

2013 IWLA NATIONAL CONSERVATION POLICY RESOLUTIONS

EMERGING CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERNS IN OUR WATERWAYS

Numerous studies have documented the presence of active pharmaceutical ingredients in our rivers, including antibiotics, nonprescription drugs, other prescription drugs, and reproductive hormones (as from birth control pills). These contaminants are not necessarily removed through current drinking water treatment technology nor is there routine testing for this broad range of contaminants.

Due to health and environmental concerns, public health officials have changed recommendations for disposal of pharmaceuticals that are out-of-date or will not be used and now recommend against flushing any medication down the toilet. For unwanted and unused prescription medications, the preferred disposal method is through “Take-Back” programs at local pharmacies, or collection days typically sponsored by law enforcement agencies to prevent abuse of these drugs by unintended users and also keep them from being discharged from wastewater.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Izaak Walton League of America, assembled in convention in Fredericksburg, Virginia, July 26, 2013, supports locally-based take back programs to allow for the safe disposal of unused prescription and over-the-counter drugs, and federal and state legislation establishing and regulating such programs. Wherever possible, these programs should be supported through a combination of private sector (participating pharmacies) and public sector (local law enforcement) engagement as needed to assure that all residents have a low-cost or no-cost way to return unused prescription and over-the-counter drugs for proper disposal.

SUSTAINABLE CLEAN ENERGY RESOLUTION

Multiple League chapters and members submitted resolutions and evidence in support of renewable energy, including research concluding that 100 percent of the world’s energy needs can be met by renewable energy sources using existing technologies by 2030-2050. These researchers claim that shifting to a new energy infrastructure that relies solely on alternative energies is economically feasible, cheaper than our current energy mix, and would create millions of jobs. Further, fossil fuels, which currently provide over 80 percent of the world’s energy supply, have important functions which they are needed for besides energy production, including as lubricants and in chemical industry applications. League delegates opted to support a transition to 100 percent renewable energy sources but not propose any deadlines for that transition.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Izaak Walton League of America, assembled in convention in Fredericksburg, Virginia on July 26, 2013, supports a goal of 100% energy production from renewable sources.

SAFE DISPOSAL OF COAL ASH

[See the article, Division Resolutions for 2013, elsewhere this issue for the text.]

OIL AND NATURAL GAS DRILLING

Hydraulic fracturing, also known as hydrofracking or simply fracking, is an increasingly popular method of extracting natural gas from the earth. As part of this process, gas companies inject a blend of chemicals, water, sand, and other ingredients into the earth in order to free up natural gas from the soil in order to extract it. This process, and the associated chemicals and water, are currently exempted from the Safe Drinking Water Act, posing unknown risks to our water supply, and to human and environmental health.

League delegates voted to amend existing League policy on oil and natural gas drilling to explicitly ask Congress to repeal current exemptions from the Safe Drinking Water Act for hydraulic fracturing, exemptions that were created in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The full resolution reads as follows:

Therefore, be it resolved that the Izaak Walton League of America, assembled in convention in Fredericksburg, Virginia, July 26, 2013, amends its Oil and Natural Gas Drilling policy (Chapter VII Energy, Section H) Oil and Natural Gas Drilling and Extraction, part 1) a)) to read:

a) Congress should repeal sections 402(1)(2) and 502(24) of the Clean Water Act, which exempt oil and natural gas drilling from National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, and section 322 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which exempts hydraulic fracturing operations from the drinking water protections required for other forms of underground injection through the Safe Drinking Water Act.

b) Following repeal of sections 402(1)(2) and 502(24) of the Clean Water Act, and Section 322 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the EPA shall develop and adopt regulations:

- i. applying the NPDES permit process to discharges of storm water runoff from oil and natural gas operations. Regulations must require monitoring and reporting of storm water discharges and can utilize general permits, provided such permits require individual site registration and address factors specific to each geographic area and geologic production zone; and
- ii. under the Safe Drinking Water Act that reflect repeal of Section 322 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

WHY BASIC PROTECTIONS FROM HARMFUL CHEMICALS ARE SO HARD TO GET

By Peter Montague/Truthout
August 19, 2013

The environmental movement has been campaigning since 2005 to modernize U.S. chemicals policy, an uphill battle. The greens have done everything by the book--written a model law, built a national grass-roots coalition, and dispatched lobbyists to capitol hill. Now, however, the chemical industry has executed a classic "divide and conquer" maneuver, cleaving the greens into disarray. If the present momentum continues, Congress could end up passing a chemical

reform bill that's far worse than what we've got now.

What we've got now is the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA, pronounced Tosca) enacted in 1976 and not revised since. As the New York Times described it May 24, 2013, "[TSCA] purports to regulate potentially harmful chemicals in industrial and consumer goods, like plastic bottles and children's pajamas. But the law is better known for its failures than for its successes. Of roughly 85,000 chemicals registered for use in the United States, [since 1976] only 200 have been tested by the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] and fewer than a dozen--including polychlorinated biphenyls, dioxin and hexavalent chromium--have been restricted.

"After a federal appeals court denied the EPA the authority to issue new limits on asbestos in 1991 [22 years ago], the agency all but abandoned its efforts to enforce the law, even as evidence of health problems from exposure to a range of chemicals in consumer products has piled up," the Times wrote.

TSCA works like this: New industrial chemicals are presumed to be safe. Ninety days before selling a new chemical, a manufacturer must notify EPA. At that time, the manufacturer must divulge any toxicity data it has for the chemical. If there's no toxicity data, there's nothing to divulge--a powerful incentive to avoid safety testing. EPA then has 60 days to approve the new chemical or to demand more toxicity data. But EPA's demand for more data must be supported by substantial evidence that new information is warranted by an "unreasonable risk" to public health or the environment. Obviously, this is a catch-22: without evidence of harm (or safety), EPA has no power to demand studies that might show harm (or safety). So every year, on average, 700 new chemicals enter commercial channels untested for effects on human health or the environment. That's TSCA in a nutshell.

A national campaign to reform TSCA bubbled up from the grassroots where people from Maine to California had been waging trench warfare against the petrochemical industry since 1978 when toxic waste was first discovered oozing onto a school playground at Love Canal in Niagara Falls, N.Y., where kids were getting sick. Nationwide, when people started looking, they found toxic waste everywhere.

Communities like Woburn, Mass. and Toms River, N.J., discovered clusters of disease among their children, and suddenly ordinary people found themselves locked in battle with armies of lawyers representing major corporations--in Woburn's case, Beatrice Foods and W.R. Grace, and in Toms River's, Ciba-Geigy--to end the toxic trespass. The Woburn fight was documented in a book and movie, both titled *A Civil Action*. Dan Fagin documented the Toms River fight in a book by that name. At the height of "the toxics movement" an estimated 7,000 local groups were engaged in hand-to-hand combat with one chemical polluter or another in all 50 states, plus Puerto Rico, Guam and the Virgin Islands.

Along the way, there were state-level victories. For example in 1986, a ballot initiative (Proposition 65) forced California state government to list all chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. The list gets updated once a year and now contains about 800 chemicals. California businesses must notify their customers about the presence of any of these chemicals in products they sell.

But ultimately town-by-town, fight-by-fight opposition to toxic chemicals wasn't changing national policy. In May, 2004, a disparate group of toxics and environmental justice activists met in Louisville, Ky. to hammer out a "Louisville Charter for Safer Chemicals"--the Magna Carta of TSCA reform. In 2005 Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.) began carrying the banner for modern chemicals policy, and a serious national TSCA reform campaign began to take shape. In 2008 Lautenberg introduced his first TSCA-reform proposal, the Kid-Safe Chemicals Act.

Features of Kid-Safe included:

- * **Require Basic Data on Industrial Chemicals.** Chemical companies must demonstrate the safety of their products, backed up with credible evidence. Chemicals that lack minimum data could not be legally manufactured in or imported into the United States. [Section 505] In other words, no data, no market.
- * **Place the Burden on Industry to Demonstrate Safety.** It's not up to government to prove harm; it's up to industry to show that their products pose a reasonable certainty of no harm. EPA must systematically review whether industry has met this burden of proof for all industrial chemicals within 15 years of adoption. [Section 503]
- * **Restrict the Use of Dangerous Chemicals Found in Newborn Babies.** Hazardous chemicals detected in human umbilical cord blood would be immediately targeted for restrictions on their use. [Section 504]
- * **Use New Scientific Evidence to Protect Health.** EPA must consider and is authorized to require additional testing as new science and new testing methods emerge, including for health effects at low doses or during fetal or infant development and for nanomaterials. [Section 503]

Together, these features of the Kid-Safe Chemicals Act add up to a "precautionary approach," turning TSCA on its head. The Kid-Safe reform assumes that industrial chemicals may be harmful until chemical companies produce data showing their products pose a reasonable certainty of no harm.

Plus, the mere presence of industrial chemicals in cord blood triggers special action to eliminate those exposures, which are presumed to be undesirable in a newborn.

In a world where cancers, attention deficits, autism, asthma, and diabetes are increasing in children year after year, precaution for chemical exposures is clearly a rational approach.

To pass legislation in Washington, grass-roots campaigners from the hinterland need the insider known-how of the "grasstops" lobbying organizations in D.C.--in this instance, NRDC (Natural Resources Defense Council), EWG (the Environmental Working Group), and EDF (Environmental Defense Fund). For their part, the grasstops lobbyists in D.C. need grass-roots groups all across the country to pressure key legislators at crucial times in the legislative sausage-making process.

Sometimes the grasstops in D.C. forget that they can't win without support of a broad grass-roots base. There's no better example of this than the inside-the-beltway campaign in 2009 to pass "cap-and-trade" legislation to curb emissions of carbon dioxide. The grasstops groups, led by Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), imagined that they could play David to the fossil fuel industry's Goliath (oil, coal, natural gas, and electric utilities) without engaging grass-roots campaigners nationwide. Predictably, Goliath slew David handily.

Just as cap and trade was going down to embarrassing defeat, the grasstops took a different tack for TSCA reform--they helped launch a large national grass-roots coalition now known as Safer Chemicals Healthy Families (SCHF), today comprising some 450 groups with perhaps 11 million total members. From the beginning, the coalition was partly staffed by grasstops: the coalition's web site lists its two "issue exerts" as Sarah Jensen, a physician with NRDC, and Richard Denison, a scientist employed by EDF. Indeed, the press release announcing the formation of the coalition August 4, 2009 listed Richard Denison of EDF as the first of two spokespeople for the coalition.

Thus, it all seemed to be working the way it was supposed to. Except that Congress was not cooperating. The petrochemical industry has a phenomenally deep pocket, and it was not about to roll over for a few green lobbyists, even if they had the backing of 11 million supporters in places like Boise and Little Rock. According to Common Cause, between 2005 and 2012 the chemical industry spent \$375 million lobbying to prevent meaningful TSCA reform. That's more than \$700,000 for each of the 535 members of Congress.

As time passed, Senator Lautenberg continually watered down his Kid-Safe proposal, each new version weaker than the last. In April of this year Lautenberg and Kristin Gillibrand (D-N.Y.) once again re-introduced a "Safe Chemicals Act." By now, the precautionary approach was long gone, as was the goal of protecting vulnerable populations like babies.

Senator Lautenberg evidently knew that even this compromised bill wasn't going anywhere because one month later--May 22, 12 days before he died--he introduced an even more industry-friendly version, "The Chemical Safety Improvement Act" or CSIA. This time his co-sponsor was Sen. David Vitter, conservative Republican from Louisiana and loyal servant of the petrochemical industry.

To say that Lautenberg-Vitter is industry-friendly understates the case. The chemical industry is salivating over the CSIA.

Here's a short list of industry groups that have endorsed the Lautenberg-Vitter bill: Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, Association of Global Automakers, Automotive Aftermarket Industry Association, California Building Industry Association, California Chamber of Commerce, California Manufacturers & Technology Association, Consumer Electronics Association, Information Technology Industry Council, Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, and the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute.

The heaviest hitters supporting CSIA include the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Vinyl

Institute, and, heaviest of all, the American Chemistry Council, trade association of the chemical manufacturers.

The position of the Safer Chemicals Healthy Families coalition is crystal clear: "We do not support the legislation in its current form." Ken Cook, president of EWG in D.C. doesn't mince words: "If you look at the bill Lautenberg was pushing last year, I don't know if this is a retreat or a rout, but it's somewhere in that range," he says of the CSIA.

Objections to the Lautenberg-Vitter CSIA bill include these:

* EPA must decide that "no unreasonable risk of harm to human health or the environment will result from exposure to a chemical." To determine what's "unreasonable," EPA must do a cost-benefit analysis--weighing the dollar value of the chemical against the dollar value of the cancers, birth defects, attention deficits, and other diseases it may cause over the years. In such studies, the commercial value of the chemical can be estimated, but the dollar value of the harms is not easily quantified. In the past, after losing too many such duels with industry, EPA has refused to engage, allowing chemicals onto the market unchallenged. CSIA seems unlikely to change that pattern.

* Once EPA determines that a chemical presents "no unreasonable risk of harm" (for example, by refusing to challenge it in a cost-benefit duel) federal and state courts would not be allowed to accept new evidence in toxic tort lawsuits. Whatever evidence was available to EPA at the time of its decision would be the only information that a judge or jury could hear. New scientific studies would be excluded from courtrooms.

* Lautenberg-Vitter contains sweeping language that preempts states from enforcing existing laws, or adopting new ones, designed to supplement federal law. So California's "Prop 65" labeling requirements would be illegal under Lautenberg-Vitter. Washington state's current restrictions on flame retardants would be nullified. Maine's goal of eliminating toxic mercury from products would be set aside.

The California attorney general's office says Lautenberg-Vitter, as currently drafted, "cripples the police powers that California relies upon to protect public health... and, in addition, severely compromises California's authority to supplement and complement federal efforts to regulate the safety of chemicals."

Greens have universally condemned the Lautenberg-Vitter bill, with one exception: EDF supports the bill and Richard Denison has been lobbying for it on capitol hill.

This is not really a surprise. EDF has long been known as "a home for business-friendly environmentalism." People who engage with EDF generally do so knowing that it's often on the opposite side of issues that matter to grass-roots pollution-fighters.

In this instance, EDF's position on CSIA creates a real conundrum for the Safer Chemicals Healthy Family Coalition, where EDF's Denison is both a scientific adviser and a coalition spokesperson yet is employed by an organization lobbying against the coalition's position.

Now, during intense jockeying in the senate, no one can be quite sure who they're talking to when Richard Denison comes knocking. Is he representing EDF, which supports CSIA, or the Safer Chemicals coalition, which opposes it?

The EDF web site is no help in sorting out this question. To a naive viewer, the site could even give the impression that the Safer Chemicals Healthy Families coalition supports EDF's pro-CSIA position, which it emphatically does not. The "Chemicals Policy" page on EDF's site, urging passage of Lautenberg-Vitter, says, "EDF is a founding member of the Safer Chemicals, Healthy Families campaign, a broad coalition of state and national environmental groups, associations of health professionals, advocates for health-affected individuals and environmental justice organizations. The group has launched a broad effort to achieve comprehensive reform of TSCA. The campaign is advocating for a set of legislative proposals in Congress summarized in its platform [PDF]."

Nowhere does the EDF web site clarify that the Safer Chemicals Healthy Families coalition opposes Lautenberg-Vitter, which EDF supports.

The value of EDF's stance to the chemical industry cannot be overstated. With EDF on its side, the Chemical Industry Council's chief lobbyist, Calvin M. Dooley, can tell senators that "reasonable" environmentalists support Lautenberg-Vitter. Only green extremists oppose it.

For its part, EDF management may be feeling a bit desperate to back a winner. With an annual budget of \$105 million, and egg on its face from the cap-and-trade fiasco of 2009-2010, EDF perhaps needs to claim a victory after years invested in TSCA reform. Faced with the disastrous Lautenberg-Vitter bill, perhaps siding with the chemical industry against its 450 grass-roots allies in the Safer Chemicals coalition will prove to be a wise financial decision for EDF going forward.

For the Safer Chemicals coalition, on the other hand, Lautenberg-Vitter portends hard times ahead not only for chemicals policy but for the politics of reform more generally. Not only must future coalitions dissect what went wrong this time, but they must try anew to figure out how to discern in advance who are their real friends, and who's likely to sell them out at the last minute.

One thing's for sure: divide and conquer is still industry's most powerful tactic. "We're delighted there's a path forward," says Calvin Dooley of the Chemical Industry Council, "and we're eager to capitalize on it."

[Peter Montague is a historian and journalist whose work has appeared in Counterpunch, Huffington Post, the Nation and many other publications. He has co-authored two books on toxic heavy metals. Reprinted from "AlterNet Release in accordance with 'Fair Use' provisions.]

FOSSIL FUEL USE PUSHES CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS INTO DANGEROUS TERRITORY

By Emily E. Adams

www.earth-policy.org/indicators/C52/carbon_emissions_2013

Earth Policy Release
Eco-Economy Indicator
July 23, 2013

Eco-Economy Indicators are twelve trends that the Earth Policy Institute tracks to measure progress in building a sustainable economy. We track carbon emissions because stabilizing the earth's climate depends on cutting carbon emissions fast.

Increasing global emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂), a heat-trapping gas, are pushing the world into dangerous territory, closing the window of time to avert the worst consequences of higher temperatures, such as melting ice and rising seas. Since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, carbon emissions from burning fossil fuels have grown exponentially. Despite wide agreement by governments on the need to limit emissions, the rate of increase ratcheted up from less than 1 percent each year in the 1990s to almost 3 percent annually in the first decade of this century. After a short dip in 2009 due to the global financial crisis, emissions from fossil fuels rebounded in 2010 and have since grown 2.6 percent each year, hitting an all-time high of 9.7 billion tons of carbon in 2012.

Carbon emissions would have risen even faster were it not for the 7 percent drop among industrial countries since 2007—a group that includes the United States, Canada, Europe, Russia, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan. The United States, long the world's largest emitter until it was eclipsed by China in 2006, cut carbon emissions by 11 percent over the past five years to 1.4 billion tons. The biggest drop was in emissions from coal—which is primarily used to generate electricity—as power plants switched to cheaper natural gas and as the use of carbon-free wind energy more than quadrupled. U.S. emissions from oil, mostly used for transportation, also dipped. (See data.)

Carbon emissions from fossil fuel burning in Europe, as a whole the third largest emitter, fell 9 percent from 2007 to 2012. Emissions in Italy and Spain shrank by 17 and 18 percent, respectively. The United Kingdom's emissions dropped by 11 percent to 126 million tons. Germany's emissions fell by 4 percent to 200 million tons. These countries have been leaders in either wind or solar energy or both.

Russia and Japan are two industrial countries that did not see an overall decline in carbon emissions over the past five years. Russia had an uptick in oil use, increasing its emissions by 2 percent to 449 million tons. And in Japan, the quick suspension of nuclear power generation after the Fukushima disaster led to more natural gas and oil use, pushing emissions up 1 percent to 336 million tons in 2012.

CO₂ emissions in developing countries surpassed those from industrial countries in 2005 and have since continued to soar. China's carbon emissions grew by 44 percent since 2007 to 2.4 billion tons in 2012. Together the United States and China account for more than 40 percent of worldwide emissions. Emissions in India, home to more than a billion people, overtook those in Russia for the first time in 2008. From 2007 to 2012, India's emissions grew 43 percent to reach 596 million tons of carbon. Carbon emissions in Indonesia, another fast-growing economy, have exploded, growing 52 percent to hit 146 million tons in 2012.

Although emissions from developing countries now dominate, the industrial countries set the world on its global warming path with over a century's worth of CO₂ emissions that have accumulated in the atmosphere. Furthermore, emissions estimates discussed here include only those from fossil fuels burned within a country's borders, meaning that the tallies do not account for international trade. For example, emissions generated from producing goods in China destined for use in the United States are added to China's books. When emissions are counted in terms of the final destination of the product, the industrial countries' carbon bill increases.

On a per person basis, the United States emits 4.4 tons of carbon pollution—twice as much as in China. The highest per capita carbon emissions are in several small oil and gas producing countries. In 2012, Qatar spewed out 11 tons of carbon per person. Trinidad and Tobago is next with 9 tons of carbon per person, and Kuwait follows at 7.5 tons.

Fossil fuels are not the only source of CO₂ emissions. Changing the landscape, for example by burning forests, releases roughly 1 billion tons of carbon globally each year. Brazil and Indonesia have high levels of deforestation and are responsible for much of the current carbon emissions from the land.

About half of the CO₂ that is released through fossil fuel burning or land use changes stays in the atmosphere. The other half is taken up by the oceans or by plants. As more CO₂ is absorbed by the world's oceans, the water becomes more acidic. This change in ocean chemistry can strip away the building blocks of coral reefs, weakening an important link in the oceanic food chain. Scientists warn that the oceans could eventually become saturated with CO₂, compromising their capacity to absorb our carbon emissions, with serious consequences for the global thermostat.

For some 800,000 years, the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere did not go above 300 parts per million (ppm). But in the 250 years following the start of the Industrial Revolution, enough CO₂ built up to bring the average concentration to nearly 394 ppm in 2012. Throughout each year, the concentration of the gas fluctuates, reaching its annual peak in the spring. In May 2013, the CO₂ concentration briefly hit 400 ppm, a grim new milestone on the path of climate disruption. Never in human history has the atmosphere been so full of this odorless and colorless yet powerfully disruptive gas.

CO₂ acts like the glass of a greenhouse, trapping heat. Since humans began burning fossil fuels on a large scale, the global average temperature has risen 1.4 degrees Fahrenheit (0.8 degrees Celsius), with most of the increase occurring since 1970. The effects of higher temperatures include rising sea levels, disappearing Arctic sea ice, more heat waves, and declining yields of food crops.

More warming is in the pipeline as the climate system slowly responds to the higher CO₂ concentrations. Reports from international institutions, such as the International Energy Agency, based on work by thousands of scientists emphasize that little time remains to cut emissions and avoid a climate catastrophe. The World Bank notes that absent any policy changes, the global average temperature could be 9 degrees Fahrenheit warmer by the end of this century, well above what human civilization has ever witnessed.

But a different future—one based on a clean energy economy—is within our reach. Germany, not a particularly sunny country, has harnessed enough of the sun's rays to power some 8 million homes, for example. The United States has enough wind turbines installed to power more than 15 million homes. Kenya generates roughly a quarter of its electricity from geothermal energy. This is but a glimpse of the enormous potential of renewable energy. The question is not whether we can build a carbon-free economy, but whether we can do it before climate change spirals out of control.

[For a plan to stabilize the Earth's climate, see "Time for Plan B." Data and additional resources at <http://www.earth-policy.org> .]

CLIMATE CHANGE

By Jim Daniels

The intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), released its fifth report at the end of September and a working group meeting was held to discuss it. You can access the full report as well as a summary by going to their web site.

The report says—again—that there is a 95% certainty of human-influenced climate change. This is backed up by a body of research from all over the globe. Arguably the most researched issue in history. The facts and science and research is both extensive and compelling. Precious little room is left for doubt or denial, but listening to the mainstream media, which requires conflict to get ratings, it is many times presented as a 50-50 proposition. It is not.

Let's put it this way. If you were to go to 100 cancer specialists and 95 of them said you had cancer but if you started treatment right away you could be cured and the side effects will be irritating but you would recover. And, if you start treatment now you will save money as well as avoid a lot of pain. But, the longer you delay treatment the more it will cost and if you wait too long you will die, regardless of any treatment you get.

Five of the cancer specialists you visit say you either don't have cancer at all or if you do there is nothing you can do about it and everything will be okay.

What action will you take?

I am convinced. You should be too. The evidence is solid and verified by reputable sources.

There are vested interests in the industries that cause climate change through pollution and they are spending millions of dollars to convince people there is not a problem. They are the fossil fuel industry. The richest industry in the world. And they are powerful.

Fewer and fewer people deny climate change as they are hard pressed to challenge the continuing avalanche of scientific data generated supporting climate change. Add to this the evidence they witness for themselves.

An example from the latest report addresses the claim of a leveling off of air temperature in the last several years. The data is all in the report, you don't have to take my word for it.

In upcoming issues I will publish some of the data contained in the report to help those still in

denial. That includes those that say sunspots are the cause, and the natural cycle folks, in addition to the temperature level people. No matter how extensive I report though, I really encourage you to read the report. Just the summary will do as the full report is over 500 pages long. I have not read the full report yet, myself.

If you are one of the doubters I encourage you to gather your facts and submit an article for publication. Name your data sources, not just where you read the data. For instance, if you read an article in a magazine, identify not just the magazine, but where they got their data. Be cautious of copyrighted material. The Waltonian can publish some of that under the Doctrine of Fair Use, but I need to give credit to all the sources. That information must be available to be able to publish quotes and other excerpts.

DIVISION MEETINGS

December 7, 2013: This is a one day Directors meeting at the Fort Wayne Chapter. Mailing to Directors and Chapters with the agenda, directions, and lodging will be sent by the Division Secretary 30 days before the meeting. All members are welcome. If you are interested in attending contact your Chapter President.

March, 2014: The specific date and location of this one day Division Directors meeting has not been decided. Historically this meeting is on the first Saturday of the month.

June 7 and 8, 2014: This is the annual Division Convention. For Chapter Delegates and Directors. It is a two day meeting and will be at the Evansville Chapter.

For all meetings the Secretary sends out agendas, maps, and lodging information 30 days before the meeting. All members are welcome at all Division meetings and are encouraged to participate. Voting requires being elected or appointed as a Director and for the convention delegates are selected by each chapter. The number of delegates is determined by the number of members a chapter has. Contact your chapter president for more details.

ENERGY ACTION ALERT

By Jim Daniels

Section 433 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA 2007), requires that all new federal buildings and major renovations meet the 2030 challenge targets—reducing fossil fuel energy consumption incrementally to carbon neutral by 2030.

With the building sector consuming almost 50 percent of all the energy produced in the United States, Section 433 is intended to provide federal leadership for addressing climate change and moving the country toward energy independence.

Senator Hoeven of North Dakota wants to repeal Section 433. The bill to repeal is co-sponsored by Senator Manchin. It is important this bill is not passed or added as an amendment to another bill. One likely target for a bill to amend to is the Shalieu (NH)- Portman(OH) Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. If the bad amendment is added to the Energy

Savings bill and cannot be yanked, the entire bill should go down.

[Ed. Note: On June 24 I e-mailed Scott Kovarovics suggesting this issue be considered as an IWLA Action Alert. Hopefully one will be posted.]

FOOD OR FUEL?

By Lester R. Brown

[<http://www.earth-policy.org/books/fpep/fpepch4>]

Earth Policy Release

Full Planet, Empty Plates

July 2, 2013

At the time of the Arab oil export embargo in the 1970s, the importing countries were beginning to ask themselves if there were alternatives to oil. In a number of countries, particularly the United States, several in Europe, and Brazil, the idea of growing crops to produce fuel for cars was appealing. The modern biofuels industry was launched.

This was the beginning of what would become one of the great tragedies of history. Brazil was able to create a thriving fuel ethanol program based on sugarcane, a tropical plant. Unfortunately for the rest of the world, however, in the United States the feedstock was corn. Between 1980 and 2005, the amount of grain used to produce fuel ethanol in the United States gradually expanded from 1 million to 41 million tons.

Then came Hurricane Katrina, which disrupted Gulf-based oil refineries and gasoline supply lines in late August 2005. As gasoline prices in the United States quickly climbed to \$3 a gallon, the conversion of a \$2 bushel of corn, which can be distilled into 2.8 gallons of ethanol, became highly profitable.

The result was a rush to raise capital and build distilleries. From November 2005 through June 2006, ground was broken for a new ethanol plant in the United States every nine days. From July through September, the construction pace accelerated to one every five days. And in October 2006, it was one every three days.

Between 2005 and 2011, the grain used to produce fuel for cars climbed from 41 million to 127 million tons—nearly a third of the U.S. grain harvest. The United States is trying to replace oil fields with corn fields to meet part of its automotive fuel needs.

The massive diversion of grain to fuel cars has helped drive up food prices, leaving low-income consumers everywhere to suffer some of the most severe food price inflation in history. As of mid-2012, world wheat, corn, and soybean prices were roughly double their historical levels.

The appetite for grain to fuel cars is seemingly insatiable. The grain required to fill a 25-gallon fuel tank of a sport utility vehicle with ethanol just once would feed one person for a whole year. The grain turned into ethanol in the United States in 2011 could have fed, at average world

consumption levels, some 400 million people. But even if the entire U.S. grain harvest were turned into ethanol, it would only satisfy 18 percent of current gasoline demand.

With its enormous growth in distilling capacity, the United States quickly overtook Brazil to become the new world leader in biofuels. In 2011, the United States produced 14 billion gallons of ethanol and Brazil produced under 6 billion gallons; together they accounted for 87 percent of world output. The 14 billion gallons of U.S. grain-based ethanol met roughly 6 percent of U.S. gasoline demand. Other countries producing ethanol from food crops, though in relatively small amounts, include China, Canada, France, and Germany.

Most ethanol production growth has been concentrated in the last several years. In 1980, the world produced scarcely 1 billion gallons of fuel ethanol. By 2000, the figure was 4.5 billion gallons. It was still increasing, albeit slowly, expanding to 8.2 billion gallons in 2005. But between then and 2011, production jumped to 23 billion gallons.

A number of countries, including the United States, are also producing biodiesel from oil-bearing crops. World biodiesel production grew from a mere 3 million gallons in 1991 to just under 1 billion gallons in 2005. During the next six years it jumped to nearly 6 billion gallons, increasing sixfold. Still, worldwide production of biodiesel is less than one fourth that of ethanol.

The production of biodiesel is much more evenly distributed among countries than that of ethanol. The top five producers are the United States, Germany, Argentina, Brazil, and France, with production ranging from 840 million gallons per year in the United States to 420 million gallons in France.

A variety of crops can be used to produce biodiesel. In Europe, where sunflower seed oil, palm oil, and rapeseed oil are leading table oils, rapeseed is used most often for biodiesel. Similarly, in the United States the soybean is the leading table oil and biodiesel feedstock. Elsewhere, palm oil is widely used both for food and to produce biodiesel.

Although production from oil palms is limited to tropical and subtropical regions, the crop yields much more biodiesel per acre than do temperate-zone oilseeds such as soybeans and rapeseed. However, one disturbing consequence of rising biofuel production is that new oil palm plantations are coming at the expense of tropical forests. And any land that is devoted to producing biofuel crops is not available to produce food.

Not only are biofuels helping raise food prices, and thus increasing the number of hungry people, most make little sense from an energy efficiency perspective. Although ethanol can be produced from any plant, it is much more efficient and much less costly to use sugar- and starch-bearing crops. But even among these crops the efficiency varies widely. The ethanol yield per acre from sugarcane is nearly 600 gallons, a third higher than that from corn. This is partly because sugarcane is grown in tropical and subtropical regions and it grows year-round. Corn, in contrast, has a growing season of 120 days or so.

In terms of energy efficiency, grain-based ethanol is a clear loser. For sugarcane, the energy yield—that is, the energy embodied in the ethanol—can be up to eight times the energy invested

in producing the biofuel. In contrast, the energy return on energy invested in producing corn-based ethanol is only roughly 1.5 to 1, a dismal return.

For biodiesel, oil palm is far and away the most energy-efficient crop, yielding roughly nine times as much energy as is invested in producing biodiesel from it. The energy return for biodiesel produced from soybeans and rapeseed is about 2.5 to 1. In terms of land productivity, an acre of oil palms can produce over 500 gallons of fuel per year—more than six times that produced from soybeans or rapeseed. Growing even the most productive fuel crops, however, still means either diverting land from other crops or clearing more land.

The capacity to convert enormous volumes of grain into fuel means that the price of grain is now more closely tied to the price of oil than ever before. If the price of fuel from grain drops below that from oil, then investment in converting grain into fuel will increase. Thus, if the price of oil were to reach, say, \$200 a barrel, there would likely be an enormous additional investment in ethanol distilleries to convert grain into fuel. If the price of corn rises high enough, however, as it may well do, distilling grain to produce fuel may no longer be profitable.

One of the consequences of integrating the world food and fuel economies is that the owners of the world's 1 billion motor vehicles are pitted against the world's poorest people in competition for grain. The winner of this competition will depend heavily on income levels. Whereas the average motorist has an annual income over \$30,000, the incomes of the 2 billion poorest people in the world are well under \$2,000.

Rising food prices can quickly translate into social unrest. As grain prices were doubling from 2007 to mid-2008, food protests and riots broke out in many countries. Economic stresses in the form of rising food prices are translating into political stresses, putting governments in some countries under unmanageable pressures. The U.S. State Department reports food unrest in some 60 countries between 2007 and 2009. Among these were Afghanistan, Yemen, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Haiti.

International food assistance programs are also hit hard by rising grain prices. Since the budgets of food aid agencies are set well in advance, a rise in prices shrinks food assistance precisely when more help is needed. The U.N. World Food Programme, which supplies emergency food aid to more than 60 countries, has to cut shipments as prices soar. Meanwhile, over 7,000 children are dying each day from hunger and related illnesses.

When governments subsidize food-based biofuel production, they are in effect spending taxpayers' money to raise costs at the supermarket checkout counter. In the United States, the production of fuel ethanol was encouraged by a tax credit granted to fuel blenders for each gallon of ethanol they blended with gasoline. This tax credit expired at the end of 2011.

Still in place, however, is the Renewable Fuel Standard, which is seen by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as part of a strategy to "help recharge the rural American economy." This mandate requires that biofuel use ramp up to 36 billion gallons annually by 2022. Of this total, 16 billion gallons are slated to come from cellulosic feedstocks, such as cornstalks, grass, or wood chips.

Yet for the foreseeable future, production of those cellulose-based fuels has little chance of reaching such levels. Producing ethanol from sugars or starches like corn or sugarcane is a one-step process that converts the feedstock to ethanol. But producing ethanol from cellulosic materials is a two-step process: first the material must be broken down into sugar or starch, and then it is converted into ethanol. Furthermore, cellulosic feedstocks like corn stalks are much bulkier than feedstocks like corn kernels, so transporting them from distant fields to a distillery is much more costly. Removing agricultural residues such as corn stalks or wheat straw from the field to produce ethanol deprives the soil of needed organic matter.

The unfortunate reality is that the road to this ambitious cellulosic biofuel goal is littered with bankrupt firms that tried and failed to develop a process that would produce an economically viable fuel. Despite having the advantage of not being directly part of the food supply, cellulosic ethanol has strong intrinsic characteristics that put it at a basic disadvantage compared with grain ethanol, so it may never become economically viable.

The mandate from the European Union (EU) requiring that 10 percent of its transportation energy come from renewable sources, principally biofuels, by 2020 is similarly ambitious. Among international agribusiness firms, this is seen as a reason to acquire land, mostly in Africa, on which to produce fuel for export to Europe. Since Europe relies primarily on diesel fuel for its cars, the investors are looking at crops such as the oil palm and jatropha, a relatively low-yielding oil-bearing shrub, as a source of diesel fuel.

There is growing opposition to this EU goal from environmental groups, the European Environment Agency, and many other stakeholders. They object to the deforestation and the displacement of the poor that often results from such “land grabbing.” (See Chapter 10.) They are also concerned that, by and large, biofuels do not deliver the promised climate benefits.

The biofuel industry and its proponents have argued that greenhouse gas emissions from biofuels are lower than those from gasoline, but this has been challenged by a number of scientific studies. Indeed, there is growing evidence that biofuel production may contribute to global warming rather than ameliorate it. A study led by Nobel prize-winning chemist Paul Crutzen at the Max Planck Institute for Chemistry in Germany reports that the nitrogen fertilizers used to produce biofuel crops release “nitrous oxide emissions large enough to cause climate warming instead of cooling.”

A report from Rice University that carefully examined the greenhouse gas emissions question concluded that “it is uncertain whether existing biofuels production provides any beneficial improvement over traditional gasoline, after taking into account land use changes and emissions of nitrous oxide. Legislation giving biofuels preferences on the basis of greenhouse gas benefits should be avoided.” The U.S. National Academy of Sciences also voiced concern about biofuel production’s negative effects on soils, water, and the climate.

There is some good news on the issue of food or fuel. An April 2012 industry report notes that “the world ethanol engine continues to sputter.” U.S. ethanol production likely peaked in 2011 and is projected to drop 2 percent in 2012. An even greater decline in U.S. ethanol production is likely in 2013 as oil prices weaken and as heat and drought in the U.S. Midwest drive corn prices

upward. For many distillers, the profit margin disappeared in 2012. In early July 2012, Valero Energy Corporation, an oil company and major ethanol producer, reported it was idling the second of its 10 ethanol distilleries. Numerous other distilleries are on the verge of shutting down.

If the ethanol mandate were phased out, U.S. distillers would have even less confidence in the future marketability of ethanol. In a world of widely fluctuating oil and grain prices, ethanol production would not always be profitable.

Beyond this, the use of automotive fuel in the United States, which peaked in 2007, fell 11 percent by 2012. Young people living in cities are simply not as car-oriented as their parents were. They are not part of the car culture. This helps explain why the size of the U.S. motor vehicle fleet, after climbing for a century, peaked at 250 million in 2008. It now appears that the fleet size will continue to shrink through this decade.

In addition, the introduction of more stringent U.S. auto fuel-efficiency standards means that gasoline use by new cars sold in 2025 will be half that of new cars sold in 2010. As older, less efficient cars are retired and fuel use declines, the demand for grain-based ethanol for blending will also decline.

Within the automobile sector, a major move to plug-in hybrids and all-electric cars will further reduce the use of gasoline. If this shift is accompanied by investment in thousands of wind farms to feed cheap electricity into the grid, then cars could run largely on electricity for the equivalent cost of 80¢ per gallon of gasoline.

There is also a growing public preference for walking, biking, and using public transportation wherever possible. This reduces not only the demand for cars and gasoline but also the paving of land for roads and parking lots.

Whether viewed from an environmental or an economic vantage point, we would all benefit by shifting from liquid fuels to electrically driven vehicles. Using electricity from wind farms, solar cells, or geothermal power plants to power cars will dramatically reduce carbon emissions. We now have both the electricity-generating technologies and the automotive technologies to create a clean, carbon-free transportation system, one that does not rely on either the use of oil or the conversion of food crops into fuel.

[From Full Planet, Empty Plates: The New Geopolitics of Food Scarcity by Lester R. Brown (New York: W.W. Norton & Co.) Supporting data, video, and slideshows are available for free download at <http://www.earth-policy.org/books/fpep> .]

PUBLIC LANDS & FISH AND WILDLIFE REPORT
September 2013
By Chuck Bauer

The IDNR is still aggressively purchasing Fish and Wildlife parcels with Pittman-Robinson, Healthy Rivers, and Bicentennial trust money. Property purchases are always slow but steady

progress is being made. Ducks Unlimited submitted a grant request for \$1,000,000 to the North American Wetlands Management Plan for acquisition of land in the Patoka Refuge. Izaak Walton joined DU, TNC, Peabody Coal, Sycamore Land Trust, and Indiana Wildlife Federation in this request. We will get our scores in December. The Patoka has an additional 1,000 acres plus with willing sellers and has signed contracts on 300+ of those acres.

I represented the Izaak Walton League at a sportsman's meeting with Cam Clark, the new director of the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. Cam is a hunter and he has a young Labrador retriever. He hunts with his son. It is clear he is dedicated to the resource and understands the issues. We were all in basic agreement on issues of canned hunting, forest management and land acquisition. It is still unclear on what support he will get from Governor Pence. So far it has been okay. Pence's staff would like to see an accommodation on High Fence hunting but I believe Cam will win them over. The problem with the management of the IDNR is often when politics (Particularly large party financial donors who want a favor in return) overrides sound Resource management.

The Sportsman's Roundtable is being revitalized. Their key goal is to watch and influence legislation which effects sportsmen. I attended a meeting in late August where we discussed issues. The meeting was well attended by representatives of most hunting groups as well as Conservation Officers and NRA spokesmen. Mark Reiter, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Division, and Jack Seifert, Director of the Division of Forestry, spoke. We all expect another push for canned hunting by the Deer Farmers and Farm Bureau. There is an issue with commercial fisherman netting trophy catfish from the Ohio and Wabash and selling them live to pay lakes. The primary market is Ohio where it is illegal for them to do it in their stretch of the Ohio River. There will likely be some limits placed on this activity by Indiana and possibly Kentucky. There is enough breeding stock that the production of the fishery is not threatened but there is a lack of trophy (35 inches or more) and sport cat fisherman are concerned. I believe we should consider joining Sportsman's Roundtable and possibly have representation from Evansville, North West Indiana and Fort Wayne involved. I will advise more at the December meeting.

There is a new Indiana Hunting and Trapping Guide. It is well done. A welcome addition to the online information.

SOIL AND AG REPORT

September, 2013

By Clara Walters

How many years does it take to pass a Farm Bill? So far it is taking 2 years and will probably take at least 3 years since Congress only has until September 30th to pass one.

The Farm Bill is an important piece of legislation that needs to be passed to ensure that conservation programs are in place, farmer programs and assistance remains available as well as the SNAP program (food stamps). This bill affects all walks of life, not just the farmer. It is up to us to contact our legislators and urge them to work on this now. I called Senator Donnelly's office last week and was told that although it is on the docket, the situation with Syria was taking

precedence.

I recently attended a workshop on cover crops and found it to be very informative. Many of the farmers there were very pleased with the results that they are having by using no-till and cover crops. Discussion was held on what works best with what crop and the methods that they have found to be most effective in planting. This is one of the many workshops that are being offered by the local Soil and Water Conservation Districts throughout the year. I urge everyone to check with your local offices to see what is being offered and take advantage of them. Most of them are free or low cost and they offer a wealth of information that we as Ikes should know.

The first weekend in October, I will be attending part 2 of 5 of the Leadership Series being offered by the Indiana Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts in Lafayette.

This year the SWCD sponsored a poster contest entitled "Where Does Your Water Shed?" The winner, a 3rd grader from North Vermillion School won the state award and her poster is being entered into the National Contest. I will be taking the photos on Monday when she is presented her state award.

It looks as though the SWCDs this year are going to be focusing on soil health and how we can preserve what we have and improve that which has been diminished. It is not an easy process but with a little common sense and a whole lot of work, it can be accomplished. We need to focus on eliminating run-off, encourage cover crops and minimize tilling.

Purdue Extension presented a free webinar on September 13th entitled 2014 Agricultural Outlook Summary. It covered a wide range of topics including but not limited to crop prospects and strategies for marketing, land values, cash rents and government policy.

SOUTHERN VP REPORT

September, 2013

By Clara Walters

This is my last report as Southern VP. I have enjoyed my year and will probably continue to visit those chapters simply because they are great chapters

I did visit all my chapters this last quarter with the exception of Gene Stratton Porter. They do not have a chapter house and do not hold formal meetings.

My home chapter is the Clinton Chapter and I am there for every meeting. They have received their gaming permit and are in the process of raffling off a Henry Golden Boy .22 Military Tribute rifle to raise funds for the chapter. They held a Labor Day Membership Drive and garnered 15 new members. The grounds were open to the public and Rich Walters fixed beans cooked over an open fire. Their Hunter Education class was put on hold due to conflicting schedules with the DNR instructors. They held a public fishing tournament on Sept 7 and 8. A lifetime achievement award was presented by Jerry Taylor, the president, to Mike and Karen Pierce for all the work they have done since 1987. There was also a brass plaque engraved for the wall of honor in their name as well as a tree which will probably be called Mike's tree. They

have held their hunting sign-up and are all set for hunting season. All their required reporting to National has been done.

I visited the Terre Haute Chapter for their August meeting. They are debating allowing hunting on the property as well as rules for ATV's. They are building birdhouses again this year with the 4-H kids in Clay County. They moved the time of their meeting today to allow for volunteers to build the birdhouses and still attend the meeting. They held a Labor Day party for the members and for the karaoke in the evening, the admission was canned goods or school supplies to be given to a Clay County charity for distribution. They do a lot of charity work. They completed their shower house and had a ribbon cutting ceremony. President Karen Jones presented awards to volunteers who had gone above and beyond on the shower house. It took a very long time to work through the red tape and get the project completed. I presented their membership award from National to them. They presented all that had been done in the last year which includes the Veterans Memorial, food plot, archery training, Energize Indiana, Big Brother/Big Sister activities, planted trees for Arbor Day, Run for Riley participation, Fishing Rodeo for kids, opened a Facebook page, printed promotion brochures, Riverwatch and flower planting. They have also purchased a Skag lawnmower for keeping up the grounds.

I also attended the Evansville meeting and presented them with their membership award. They are over 800 members at this time. They handle their elections a little differently since they send out ballots to all members. They will not have their officers and board elected until the September meeting. They have been advised that they have to have their officer report form into National the day after the elections are complete. They are still working with the Scout troop. One of the Scouts is working towards Eagle Scout and he is going to make duck boxes for the chapter as part of his service project. They had gotten involved with allowing Girls With Guns to use the ranges. Now there is an issue with the national GWG and this chapter, as well as numerous others, has broken away and become re-established. The chapter has set a user fee for guests at the gun range in order to defray the cost of repairs to the new ranges. They have rigid rules in place for shooters with safety being the prime one.

When I went to the Miami Chapter, I presented them with their membership award from National as well as the award for Greg Sharp from Division. This was election night and for the most part, they had enough volunteers to fill all the positions that were open. The officers have pretty much stayed the same. They brought up the Bike Ride on September 7th to raise money to put a roof on the chapter house. They were also doing a Tiny Tots Motorcycle w/training wheels with a band from 7-11 PM. They still have Scout troops using the grounds. There was also discussion about opening a gun range but it was decided not to have one.

I have been working with a grass roots movement in Hancock County for the past couple weeks. I received an e-mail about some land that had been in agriculture and had woodlands on it. The County Council approved a plan to build a 35 acre sports complex on it without an environmental study or holding a public hearing because they felt it was not of significant interest. The citizens of the county took exception to it when they found out 7 months later. They were concerned because the area floods on a regular basis and the 300 car parking lot would be running off into Spring Lake which in turn dumps into the Sugar Creek Watershed. As of this writing, the Council has overturned the approval of the plan. It is not known whether or

not the owners of the proposed complex will be fighting it.

WORKERS, RELAX

By John de Graaf

The late, great environmentalist David Brower used to say that there will be no profits, no corporations, no economic growth, and by implication, no successful economies on a dead planet.

Brower, who made the Sierra Club a powerful force for conservation and founded Friends of the Earth, often delivered what he called his “sermon.” He compressed the age of the Earth, some 4.6 billion years, into the biblical week of creation.

The Earth forms on Sunday morning, and by Tuesday afternoon, the first life-forms arrive. Over the next few days, they grow larger and more complex. On the last day of the week, at 10:00 a.m., the dinosaurs show up. They last until 3:00 p.m., when an asteroid ends their reign. Only three minutes before midnight on the final night, humans arrive. And only in the last tiny

fraction of a second before midnight do we get the consumer society that began after World War II.

In that last fraction of a second, we have used more resources than all human beings who ever lived before that time, reduced our soils and fisheries by half, caused the extinction of countless species, and changed the climate. Our leaders believe that what we’ve been doing for that last fraction of a second can continue indefinitely. They are considered normal and reasonable, Brower observed, but actually, they are stark, raving mad.

We can’t grow on like this.

Already, our “ecological footprint” is well in excess of what is sustainable for future generations. And beyond a modest level of income, growth doesn’t make countries happier either. So perhaps we should be asking a different question: Is continuous growth undercutting our efforts to create a successful economy? I think so.

Economic growth, our current indicator of success, is measured by the rise of the gross domestic product (GDP), the market value of the goods and services we produce, the sum total of things bought and sold. It’s commonly agreed that GDP is a blunt instrument; it doesn’t measure valuable activities that are not monetized (e.g. housework) and it counts (as a plus) expenditures that only alleviate things gone wrong (e.g. cancer treatments). Perhaps Bobby Kennedy put it best when he said, “It measures, in short, everything except that which makes life worthwhile.”

By all accounts, the United States’ economy has grown faster than those of Europe over the past two decades, when measured by GDP. We trumpet that fact as indicating the success of our economic model. But Italian economist Stefano Bartolini makes a powerful case for a different view. He says our more rapid growth rate is a symptom of American economic decay, not dynamism. In his new book, *Manifesto for Happiness*, to be published in English this year by

the University of Pennsylvania, Bartolini calls the United States “the example not to follow.”

In short, his argument is this: Growing inequality has left median American hourly incomes flat for a generation while GDP doubled. We were able to purchase the increased volume of consumer goods produced by working longer hours and by taking on excessive personal debt. But more work and more stuff have left us much lonelier and less connected with each other, while growing debt has led to calls for slashing taxes, leading to higher prices for public goods such as higher education or access to public parks.

We have been encouraged to counter these losses by purchasing even more private goods (Want friends? Buy a hot car...Want nature? Fly to a tropical paradise...), leading to even heavier debt and workloads. Moreover, our lifestyles, built around private consumption, have created low-density sprawl that makes public transit too expensive and encourages automobile dependence, longer commutes, and even less social connection, while further reducing public space and access to nature. It’s a vicious circle.

Bartolini argues that free or publically provided and often non-material need-satisfiers have atrophied or been crowded out by costly private consumer goods.

The outcome is poor health (the worst in the rich world), time stress, greater anxiety, and diminished happiness, including a suicide rate that now exceeds that for traffic fatalities. Yet our expenditures to soften these impacts (the highest health care costs in the world, for example) mean our economy grows faster than Europe’s, where people work and consume less and devote more time to social relationships. We are hamsters, turning the wheel faster and faster but never moving forward to better lives.

This result can scarcely be called a “successful” economy. Economic success is better measured the way Bhutan measures it. Since 1972, that tiny Himalayan kingdom has been promoting Gross National Happiness rather than GDP. With Bhutan’s encouragement, the United Nations is now advocating “equitable and sustainable well-being” as the goal of development instead of mere economic growth, while asking member nations to measure their success in pursuing happiness. A better measurement of “success” is the first step toward balance and well-being.

In the United States, an organization called *The Happiness Initiative* has been working with colleges and communities on such a measurement of progress, using a comprehensive but short survey that measures life satisfaction in ten “domains” identified by researchers as essential for happiness: financial security; environmental quality; physical and mental health; education; arts and culture; government; social connection; workplace quality and time balance.

“Time Balance” scores for Americans are uniformly low, leading, after years of experience, to my own recipe—supported by Juliet Schor, Gus Speth, and others—for strategically moving towards a successful economy without continuous economic growth: work reduction.

High unemployment is certainly no indication of economic success; indeed, it contributes greatly to unhappiness. As productivity increases, employment must be maintained either by greater production (with attendant environmental costs) or by sharing and shortening work hours

through reduced work weeks, longer vacations, liberal family and sick leave policies, and greater opportunities for decently remunerated part-time work with benefits.

Work reduction would provide more economic security and more time for self-chosen activity—exercise, gardening, volunteering, environmental restoration and stewardship, socializing, stress-reducing leisure, personal care giving. Yet, this obvious answer to the question of how to create a successful economy without continuous growth has been systematically excluded from American politics since the Second World War.

Some argue that it will be very difficult to change the laws that permit work without end. They forget that it will be far harder to change the laws of Physics to permit growth without end.

[John de Graaf is a documentary film maker. He is the Executive Director of Take Back Your Time and co-founder of The Happiness Initiative. Source: Center for Humans and Nature, <<http://www.humansandnature.org/economy-john-de-graaf-response-68.php>>. Reprinted from the Summer 2013 edition of Population Press]

WHITEHOUSE RESPONSE

[The following letter was in response to my letter asking for a much stronger stance by the Obama administration to combat climate change. Statements by the administration did not give nearly enough importance, in my estimation, to reducing energy consumption and moving away from all fossil fuels as well as the biofuels that compete with food crops. Below is the reply.]

Dear Jim:

Thank you for writing. Few challenges are more urgent than climate change, and I appreciate your perspective.

For the sake of our children and our future, we must do more to combat climate change. Its effects, including warmer temperatures, extreme weather, and sea level rise, are already being felt across our Nation and around the world. The 12 hottest years on record have all come in the last 15. Heat waves, droughts, wildfires, and floods are all increasingly frequent and intense. We can choose to believe that these disasters are the result of coincidence, or we can accept the overwhelming judgment of science and act before it is too late. Our planet's future depends on a global commitment to permanently reduce the greenhouse gas pollution causing climate change.

In my first year in office, I set a goal of significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. Today, my Administration's actions have helped drive down our carbon emissions to their lowest level in nearly two decades. We are now on a path to a cleaner and more secure energy future—but there is still more work to be done.

Changing the way we produce and use energy is essential to protecting our environment for future generations. To decrease our dependence on oil and cut pollution, my Administration has established the toughest new fuel economy standards in history. These standards will double the

fuel efficiency of our cars and light trucks by the middle of the next decade, saving families money at the pump while slashing harmful carbon pollution. Our Nation is becoming a global leader in advanced vehicles, and auto dealers are selling more hybrid vehicles than ever before. I am calling on Congress to use some of our oil and gas revenues to fund an Energy Security Trust that will drive new research and technology to shift our cars and trucks off oil for good. The Trust will support research into a range of cost-effective technologies, including advanced vehicles that run on electricity, homegrown biofuels, and domestically produced natural gas.

Thanks in part to my Administration's investments in clean energy—the largest of their kind in American history—the United States has doubled renewable energy generation from wind, solar, and geothermal sources, and tens of thousands of Americans now have jobs as a result. I also set a goal to double renewable electricity production again by 2020 to build on our momentum and create even more jobs. The United States military—the largest energy consumer in the world—is reducing its fuel use and improving its operational performance through a historic commitment to clean energy.

We must lead the world in developing the technology and driving the innovation that will power tomorrow's industries and jobs. Congress must come together to pursue a bipartisan, market-based solution to climate change. This should not be a divisive issue—it is one in which the best interests of our planet and the well-being of our economy are fundamentally aligned. I have repeatedly called on Congress to stop giving away \$4 billion a year in oil and gas subsidies to an industry that has never been more profitable, and instead to pass clean energy tax credits to cultivate a market for innovation in clean energy technology in the United States. And if Congress does not act soon to reduce pollution and speed the transition to more sustainable sources of energy, I am prepared to take executive action.

As we work to reduce our own emissions and build resilience to climate change, we must also forge solutions that ensure other countries do the same. My Administration led international climate negotiations that produced the first national greenhouse gas reduction commitments by major developed and developing countries, the most robust transparency system for reviewing commitments to date, and historic global climate resiliency efforts. At the same time, we have worked through a range of international initiatives, including through the G-20, for the global phase-out of inefficient fossil fuel subsidies around the world. The threat posed by climate change is not confined within the borders of any country, and our response must continue to be global.

Finally, we must take action to prepare our communities for the consequences of climate change. Through the Climate Change Adaptation Task Force launched by my Administration in 2009, Federal agencies have developed first-ever initiatives to ensure our communities, economy, infrastructure, and natural resources are resilient in the face of extreme weather and other impacts of climate change. We are also helping increase the preparedness and resilience of American communities by providing actionable scientific information and technical assistance to cities and towns that are already feeling the impacts of rising seas, more severe storms, and other effects of climate change.

We must summon the spirit of optimism and the willingness to tackle tough problems that led

previous generations to meet the challenges of their times. My Administration is making a serious, sustained commitment to address climate change, and I encourage you to learn more about our efforts at www.WhiteHouse.gov/energy/climate-change.

Thank you, again, for writing.
Sincerely,
Barack Obama

[Note the reference to “homegrown natural gas and biofuels.” Not good. The U.S. is not moving all that well in combating climate change, but the President is right in that more work needs to be done. Lots more.]

WALTONIAN NOTES

The HOOSIER WALTONIAN is published quarterly. The deadline for each issue is always the Friday following each quarterly Division meeting. As editor, I am not able to attend all of the meetings so it is advised to send any submission to me at the e-mail address which always appears in the fourth column on page two of every issue. You are encouraged to send in your article before the meeting.

Articles can be sent in a variety of formats. Word 2007, WordPerfect 12, or a Rich Text or other basic file format. It can also be a Google Drive document or simply be part of your e-mail text itself. I can work with several of these. If I cannot, I will e-mail you asking you to send your article again in a format I can work with. I cannot use text saved as an image file. Also, do not send files in any kind of text or image box.

Articles can also be mailed the old fashioned way. Here you need to be sure to include a phone and an e-mail I can use to contact you with questions.

If you have ideas about articles you would like to see in the Waltonian contact me via e-mail. Don't be surprised if you are asked to help develop the idea. But, if you need help with any aspect of your article and/or help with research tools to help you develop your issue I will be glad to help.

As editor, I have placed high importance on some issues. These are well within the scope of IWLA policy and interest. To me, they represent the quintessential issues of our time and how we as a society deal with them will determine the quality of life on this planet.

These issues are Population, Climate Change, Energy, and Food. This is pretty basic stuff and these issues are related. My intent is to highlight these issues to improve league members ability to address the challenges and opportunities they present.

Keep in mind one of the big drawbacks of a quarterly publication. It is not possible to be timely, except in some instances, like when a vote in Congress is delayed. It remains unclear if a second Division web site will be funded that can address the time challenges of any print media, so keep in mind the delay involved between submitting an article and it being published. After submission it could be six to eight weeks before the HOOSIER WALTONIAN gets into the members hands. Submissions to a web site could be loaded in minutes.