSP p8)

5. Plans rely on questionable “experts” for critical advice.

The CRSP relies on the Apollo Alliance for assurances there will be green jobs, which are fundamental to the plan’s success. Yet, Apollo advised on the ‘stimulus program’ assuring there would be shovel ready and green jobs if passed. A year later, we learned Apollo exaggerated the job potential. (CGNY p40, p44)

6. Plans release questionable or incomplete statistics, which create false impressions.

In the case of Cleaner, Greener NY, the plan optimistically depends on green jobs, stating the US had a 9.1% increase in these between 1998 and 2007. The authors omitted that NY actually lost 1.9% of their green jobs during that same period. They also failed to notify community members that Congressional hearings cast serious doubt on the permanency, quality or even existence of the green jobs claimed. (CGNY p37)

Continued to page 7

All Of The World's Deadliest Floods Occurred With CO2 Well Below 350 PPM -- *'We know that hurricanes have declined, tornadoes have declined, floods have declined, and droughts have declined. That is why history has been redefined to start in the 1970s'*

Heatwaves: EPA Say Heatwaves Much Worse in 1930's: *'Heat waves occurred with high frequency in the 1930s, and these remain the most severe heat waves in the U.S. historical record':*

'According to USHCN (U.S. Historical Climatology Network) temperature records, the 1930s holds a wide lead for all-time daily record maximums in the U.S. There is zero evidence that 'climate change' has increased the probability of setting temperature records'

40% Of U.S. All-Time Record Maximums Were Set During The 1930s

Wildfires: *'Wildfire numbers since 1950 have decreased globally by 15%' -- 'According to the National Academy of Sciences, they will likely continue to decline until around midcentury'*

New paper finds wildfires in the western US are at the lowest levels in 3,000 years: *'Finds current fire activity is at the lowest levels of the entire 3,000 year record'*

President Obama: *'We can choose to believe that Superstorm Sandy, and the most severe drought in decades, and the worst wildfires some states have ever seen were all just a freak coincidence. Or we can choose to believe in the overwhelming judgment of science – and act before it's too late.'*

Climate Depot Response: Superstorm Sandy linked to man-made global warming?! Please Mr. President, read up on science before you embarrass yourself. See: Prof. Roger Pielke Jr.: *'Remarkably, the U.S. is currently experiencing the longest-ever recorded period with no strikes of a Category 3 or stronger hurricane'* “Sandy was terrible, but we're currently in a relative hurricane 'drought',” Pielke Jr. explained..

The scientific data does not support claims that Sandy was a “new normal.” Hurricane Facts: *'According to NOAA, they have been on decline in US since the beginning of records in 19th century. The worst decade for major (category 3,4,5) hurricanes was 1940s'*

Scientist Martin Hoerling of NOAA on Sandy: *'As to underlying causes, neither the frequency of tropical or extratropical cyclones over N. Atlantic are projected to appreciably change due to climate change'*

Prof. Richard Muller: *'Hurricanes are not increasing due to human causes (actually, they have been decreasing over past 250 years).'*

New Report: 'Extreme Weather Report 2012': *'Latest peer-reviewed studies, data & analyses undermine claims that current weather is 'unprecedented' or a 'new normal' –*

Deaths from 'extreme weather' at their lowest since 1900

The Decline in Deaths from Extreme Weather, 1900–2010: *'Aggregate mortality attributed to all extreme weather events globally has declined by more than 90% since the 1920s' -- '...In spite of a four-fold rise in population and much more complete reporting of such events. The aggregate mortality rate declined by 98%'*

'A study published in 2011 in Geophysical Research Letters on causes of the 2010 Russian heat wave deduced that it 'was due to internal atmospheric dynamical processes' -- Paging Al Gore: Peer-reviewed Study: 'It is unlikely that the warming attributable to increasing greenhouse gas concentrations contributed significantly to the magnitude of the [Russian] heat wave'

President Obama: *'Or we can choose to believe in the overwhelming judgment of science – and act before it's too late.'*

Climate Depot Response: *'Act before it's too late' to stop storms?! See: Prof. Roger Pielke Jr.: 'An argument that mitigation of ghgs makes sense in terms of decreasing the future costs of extreme events is not a strong one' -- 'Even under the assumptions of IPCC, Stern Review, etc. the future costs of extreme events under the most aggressive scenarios of climate change actually decrease as a proportion of GDP'*

The 'overwhelming judgment of science?' SPECIAL REPORT: More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims - Challenge UN IPCC & Gore ●

10 REASONS *Continued from Page 5***7. Promotes community solutions without explaining the potential negative effects.**

The CRSP promotes conservation easements to protect farmland from development without addressing the loss of dominant estate status, potential for plan changes, the downsides of ‘best practices’ and a host of ways in which landowners can lose their property and its value while still technically being the owner. (CGNY p90, p100)

8. Councils open the door for government grants, which often contain restrictive policies to reduce vehicle use while forcing low-income housing and social justice.

The CRSP states that future grant monies will be necessary, but not their source nor stipulations that will be attached. (CRSP p8)

9. Regional councils confiscate much of local officials’ power, leaving the community with less representation.

In the CRSP, 25 local leaders have already diminished their oversight by agreeing to allow Albany to take the lead in all grant processing. To protect constituents, public officials must carefully study all grants and report the implications to their constituents before approval. Grants are the doorway to regulatory control of community members’ lifestyles, activities and residential opportunities. (CRSP p8) In NY, communities are already beginning to pay the price for regionalization before the plan is even approved.

10. Once formed, regional councils are virtually irreversible.

Once officials agree to form a region and council, if community members discover they dislike its regulations, how can they disband the entity and roll back the dictates? There is no provision in the CRSP for its break up or regulatory rollback.

John Anthony, www.sustainablefreedomlab.com

Real Sustainability *Continued from page 2*

bureaucrats don’t like economic development, insecticides or biotechnology, either?

Does anyone suppose human ingenuity, creativity and innovation (what Julian Simon called our ultimate resource) will suddenly stop functioning? Assuming there is no government restriction on or confiscation of our God-given rights to innovate, create, invest and build – will human beings ever stop doing so?

The fundamental problem with UN/activist/EPA “sustainability” is that it is infinitely elastic and malleable. No one can really know what it means, and it’s the perfect weapon in the hands of anti-hydrocarbon, anti-development activists. Whatever they support is sustainable. Whatever they oppose is *unsustainable*.

To the extent that their agendas foster “social justice” and “poverty eradication,” they will do so only in the context of climate protection, biodiversity, green growth, renewable energy, and an end to “unsustainable patterns of consumption and production” – as defined,

evaluated and implemented by UN or EPA-approved scientists, regulators and activists, assisted largely by assumption-laden, agenda-driven computer models.

Worst of all, this UN/activist/EPA version of sustainable development gives unelected regulators increasing control over energy use, economic growth, wealth redistribution, and people’s lives, living standards, health and well-being. And they acquire control without the essential safeguards, checks and balances of robust science, independent courts, democracy, transparency, honesty and accountability.

We should strive to conserve energy, water and other resources, when it makes economic, technological, ecological and ethical sense to do so. We should reduce air and water pollutants that actually endanger human health and welfare. But we cannot afford to let “sustainable development” become yet another justification for ceding still more power to unelected, non-transparent, unaccountable overseers.

*Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (www.CFACT.org) and author of *Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death*. ●*

IRS: Cheapest Obamacare Plan Will Be \$20,000 Per Family

By Matt Cover

(CNSNews.com) – In a final regulation issued Wednesday, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) assumed that under Obamacare the cheapest health insurance plan available in 2016 for a family will cost \$20,000 for the year. Under Obamacare, Americans will be required to buy health insurance or pay a penalty to the IRS.

The IRS's assumption that the cheapest plan for a family will cost \$20,000 per year is found in examples the IRS gives to help people understand how to calculate the penalty they will need to pay the government if they do not buy a mandated health plan. The examples point to families of four and families of five, both of which the IRS expects in its assumptions to pay a minimum of \$20,000 per year for a bronze plan. "The annual national average bronze plan premium for a family of 5 (2 adults, 3 children) is \$20,000," the regulation says.

Bronze will be the lowest tier health-insurance plan available under Obamacare--after Silver, Gold, and Platinum. Under the law, the penalty for not buying health insurance is supposed to be capped at either the annual average Bronze premium, 2.5 percent of taxable income, or \$2,085.00 per family in 2016. In the new final rules published Wednesday, IRS set in law the rules for implementing the penalty Americans must pay if they fail to obey Obamacare's mandate to buy insurance.

To help illustrate these rules, the IRS presented examples of different situations families might find themselves in. In the examples, the IRS assumes that families of five who are uninsured would need to pay an average of \$20,000 per year to purchase a Bronze plan in 2016.

Using the conditions laid out in the regulations, the IRS calculates that a family

earning \$120,000 per year that did not buy insurance would need to pay a "penalty" (a word the IRS still uses despite the Supreme Court ruling that it is in fact a "tax") of \$2,400 in 2016.

For those wondering how clear the IRS's clarifications of this new "penalty" rule are, here is one of the actual examples the IRS gives: "Example 3. Family without minimum essential coverage.

"(i) In 2016, Taxpayers H and J are married and file a joint return. H and J have three children: K, age 21, L, age 15, and M, age 10. No member of the family has minimum essential coverage for any month in 2016. H and J's household income is \$120,000. H and J's applicable filing threshold is \$24,000. The annual national average bronze plan premium for a family of 5 (2 adults, 3 children) is \$20,000.

"(ii) For each month in 2016, under paragraphs (b)(2)(ii) and (b)(2)(iii) of this section, the applicable dollar amount is \$2,780 ($(\$695 \times 3 \text{ adults}) + ((\$695/2) \times 2 \text{ children})$). Under paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this section, the flat dollar amount is \$2,085 (the lesser of \$2,780 and $\$2,085 (\$695 \times 3)$). Under paragraph (b)(3) of this section, the excess income amount is \$2,400 ($(\$120,000 - \$24,000) \times 0.025$). Therefore, under paragraph (b)(1) of this section, the monthly penalty amount is \$200 (the greater of $\$173.75 (\$2,085/12)$ or $\$200 (\$2,400/12)$).

"(iii) The sum of the monthly penalty amounts is \$2,400 ($\200×12). The sum of the monthly national average bronze plan premiums is \$20,000 ($\$20,000/12 \times 12$). Therefore, under paragraph (a) of this section, the shared responsibility payment imposed on H and J for 2016 is \$2,400 (the lesser of \$2,400 or \$20,000)." ●

TYRANNY