



Letters

Summer 2023

Hottest Days Ever? Don't Believe It

by Steve Milloy, Senior Policy Fellow
As Appearing in the *The Wall Street Journal*



Average global temperature' is a meaningless measure, and comparisons to 125,000 years ago are preposterous.

The global-warming industry has declared that July 3 and 4 were the two hottest days on Earth on record. The reported average global temperature on those days was 62.6 degrees Fahrenheit, supposedly the hottest in 125,000 years. The claimed temperature was derived from the University of Maine's Climate Reanalyzer, which relies on a mix of satellite temperature data and computer-model guesstimation to calculate estimates of temperature.

One obvious problem with the updated narrative is that there are no satellite data from 125,000 years ago. Calculated estimates of current temperatures can't be fairly compared with guesses of global temperature from thousands of years ago.

A more likely alternative to

the 62.6-degree estimate is something around 57.5 degrees. The latter is an average of actual surface temperature measurements taken around the world and processed on a minute-by-minute basis by a website called temperature.global. The numbers have been steady this year, with no spike in July.

Moreover, the notion of "average global temperature" is meaningless. Average global temperature is a concept invented by and for the global-warming hypothesis. It is more a political concept than a scientific one. The Earth and its atmosphere is large and diverse, and no place is meaningfully average.

Average global temperature also changes on seasonal basis: Temperatures are higher globally during the Northern Hemisphere's summer because of more sunlight-trapping land. In this case, the Climate Reanalyzer's estimated temperatures in early July were skewed by a heat wave in the Antarctic, where areas may have warmed some Antarctic temperatures by as much as 43 degrees. This is likely the explanation for the difference between the 62.6-degree and 57.5-degree estimates.

Another problem is that our

Continued on Page 6

In This Issue

Why a Tesla costs more than a Model T



Greg Walcher illustrates the impact government mandates have had on the price of cars. A Model T in today's dollars would sell for roughly \$3,500. Good luck buying a car on that budget and Washington is to blame.

Page 2

Normal People Don't Buy the Climate Con



Katy Grimes writes that all the climate lies and "chicken little" predication that never come true have most "normal" people tuning out to the scare of the day.

Page 3

Fixing the climate by banning things



Greg Walcher dives into the latest climate absurdity and that a call for a ban on pizza ovens in New York City.

Page 4

15 Groups Demand Energy Sec. Resignation



E&E Legal joined 14 other free-market organizations in calling for the ethically-challenged Energy Secretary Jennifer Granholm, resignation in a letter to Biden.

Page 5

Bad Government Real Cause for Maui Fires



Steve Milloy points out that the Maui Fires weren't the cause of climate change...just good old fashioned government incompetence from top to bottom.

Page 6

Why a Tesla costs more than a Model T

by Greg Walcher, Senior Policy Fellow
As appearing in *The Daily Sentinel*



Henry Ford's use of a moving assembly line finally made it possible for average working Americans to own cars.

Automobiles were toys for the rich, but in 1920 Ford lowered the price of a new Model T to \$260, about \$3,500 in current dollars. Try buying a new car today for \$3,500.

What caused the price of cars to skyrocket, far beyond the rate of inflation? Other consumer products have not similarly spiked. In 1920 a new radio, the latest consumer craze, cost about \$150. Cumulative inflation since then has been 1,425%, so that radio should now cost \$2,288. But Amazon sells new radios with better sound for \$30. In 1950 a new 14-inch TV, the new fad, cost \$160, more than \$2,000 in 2023 dollars. Yet Best Buy sells a 43-inch TV for only \$270.

Scores of consumer products have gone down in real dollars as technology improved, while the price of cars has gone through the roof. Even though Ford upgraded to the latest technology with its Model A, by 1930 the car still sold for \$650, less than half the average Americans' annual income. Adjusted for inflation, such an everyday car would now cost \$11,875. But Kelley Blue Book shows the average car today sells for \$49,388 — a 7,600% increase. And the government is hell-bent on forcing everyone to switch to electric vehicles, which now average \$66,000 — more than the average American's total annual income.

A recent MotorTrend article,

"We can live with the government's push for electric cars," began by asserting that car buyers survived earlier mandates.

"Back in the early 1970s, MotorTrend spilled a lot of ink railing against federally mandated emissions and fuel economy standards. We argued government mandates would drive up car prices..." Apparently, we're supposed to chuckle at silly 1970s thinking, but it wasn't silly — it is exactly what happened.

Government mandates are the primary reason car prices spiked so sharply compared to other products. Most mandates were safety-related, beginning in the 1960s when the Department of Transportation began requiring seat belts, padded dashboards, safety glass, head rests and collapsible steering columns. Later mandates focused on car body and chassis design. Automakers added entire divisions of safety engineers, accountants, and report writers as governments regulated everything from crash test dummy design to years-long testing requirements. More recent mandates required disc brakes, electronic stability control systems, tire inflation monitoring and backup cameras. Anti-drunk driving technology is now required, starting in 2026.

All those mandates increased the cost of making cars, but they pale in comparison to emission requirements that started with EPA in 1970. The agency began by banning leaded gasoline, requiring a complete redesign of decades-old engine technology. California's catalytic converter requirement soon became national policy, and EPA has since added requirements for computer technology, fuel injection, exhaust systems, onboard diagnostics and much more. EPA itself estimates that emission equipment manufacturing now employs 65,000 people and sells over

\$26 billion annually. That has resulted in major declines in auto fatalities since the 1960s, and especially the incredible achievement in cleaning up air pollution since the 1970s. But don't be under any delusion about why car prices are so much higher these days.

Nor is there any relief in sight. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration now proposes stricter emission standards, this time not to reduce auto emissions, but to eliminate them. The new regulations would require a "2% per year improvement in fuel efficiency for passenger cars, and a 4% per year improvement for light trucks... reaching an average fleet fuel economy of 58 miles per gallon by 2032." A Heritage Foundation analysis concludes that the mandate would increase average car prices by another \$7,200 per vehicle. Even then, that gas mileage goal isn't possible with existing gasoline engines, as the agency's own chief, Ann Carlson, admits — but that isn't her real objective, anyway. The goal is to require a nationwide conversion to electric vehicles.

That's about neither safety nor pollution. It's about fundamental transformation of the American economy — not the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's job. Before her current appointment, as a UCLA professor, Carlson helped lead the California plan to ban gas-powered vehicles. She said it is "impossible" to achieve climate goals without "moving away from the internal combustion engine."

That's more than what her agency disingenuously calls "updating fuel economy standards." It is a plan to make electric vehicles mandatory, and the cost of driving — for the first time since Henry Ford — prohibitive for average working Americans. □

Climate Change Con isn't Resonating with Normal People

by Katie Grimes, Senior Media Fellow
As Appearing in the *California Globe*



Eco-guilt is a first-world luxury'

"Anthropogenic global warming is the biggest, most dangerous and ruinously expensive con trick in history."

Remember when climate hysterics claimed "the science is settled?" That claim didn't weather well, but it also didn't stop the climate liars: "The scientific consensus that humans are altering the climate has passed 99.9%, according to research that strengthens the case for global action at the Cop26 summit in Glasgow," the Guardian reported in 2021. The Cornell University climate study the Guardian cites in the article was "supported" (funded) by Alliance for Science. "Support for the Alliance for Science is provided by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation."

But the hysterics just moved on from that lie to other climate lies.

A little over a year ago, California Governor Gavin Newsom announced his pompous plan for addressing "California's hotter, drier future:"

"Hotter and drier weather conditions spurred by climate change could reduce California's water supply by up to 10 percent by the year 2040. To replace and replenish what we will lose to thirstier soils, vegetation, and the atmosphere, Governor Gavin Newsom has announced California's latest actions to increase water supply and adapt to more extreme weather patterns caused by climate change."

Think about that arrogant statement – as if California politicians are going to stop hot weather. But the joke was on the governor with record rainfall and snowfall in the winter of

2023... except that didn't stop him. Since then, we've been barraged with absurd radio advertisements warning us, "now that we face a hotter, dryer future..." and "let's make conservation a way of life," providing helpful hints about saving water.

Enjoy the water-saving brilliance, brought to you by the Drought.CA.gov website:

- If it's raining, turn off your sprinklers
- Take 5-minute showers
- Fill bathtubs halfway or less
- Turn off water when brushing teeth or shaving
- Wash full loads of clothes and dishes
- Fix leaks
- Set mower blades to 3"
- Use a broom to clean outdoor areas
- Improve landscape irrigation

Taxpayers paid for this babble. With the state sending 50% of the water to the Pacific Ocean for environmental purposes, of the remaining 50%, 40% goes to agriculture, and 10% is urban use. Setting your mower blade to 3" isn't going to make a measurable amount of water conservation.

And, as we heard this week, PG&E will be shutting off the power when it is windy. Never in California's history have energy providers shut off power when it was windy. This is a new policy, and is criminal – we are paying for that electricity. Who will be the first to sue over this?

According to the governor, "California's Water Supply Strategy, Adapting to a Hotter, Drier Future calls for investing in new sources of water supply, accelerating projects and modernizing how the state manages water through new technology."

Refuting this drivel isn't hard.

One way is to read the monthly reports by E&E Legal, the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI), the Heartland Institute, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), the

International Climate Science Coalition (ICSC), and Truth in Energy and Climate, which just released another version of "Climate Fact Check," for July.

"Climate Fact Check: July 2023 Edition highlights sensationalized stories about the climate, which is typical for the corporate media propaganda machine, although not rooted in reality."

"The media is calling July 2023 the 'hottest month on record' and even the 'hottest month in the history of civilization.' Keeping in mind that July is typically the warmest month of every year, NASA satellite data indicate that July 2023 was the warmest July in the satellite record. But that record only dates back to 1979 and there certainly were Julys before 1979."

This is Very interesting:

"Recalling that average global temperature is on the order of 58°F, use of the term "hottest" is obviously quite an exaggeration. Finally, the notion of "average global temperature" is not really meaningful in the first place. It has no physical reality, and its component satellite and surface station temperature measurements lack precision to a significant degree..."

As for "emissions causing hotter oceans," the Fact Check is delicious and easy – talk to a real meteorologist: "No one knows why various parts of the oceans were so much warmer this year, but one factor can be ruled out – emissions. Not only does it remain unproven that emissions measurably warm the atmosphere, even if they could, the atmosphere can only warm the top one or two millimeters of the ocean, per meteorologist Joe Bastardi."

And no, extreme heat is not killing more people. The scientists confirm that "it is well established that cold weather kills many more people than hot weather."

In a 2009 interview at the Spectator, James Delingpole talked to Professor Ian Plimer, the Australian geologist who dispelled much of the nonsense:

Continued on Page 5

Fixing the climate by banning things

by Greg Walcher, Senior Policy Fellow
As appearing in *The Daily Sentinel*



I've been waiting since May for the media feeding frenzy I assumed would develop, when the Biden administration announced new rules to further restrict home dishwashers.

There has been a deafening silence about it, though, maybe because such overreach no longer astonishes anyone. Or as Sen. Bill Armstrong often said, "The only thing shocking about this is that no one is shocked."

Instead, the feeding frenzy has been directed at New York City officials for their plan that would put hundreds of pizza restaurants out of business. The new ordinance will require pizzerias with wood and coal burning ovens built before 2016 to install equipment to capture 75% of their carbon emissions. The cost of doing so is prohibitive for most small businesses, so most say they will simply close. They could convert to electricity, but that would defeat the purpose, since New York's electricity comes from burning gas and coal.

There is evidence that variations of pizza were prepared in Italy as early as ancient Pompeii before the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in AD 79. But the American version we recognize was created by Italian immigrants in New York. It is so iconic that it is commonly known as "New York-style" pizza, as opposed to the deep dish "Chicago-style." New

York pizza is said to have originated in 1905 at Lombardi's, 32 Spring Street in New York's "Little Italy." It's still there, enormously popular, and like dozens of others, in danger of being shuttered because of its historic coal-burning pizza ovens.

You can well imagine how upset many New Yorkers are, along with myriad tourists who make such places so popular it's hard to get a table. Lots of writers have piled on, one describing the "climate pizza rebellion," in which an "artist" was filmed throwing slices of pizza over the fence at City Hall while shouting, "Give me pizza or give me death!" Other articles have been filled with groan-worthy puns about "doughy gestures," "cheesy comments," and "another one bites the crust." A New York Post op-ed called attention to the irrationality of connecting pizza to climate change, by pointing out, "you'd have to burn a pizza stove 849 years to equal one year of John Kerry's private jet."

It is estimated that his jet emits about 116 tons of carbon in a year, compared to wood-burning stoves, estimated by "The 8 Billion Trees Project" to emit 13.2 ounces a day (one-tenth of a ton per year). Still, the comparison seems a little out of place, since New York City politicians have nothing to say about how Kerry — a former senator and secretary of state — travels. They would doubtless respond by saying they can only regulate what's within their jurisdiction. But the absurdity of that comparison actually helps illustrate the obvious fact that banning old pizza ovens will have no more impact on the global climate than grounding one private jet would have.

That is the heart of this

endless and tiresome trend toward banning things we use in our daily lives, under the false illusion that it will mitigate climate change. My friend Craig Rucker of the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, put it this way: "Anyone who thinks they can change the temperature of the Earth by regulating pizzerias has no clue. Have they even heard of China?"

China is building 100 new coal-fired power plants every year — two a week. American and European politicians continue to adopt policies to encourage a lower standard of living, wanting people to live in less comfortable homes, give up their cars and use mass transit and bicycles. Meanwhile on the other side of the globe, several billion people are abandoning their bikes, and air conditioning their homes, excited to be living a more prosperous life than they have ever known.

Despite the climate-change futility of banning things that make Americans' lives easier, the Biden administration persists. The May announcement requires dishwashers (beginning in 2027) that have 27% less power and use 34% less water. The Energy Department claims the new "efficiency" standards (judged by energy use, not by whether dishes come clean) will save Americans money. But isn't that our choice, deciding how much we spend dishwashing? As Steve Moore put it, perhaps they really want to return to "the ultimate zero carbon emission dishwasher: mom with a dish rag and towel."

I've never experienced Lombardi's pizza, but we often make our own, using a gas oven. It's a little messy but that's OK — we still have a dishwasher. ■

15 Groups Demand Energy Sec. Resignation

by Mairead Elordi, Reporter
As Appearing in *The Daily Wire*



Energy Secretary Jennifer Granholm's alleged ethics violations and failures have prompted 15 nonprofits to write to President Joe Biden on Tuesday demanding her resignation.

The coalition of nonprofits, which say they are dedicated to promoting ethics and integrity in government, said Granholm has "disregarded and de-prioritized her ethics obligations at every turn."

"We request the immediate resignation of Secretary Jennifer Granholm based not only on her actions – her repeated apparent violations of federal ethics laws and regulations – but also on the ethics failures and legal missteps of her subordinates resulting from her poor example," the group wrote in their letter to President Biden.

One of the first ethics concerns around Granholm, who was governor of MI from 2003 to 2011, cropped up in 2021, shortly after she took office as secretary.

During her first months as a Biden cabinet member, the Biden administration promoted the electric bus company Proterra while Granholm still held Proterra stock options because she had been a member of the company's board. She finally sold her stock in Proterra for \$1.6 million before an ethics deadline requiring her to do so.

She was also able to defer paying capital gains taxes on the \$1.6 million since cabinet members are not required to pay

the tax on stocks they must sell in order to take office.

Last year, Granholm admitted to paying \$400 in late fees for failing to disclose up to \$240,000 in stock sales in 2021.

Her aides initially claimed she had not broken the law but later called the issue an "inadvertent clerical oversight."

"The planet is warming faster than ever, the cost and impact of extreme weather events are intensifying, and yet what some people are spending their time on is a \$400 late fee that was already paid on a clerical oversight," Energy Department spokeswoman Charisma Troiano responded at one point when Insider asked about the situation.

Then last month, Granholm admitted that her husband owned shares in Ford Motor Company, which she did not previously disclose, claiming she only became aware of them in May. Her husband sold the shares worth \$2,457.89 on May 15.

She claimed she "mistakenly" testified in April to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee that she "did not own any individual stocks" when she meant she "did not own any conflicting stocks."

Before her husband sold the stock, Granholm filmed a video promoting electric vehicles in which she rode an electric Ford Mustang, sparking concerns that she was promoting Ford.

"It's one of two things at this point. She's either incompetent or lying," said Representative Kelly Armstrong (R-ND), a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, in June.

Armstrong added that Ford is "a company that squarely falls under her

authority" as energy secretary.

On top of the alleged stock violations, Granholm also violated a law that limits political speech by federal employees, according to a government watchdog.

"The good news is that marching and that voting gave Democrats a bare majority, but a majority, in the House, in the Senate," Granholm said in a 2021 interview with the magazine *Marie Claire*.

"And again, I am using Democrats as a substitute for the policies that you believe in, the policies that you would like to see happen," she said.

Granholm's comments violated the Hatch Act, according to the U.S. Office of Special Counsel, but the agency decided not to discipline her, although further violations could result in discipline.

"Since Ms. Granholm's responses to these allegations have often relied on some variation of 'it wasn't my fault,' this has left the American public wondering where exactly the buck stops in your administration," the group of 15 nonprofits wrote in their Tuesday letter to Biden.

The group of nonprofits demanding Granholm's resignation include the 60 Plus Association, AMAC Action, the American Accountability Foundation, CFACT, the Conservative Caucus, the Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation, the Eagle Forum, the Energy & Environment Legal Institute, David Bozell of ForAmerica, Heartland Impact, the Heartland Institute, Brent Bozell III, founder and president of the Media Research Center, the Project 21 Black Leadership Network, and Protect the Public's Trust. □

Climate Change Con (Cont.)

"...geologists have always recognized that climate changes over time. Where we differ from a lot of people pushing Anthropogenic global warming is in our understanding of scale. They're only interested in the last 150 years. Our time frame is 4,567 million years. So what they're doing is the equivalent of trying to extrapolate the plot of *Casablanca* from one tiny bit of the love scene. And you can't. It doesn't work."

How did this common sense not get more traction? We can thank the media for that, and the global nonprofits funded by hateful billionaires.

Looking at the mind numbingly imbecilic headlines reminds us that the stupid people are in charge of everything right now – they are easier to control.

Plimer said "modern environmentalism is that it is driven by people who are 'too wealthy.' 'When I try explaining 'global warming' to people in Iran or Turkey they have no idea what I'm talking about. Their life is about getting through to the next day, finding their next meal. Eco-guilt is a first-world luxury. It's the new religion for urban populations which have lost their faith in Christianity. The IPCC report is their Bible. Al Gore and Lord Stern are their prophets.'" □

While nearly every poll shows that most people think claims of man-made climate change is BS, we can't let them get away with this green hustle – but we may not have to push back very hard as a downturn in the economy will likely take care of it organically. As Plimer explained in 2009, "the global economic meltdown has changed all that. As countless opinion surveys have shown, the poorer people feel, the lower down their list of priorities ecological righteousness sinks. 'It's one of the few good things to come out of this recession,' says Plimer. 'People are starting to ask themselves: 'Can we really afford this green legislation?'" □

Bad Government, Not Climate to Blame for Maui Wildfire Disaster

by Steve Milloy, Senior Policy Fellow
As Appearing on RealClear Policy



Hawaii Gov. Josh Green and the media pointed the finger at climate change as responsible for the dozens of deaths and tremendous property loss resulting from the Maui wildfires. They're pointing in the wrong direction.

Dry grasslands, windy conditions and one or more sparks were all it took to put Maui ablaze. As usual with natural disasters, what happened is not really predictable so no one is to blame for the event itself.

But that's where blamelessness ends and government culpability begins.

The grasslands that the wildfire blew through did not dry overnight. The area where the wildfires occurred has been in moderate to severe drought. Drought conditions are a significant risk factor for out-of-control wildfires.

Though lightning strikes can ignite wildfires, most wildfires are touched off by some human activity, a downed power line, a negligently extinguished campfire or arson. In May 2022, Maui officials investigated arson as the cause of wildfires that had been

set all over the island.

So the Maui government had actual knowledge of drought conditions and constructive knowledge that arson was a possibility. Yet no warning was issued to the public or emergency plans made for the possibility of wildfire until it was too late on August 9. The primary responsibility of government is to keep its citizens safe. Government was tragically asleep on Maui.

But there is a lesson related to climate in all of this.

The Biden administration has taken an all-of-government approach to climate. Every federal agency has got some sort of initiative either aimed at emissions reduction or alarming the public about the alleged dangers of climate change.

Just about a year ago, Democrats rammed the Inflation Reduction Act through Congress on a party line vote. The law authorizes the spending of \$369 billion on various climate initiatives ostensibly aimed at reducing emissions via wind turbines, solar panels and electric vehicles.

But the reality of spending that much money on "green" technology is that it will not make the slightest dent in global emissions. Even if you believe that emissions drive "climate change", emissions cuts from Inflation Reduction Act spending will be exceedingly

small and irrelevant. China is right now planning and building more than 300 coal plants that will be in operation way before any Inflation Reduction Act emissions cuts come to fruition.

So the federal, state and local governments will be busy and focused on spending scads of money on projects that will have no effect on weather or climate, including tragedies like the one that just befell Maui.

Worse though, is the distraction that is part-and-parcel of the all-of-government approach to climate.

Instead of recognizing that natural disasters, whether related to human activity or not, have always happened and will continue to happen, and that serious emergency planning for what's could happen is obviously needed everywhere, all levels of government are distracted by climate and the money that can be handed out to special interests.

Maui has sued Big Oil alleging culpability for global warming. For full disclosure, I am identified in the lawsuit as helping out the defendants. No doubt Maui will tack on the wildfire tragedy in its claim for damages.

But the lawsuit is just a political sideshow. Dozens are dead in Maui. Although the government had knowledge of what could happen, no one was warned of the danger until it was too late. Maui should sue itself. □

Hottest Day Ever? (cont.)

temperature data are imprecise. It has been estimated that 96% of U.S. temperature stations produce corrupted data. About 92% of them reportedly have a margin of error of a full degree Celsius, or nearly 2 degrees Fahrenheit. The lack of precision of reported temperatures, whether estimated or measured, is not reassuring.

Temperature stations also tend to be limited to populated areas. Much of the Earth's surface

isn't measured at all. Although the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration likes to present global temperatures starting in 1880, regular temperature collection in places such as the north and south poles began much later.

It isn't plausible to characterize Earth's warming in a single average number, especially when we don't really know what that number is today, much less from 125,000 years ago. □

E&E Legal Letter is a quarterly publication of the Energy and Environment Legal Institute (E&E Legal). The publication is widely disseminated to our key stakeholders, such as our members, website inquiries, energy, environment, and legal industry representatives, the media, congressional, legislative, and regulatory contacts, the judiciary, and supporters.

Energy & Environment Legal Institute
1350 Beverly Rd., Suite 115-445
McLean, VA 22101
202-810-2001
Info@eelegal.org
www.eelegal.org