LAST SUMMER Friends of the Earth’s growing number of e-activists effectively made their voices heard on two important campaigns. In July, they sent thousands of letters to the International Maritime Organization demanding that it act on a potentially devastating project to dump iron particles into the Pacific Ocean as an alleged solution to global warming. As a result, at its convention this November, the IMO will be looking at placing restrictions on such projects. In August, our e-activists supported citizens in Armenia who are trying to protect an ancient forest from deforestation to accommodate an open-pit copper mine. Again our activists proved their power by sending thousands of letters to key decision makers in Armenia and the U.S.

You too can make your voice heard and help Friends of the Earth’s campaigns by signing up for our e-activist list on our homepage. Ask your friends to do the same! The coming year holds a lot in store for activists wanting to do their part to protect the health of our planet.

This fall, a major battle is underway over energy legislation passed by the House and Senate. The House bill is about 75 percent good while the Senate bill is about 75 percent bad, so the goal is to get the best provisions from each and reject the worst. The best provisions are renewable, clean energy standards and some new tax incentives in the House bill and auto fuel economy (CAFE) standards in the Senate bill, while the worst are the subsidies for corn ethanol and the loan guarantees for new nuclear power plants and for converting coal to a liquid fuel.

Nuclear energy and coal to liquid fuels have serious environmental implications. Nuclear power plants threaten national security and pose risks as we figure out how to dispose of their radioactive waste. Coal to liquid technology means more destructive coal mining, new and very expensive processing plants and a doubling of global warming gas emissions per gallon. Yet while federal legislation continues to support these environmentally harmful industries, it stunts real progress in developing available, cost-effective production of renewable energy like wind and solar power.

And instead of concentrating on raising fuel economy standards for cars, driving less and focusing on conservation, the provisions for corn ethanol subsidies in the energy legislation prop up wasteful lifestyle choices. Wes Jackson, former Friends of the Earth board member and founder of the Land Institute in Kansas, poses the basic dilemma for corn ethanol enthusiasts: Even if all 300 million Americans chose not to eat for a year so as to allow all the cropland that feeds us to grow corn for ethanol, we would not even come halfway to meeting our current needs for fueling our vehicle-driven lifestyles.

As Friends of the Earth looks at the global picture for biofuels, we see the great rainforests of the Amazon, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Indonesia being targeted by governments and transnational corporations for biofuel plantations. Certain biofuels, such as sugar cane and palm oil, pose a most ominous threat to the remaining tropical rainforests on this earth. Such plantations will devastate the ability of these ancient forests to absorb global warming gases in the atmosphere and will wipe away the astonishing biological diversity of these areas.

The plan by President Lula of Brazil to expand ethanol production from sugar cane and soy plantations in order to supply the gluttonous consumption of those in the north could mark the demise of the Amazon. Some scientists are worried that as deforestation of the Amazon gets close to 40 percent of the total area, the whole ecosystem will unravel.

Our feature story describes the extraordinarily ruthless exploitation of Africa’s natural resources such as oil, timber and minerals by companies from industrialized nations, leaving a devastating legacy of pollution and worsening the health of area residents and degrading their living conditions. By exposing the abuses caused by international investments in the extractive industries on the African continent, Friends of the Earth hopes to bring awareness to the interconnectedness of all life on earth. And perhaps make us all see that, as Gandhi said, we can be the change we hope to see in the world.
Our Mission: Friends of the Earth defends the environment and champions a healthy and just world.
Africa
By Roxanne Lawson

FROM PURCHASING HOME gaming systems and mobile phones that contain coltan extracted from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) to filling up at gas stations that get fuel from the Niger Delta, the lifestyle and consumption patterns of many in the U.S. reflect corporate globalization at its core. In many cases, environmental degradation stems from U.S. consumption of products and resources that originate outside our borders.

Perhaps no place exemplifies the intersection of environmental degradation and the politics of corporate globalization more than the African continent. Despite an abundance of resources – the world’s second largest rain forest and the lion’s share of the planet’s mineral deposits such as platinum, tantalite, cobalt and gold – nearly one half of African people live on less than one U.S. dollar a day.

In an effort to meet the needs of the world’s poorest, the international community has focused much of its Africa-related diplomacy on alleviating poverty through promises of debt cancellation, increased aid and investment in extractive industries such as oil, gas and mining. Despite global campaigns, aid money from nation states, charities, financial institutions and other groups to the African continent actually dropped in 2006 by more than five percent. Meanwhile, huge boosts in investments in extractive industries have fueled environmental destruction and increased impoverishment.

International Investors on the African Continent

U.S.-Based Institutions
Since the 1970s, global economic, social and environmental policy has been shaped by international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank Group, the U.S. Treasury, the U.S. Federal Reserve and various like-minded groups. In the mid-1980s the World Bank advised loosening restrictions on foreign investments in the African extractive sectors, even offering tax incentives to attract investors. While this did a lot to promote economic development, it left giant gaps in protections for social and ecological values.

Mining projects in Africa generate large scale destruction at the site –
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Environment and Energy
Wasted by Foreign Investment

Perhaps no place exemplifies the intersection of environmental degradation and the politics of corporate globalization more than the African continent. Despite an abundance of resources – the world’s second largest rain forest and the lion’s share of the planet’s mineral deposits such as...
leaching high levels of arsenic, lead, cyanide and other toxic wastes into the groundwater, destroying vegetation and leading to health problems in local communities.

In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), farmers are abandoning their traditional lifestyles to become miners in an effort to meet the high demand for minerals like coltan and tin. By mining instead of farming they are unintentionally causing further ecological damage to water and land as well as creating severe food shortages for millions of people.

**Chinese-Based Institutions**
Western investment institutions are not the only ones extending development in foreign countries. China is increasingly involved in the development of the African continent.

China’s own rapid economic growth, as it follows in the unsustainable development path of the U.S., is one characterized by income disparity, unfair treatment of workers and lost livelihoods – especially in rural areas. In their overseas investments, the Chinese model is characterized by a low-price/high-cost paradigm that lacks rigorous environmental and social standards, and comes at a very high cost to societies as well as to the environment.

In 2004, the IMF censured Angola for corruption in its oil sector. The China Export-Import Bank, or Chexim, stepped in and offered the government a loan to repair railways and construct new governmental offices. Its only stipulation was that the Angolan government give preference to 35 Chinese construction companies to conduct the project. The project could have boosted the Angolan economy and employed thousands of Africans, but instead China disregarded the best interests of Angolans in favor of propping up Chinese companies.

**What We’re Doing:** Friends of the Earth is working with Congolese and Chinese civil societies to examine the environmental impacts of Chinese investment and to monitor copper and cobalt mining. For more information on this work please visit www.foe.org.

**Cobalt in the Democratic Republic of Congo**
Forty percent of the world’s supply of Cobalt is in the DRC. Cobalt is used in the production of a wide variety of items from recorded media to vitamin B12. In 2005 China was the world’s leading cobalt producer. Approximately three quarters of all cobalt made in China in 2005 was derived from imported concentrates, of which almost 90 percent came from the DRC.

In 2006, one of the largest conglomerates in China purchased three high-grade copper-cobalt mines in Lubumbashi province, and Chinese mining companies have developed cobalt mining and processing projects in Katanga province in the DRC.

These projects cause environmental degradation, deforestation, erosion and biodiversity loss. Assessments of the environmental impacts of both small- and large-scale mining have shown that mining projects have a damaging effect on the health of local citizens and the integrity of ecosystems, downstream forests and unique copper-cobalt-tolerant flora. Additionally, these projects continue to keep local Congolese from profiting from their country’s vast mineral wealth.

**What We’re Doing:** Friends of the Earth is working with Congolese and Chinese civil societies to examine the environmental impacts of Chinese investment and to monitor copper and cobalt mining. For more information on this work please visit www.foe.org.

**Chinese companies are quickly generating the same kinds of environmental damage and community opposition that western companies have spawned around the world.**

**The Economics of Global Warming**
Both the Washington- and China-based models of economic development – particularly in the oil, gas and mining extractive industries – are environmentally destructive and contribute most of the greenhouse gas emissions from the African continent. Yet there is a huge disparity between how these resources are distributed and what the countries supplying them get in return.

The United States is home to five percent of the world’s population and contributes an astounding 25 percent of worldwide greenhouse
Gas Flaring and Oil Conflicts in Nigeria

Decades of oil production in Nigeria have spurred corruption, impoverishment, environmental disasters and violent conflicts, as well as the highest greenhouse gas emissions in sub-Saharan Africa. This is due in particular to a process known as gas flaring, where excess, unusable natural gas released from oil rigs is burned off rather than re-injected into the ground or processed for use by local communities.

Approximately 75 percent of gas produced is flared annually, causing considerable ecological damage to soil, water and vegetation as well as human health. The result is that in the short term, the environment and people suffer from toxic pollution and in the long term, the effects of global warming.

Gas flares in Nigeria are often situated close to villages where community members suffer from a myriad of health issues – particularly cancer and asthma – as a result of breathing flare smoke.

Gas flaring has been associated with reduced crop yields and plant growth as well as the disruption of wildlife in the immediate vicinity. Oil spills and oil dumped into waterways is extensive in Nigeria, poisoning drinking water and destroying vegetation. Spills contaminate the top soil, rendering the soil in the surrounding areas unsuitable for plant growth as it reduces the availability of nutrients and increases toxic waste in the soil.

In addition to the numerous health and environmental issues brought on by oil exploitation, the Nigerian government’s concessions of natural resources to foreign firms stand to increase oil-related conflicts. Nigerian militant groups, frustrated by the lack of resources and opportunity, are demanding that local communities receive benefits from oil extraction. One group, the Movement for the Emancipation of the Nigerian Delta (MEND), has threatened foreign oil firms operating in the Delta with violence and has previously attacked facilities belonging to multinational oil producers, in operations that coincided with taking hostages. Now, Chinese companies are facing similar threats – most recently just days after China signed a $4 billion infrastructure deal for the right to purchase four oil development areas.

What We’re Doing: Friends of the Earth’s International Policy Campaigner and the Green Investments Program Manager have been tracking the environmental impacts of Chinese investment on the African continent. They recently co-authored a chapter on the Impacts of China’s “Going Out Strategy” in Africa in China’s Global Strategy by Dr. Marcel Kitissou (editor) for Adonis & Abbey Publishers Ltd United Kingdom.

And this month Friends of the Earth is launching a campaign aimed at mobilizing support in the U.S. to press ChevronTexaco to end its practice of gas flaring in the Niger Delta. For more information and to join our campaign visit us at www.foe.org.

gas pollution annually. The U.S.’s electricity consumption, ecologically harmful industries and 230 million passenger vehicles are fueling the destruction of the planet.

Conversely, the African continent’s 57 countries are home to 14 percent of the world’s population and contribute only three percent of the global greenhouse gas emissions that cause global warming. The majority of this three percent comes from Nigeria, South Africa and Angola – nations with large-scale extractive industry sectors that feed the consumptive habits of wealthy, developed nations.

Global warming has caused changes in weather patterns that have and will continue to disrupt lives across the continent. Declining crop yields in the next 20 years will lead to more famines and deaths. Droughts and increasing desertification mean smaller areas of viable farm land and an increase in forced migration to more densely populated areas. The results of global warming will inevitably heighten resource scarcity and fuel conflict and war.

At the same time, U.S.-based multinational corporations currently exploiting African resources and people are subsidized through our tax dollars and our patronage when we fill up at the pump or buy certain electronics. As the nation that benefits from the products whose production causes the bulk of the environmental destruction on the African continent, we must hold U.S. corporations and U.S.-supported financial institutions accountable for the role that we all play in this cycle of exploitation, environmental destruction and poverty.
Environmental Indulgences... or Path to Climate Neutrality?

By Erich Pica

FEELING GUILTY ABOUT the global warming emissions you’re pumping into the atmosphere by driving a gas-guzzling SUV or maintaining a large house? For a fee you can now buy carbon credits that purport to offset your carbon-fueled lifestyle. Al Gore and Leonardo DiCaprio already purchase them to offset carbon emissions from their homes and travels. Even Dell Computer will plant a tree for you to offset the carbon emissions from producing and using your computer.

Carbon offsets are becoming a popular tool to “achieve” carbon neutrality. By some accounts, corporations and individuals are spending an estimated $100 million a year on carbon offsets and this number is expected to grow.

Firms in the carbon offsetting business, such as Carbonfund.org or Planktos, host carbon calculators on their websites that determine your global warming emissions and allow you to pay a fee to compensate for those emissions. These fees may go towards planting trees in Armenia, protecting rainforests in Brazil or helping finance the construction of a wind turbine.

While these may sound like ideal paths to the goal of becoming carbon neutral, the issue is fraught with complexity. Carbon offsets are a relatively new idea. There is no national or international governing body regulating the emerging voluntary carbon offset market. Since it’s so new, groups such as the International Emissions Trading Association and The Climate Group are just now creating standards by which to guide the trade. Without regulatory standards, how do you know, for instance, if the Brazilian rainforests you are paying to save haven’t already been “saved” by some else. Who is ensuring that the trees will not be clear-cut five, 10 or 25 years from now? Were these trees even in danger in the first place?

Solving global warming is going to take societal change, and that is precisely what is lacking in carbon offsetting schemes.

Unscrupulous companies trying to make a quick buck with no regard for the impacts of their businesses may find the carbon offsetting market appealing. This summer Friends of the Earth launched a campaign against Planktos to prevent the company from dumping iron into the ocean off the shores of the Galapagos Islands. According to Planktos, the iron would create algae blooms that would in turn absorb carbon dioxide. However, top scientists agree that the plan may threaten the ocean and might not even work.

Despite Planktos’ efforts, the unregulated nature of carbon offsets is beginning to change. In July, Representative Ed Markey (D-Mass.) held a hearing on voluntary carbon offsets that exposed Planktos’ iron dumping plan, as well as set in motion an effort to create more federal oversight of the carbon offset market. The Federal Trade Commission is planning a workshop on carbon offsets to discuss consumer protections.

These efforts still leave unanswered an important question—are carbon offsets little more than feel-good environmental indulgences? Solving global warming is going to take societal change, and that is precisely what is lacking in carbon offsetting schemes. Purchasing carbon offsets allows people to go on with business as usual, while simultaneously undermining investments in renewable energy and energy conservation. Like all purported global warming panaceas that delay individual action, carbon offsets should be considered an indulgence and be thrown out in the upcoming environmental reformation.
When a Prius Just Isn’t Enough: Solving Global Warming Means Less Driving

By Colin Peppard

WE DRIVE OUR CARS more than we should. It’s a statement that very few Americans would disagree with. We are spending more and more time stuck in our cars every year, and it’s not getting any better. By 2030, the total number of miles Americans drive annually is forecast to increase between 50 and 60 percent.

We know that cars and trucks are already an enormous source of global warming pollution in the U.S. So you can imagine that all those extra miles will make the problem much worse. Studies show that higher-mileage cars alone are not going to get us the CO2 reductions we need to stabilize the climate. The Center for Clean Air Policy has found that even if Congress adopted California’s proposed clean cars standards tomorrow – the strictest such rules in the country – CO2 emissions from automobiles would still increase nearly 18 percent by 2030. We need to do more.

Everyone knows that driving a car contributes to global warming, and that taking public transit is a better choice for the environment.

Unfortunately, for most Americans, leaving the car in the garage is just not feasible, since only a small portion of our country has access to high-quality, energy-efficient mass transit options. Mass transit and passenger rail projects across the country are chronically underfunded, even as billions of tax dollars pour into new highways each year.

However, when transit projects are offered as real alternatives to the automobile, people turn out in droves. In 2005, amidst rising gas prices, both Amtrak and transit systems around the country saw record ridership levels. That same year, Americans drove less per capita for the first time in 25 years.

That’s why Friends of the Earth is committed to making sure that by 2050, 75 percent of Americans can use public transportation for 25 percent of their trips. Of course, in the mean time, we’ll continue to aggressively seek higher auto efficiency standards. We just realize that sometimes a Prius isn’t enough.

Special Tax Law Opportunity Ends December 31

IRA holders can make a gift directly from their IRA to a charity without having to recognize the payment as income. Starting at age 70.5, anyone with an IRA must withdraw a certain amount every year – called the Mandatory Required Distribution (MRD) – and pay income taxes on that withdrawal. Through December 31, 2007, gifts of any amount (up to $100,000) can be made from your IRA without recognizing the income and thus avoiding the tax. This will count toward your MRD, allowing you to help FoE and save on taxes.

For more information, contact Chris Pabon at 866-441-7292 or cpabon@foe.org.
URUGUAY IS THE SECOND smallest independent country in South America, bordered by Brazil to the east and Argentina to the west, with the Rio de la Plata and the Atlantic Ocean to the south. Friends of the Earth Uruguay, also known as REDES, ([http://www.redes.org.uy/](http://www.redes.org.uy/)) works with local groups and communities throughout the country and on national policy to protect water and land rights and to prevent multinational corporations from harming the environment and people.

One of REDES' major victories was to achieve a constitutional provision guaranteeing the right to water for all citizens and outlawing privatization of water resources by multinational corporations. In 2004, 65 percent of Uruguayans supported the Constitutional Reform in Defense of Water, paving the way for a public, participative and sustainable national water management system. REDES continues to ensure implementation of the reform, participating on the National Commission in Defense of Water and Life and working directly on how the policy is written.

One of the threats to Uruguay’s water resources is the rapid expansion of forestry plantations. These plantations, often of eucalyptus or other non-indigenous trees, use much more water than native vegetation. The area covered by plantations in Uruguay has grown rapidly in recent years from about 150,000 acres in 1990 to more than two million acres in 2006, and major multinational corporations like Weyerhaeuser continue to purchase land to convert into plantations. REDES works with local groups and grassroots organizations, such as rural women’s groups, to raise awareness of the problems posed by these plantations.

Paper and pulp mills are also a major issue in Uruguay, as they increase the demand for wood and have serious environmental impacts on the areas where they are located. There are several major pulp mills being planned in the country, including one by the Spanish company ENCE, which would be built on an untouched stretch of land along the Rio de la Plata. REDES is working
with concerned citizens in surrounding communities to expose the potential impacts of the ENCE plant on the river and land.

Although large-scale agriculture is growing in the country, much of Uruguay’s farms are still small-scale and family owned. REDES works with Ecotiendas, a local store in the capital city of Montevideo that sells organic products, and other groups to promote national policies to preserve local agriculture and encourage organic farming.

REDES also houses Radio Mundo Real (http://www.radiomundoreal.fm/), an online radio station that provides daily summaries of the latest progressive news in Latin America and around the world. The radio collaborates with rural radio stations to broadcast to communities in Uruguay and throughout Latin America. In addition to a Spanish version of the news, the station puts out material in English and Portuguese and is expanding to French and Italian.

SPOTLIGHT ON OUR FRIENDS

COMMUNITY MEETING ON ENCE PULP MILL

IN MEMORIAM

Friends of the Earth Mourns the Passing of Three Exemplary Environmental Champions This Year

Anita Roddick, founder of the Body Shop, helped pioneer the green personal health industry. She led by example and proved that businesses could rid their products of toxic ingredients while still flourishing. She encouraged customers of the Body Shop to support Friends of the Earth.

Former Congressman Jim Jontz was an early leader in saving U.S. rivers and opposing destructive water projects of the Army Corps of Engineers. As head of the Citizens Trade Campaign, Jontz was active in exposing what trade agreements were doing to communities and the environment.

Perry Knowlton was a life-long environmental philanthropist and Friends of the Earth supporter. In the organization’s early years, Mr. Knowlton was a source of encouragement and advice to founder David Brower in the publication of the “exhibit format” books that featured awe-inspiring, large format photos of wilderness as a means to promoting conservation.
CAUTION CONSUMERS

Natural vs. Synthetic... in Biology?

By Gillian Madill

CONSUMERS BEWARE: there is a new category of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) to worry about. Instead of splicing genes from different plants together, some scientists are trying to fundamentally redesign existing life and create life anew. They are using the convergence of genetics, nanotechnology, robotics, artificial intelligence, and other emerging technologies to essentially remake Eden. This new category is called Synthetic Biology or SynBio.

SynBio poses great threats to human health and the environment. Manipulating the basic code of life in such an invasive and unregulated way promises to challenge the nature of all life. Some scientists are trying to make a new genetic code, designing entirely new forms of life that could destroy the existing balance in nature and cause a catastrophic invasion of alien species into our world.

The first SynBio business ventures are aimed toward consumers: biofuels and pharmaceuticals. In the United States alone, more than 15 companies and most top universities have begun major SynBio programs to develop the first trillion dollar organism that produces biofuels. Pharmaceutical companies and medical universities have begun to develop designer viruses that might cure disease. While these goals may sound noble, the reality is that man-made life will be released into the environment, and will evolve independent of our control. These ‘miracle’ organisms could become killer organisms.

Currently, there are no regulations on SynBio research. We must urge these companies, academic institutions and our government to put a hold on SynBio research until we are sure that it is safe and ethical.
How Do You Like Your Nanoparticles?

By Ian Illuminato

DON’T WANT TO EAT YOUR VEGGIES?
Fine, have a nano-fortified candy bar instead. Given free range, food scientists may soon be using nanotechnology to atomically restructure low nutrient value (junk) foods to create chocolate bars that can be marketed as health-promoting and cola drinks with the nutritional benefits of milk. This vision of atomically reconstituted nano foods has significant implications for our already tenuous relationship with ‘real food and farming.’ It also introduces serious new toxicity risks for human health and the environment.

The long term health implications of eating nano foods remain poorly understood, although preliminary nanotoxicological research has raised a number of warning flags. The novel properties of nanomaterials make them attractive for use in anti-bacterial food packaging or as agrochemical inputs. However, their greater reactivity and extremely small dimensions are also one of the primary mechanisms of nanoparticle toxicity, which may result in the production of free radicals causing oxidative stress, inflammation, and consequent damage to proteins, membranes and DNA. The ability of nanoparticles of supposedly inert substances to negatively affect cellular functions is of major significance and great concern.

Another concern is that nanomaterials now in widespread commercial use, such as nano titanium dioxide and nano silver, have also caused severe toxicity to cells and tissues in test tube experiments.

Yet unaccompanied by public debate, labelling, or government requirements for nano-specific safety testing of nano food ingredients, nanotechnology is rapidly expanding through every sector of the global food chain.

Nanotechnology has potential applications in all aspects of agriculture, food processing, food packaging and even farm and food surveillance. Read Friends of the Earth’s new report on the use of nanotechnology in food processing and food packaging at www.foe.org/nanofood.
Friends of the Earth Wins Court Battle Against Bush Administration

In August, Friends of the Earth won a federal lawsuit against the Bush administration that will require the administration to publish scientific reports about global warming. The administration had been violating a 1990 law that requires it to produce such reports.

Friends of the Earth Wins Suit Against Chevron

This summer, Chevron agreed to fund the addition of more than 1,600 acres of wetlands to the Big Thicket National Preserve in Texas – ending a 13-year lawsuit from Friends of the Earth. The agreement came after a court found that Chevron had violated pollution laws.

Campaign to Prevent Iron Dump Making Waves

The stock of Planktos, a company planning to dump iron into the ocean in what it claims is a bid to offset global warming, has plummeted by more than half since Friends of the Earth began campaigning against the dump. Scientists say the iron dumping scheme threatens the ocean and won’t work.

Griles Going to Jail, Without Passing Go

Former Deputy Secretary of the Interior Department J. Steven Griles will serve 10 months for obstructing the criminal investigation of disgraced lobbyist Jack Abramoff. Friends of the Earth initiated numerous ethics probes involving Griles’ advocacy on behalf of former clients in the oil and gas and coal mining industry while at the Interior Department.

Became a Charter Member of the Global Stewardship Council

ARDENT ENVIRONMENTALISTS Ed Begley Jr. and Jayni Chase, co-chairs of the new Friends of the Earth Global Stewardship Council, invite you to join them in making a difference now to protect a planet under siege.

“I am very proud to be a part of Friends of the Earth and to help in their untiring efforts to defend our environment. Without a doubt, FoE is the environmental group that has been doing the best work for the longest time,” says former Friends of the Earth Board member and charter supporter, actor Ed Begley Jr.

As our planet-wide problems become more urgent, it has become imperative for those of us with the knowledge, the means and the fighting spirit to lead the way in safeguarding the Earth’s future.

Donors of $500 or more are invited to become part of this select group composed of leaders dedicated to ensuring a healthy and just future for the environment and for human beings.

To join now, please mail your contribution to Attn: Ed Begley Jr. and Jayni Chase, Co-Chairs, Global Stewardship Council, Friends of the Earth, P.O. Box 96466, Washington DC 20090-6466. To request more information, contact Marsha Mather-Thrift, Director of Development at (415) 544-0790 x 13 or email mmather@foe.org.
PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

By League of Conservation Voters
President Gene Karpinski

WITH NO INCUMBENT president or sitting vice president running for their party’s nomination in 2008, this year’s presidential primary is the most wide open contest in 80 years. So it comes as no surprise that more than 20 people have announced that they are running for president. At least a handful of those candidates have already fizzled out, and a few more may still throw their hat in before the primaries. This cycle, global warming is gaining greater prominence than in any previous presidential election.

Candidates are focusing on global warming increasingly as the campaigns evolve. As recently as this January, of the current members of the Senate who are running for president, only Senator Chris Dodd was a co-sponsor of the Sanders-Boxer Global Warming Pollution Reduction Act, the most ambitious global warming bill in the Senate that would reduce global warming pollution 80 percent by 2050. Yet by the spring, Senators Joe Biden, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama had signed on as co-sponsors.

Furthermore, Senator Dodd, Governor Bill Richardson and former Senator John Edwards have released comprehensive plans to tackle global warming. Senators Clinton and Obama have outlined key components of their energy policies. Additionally, Senator John McCain, former Mayor Rudy Giuliani and former Governor Mike Huckabee delivered major speeches on their proposed energy polices.

Clearly, many of the candidates have recognized the urgency of addressing global warming. Undoubtedly, many have seen the growing number of polls demonstrating that voters want to see leadership on global warming and our energy future. For example, in the key primary state of New Hampshire, a recent poll found that 90 percent of Democratic and 75 percent of Republican primary voters support federal action to reduce global warming pollution. Additionally, an April 2007 poll in South Carolina – home of the first-in-the-south presidential primary – found that a majority of the state’s primary voters strongly favor an increase in mileage standards for new cars and SUVs to 40 miles-per-gallon instead of the current 24 miles-per-gallon.

However, for all the attention the top tier candidates and primary state voters are giving the issue of global warming, the issue has yet to break through the media filter as the top domestic issue looming in our future. Many political reporters have failed to distinguish the important differences between the candidates’ proposed energy plans. By and large, the candidates have also failed to use the issue of global warming to draw sharp distinctions between their policies and their opponents’ plans.

As the race for the White House continues to heat up, we hope the candidates and the media focus on the need to tackle global warming and cool down our planet. Regardless of who wins the ’08 election, it is essential that they have a plan to address this challenge.

To learn more about where the candidates stand on global warming and energy and to view recent video of the candidates talking about these issues on the campaign trail, visit www.heatison.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Year</th>
<th>Four Years Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than a dozen questions relating to global warming and energy have been posed to the candidates in media-sponsored Democratic and Republican presidential debates that took place in California, New Hampshire and South Carolina.</td>
<td>Not a single question about global warming or energy policy – in either the primary or general elections – was asked of the candidates in the media-sponsored presidential debates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the major candidates regularly talk about global warming in their stump speeches and several candidates have run television ads highlighting their energy policies.</td>
<td>Not a single candidate for president – in either the primary or general elections – made global warming a central issue in their campaign.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hot Ideas for Winter Holiday Shopping

You can find original gifts such as books, CDs, outdoor gear and more at the new Friends of the Earth Online Store. Your gift purchase will support Friends of the Earth’s vital campaigns and help us win new victories that can protect our world. Please visit our online store at www.foe.org.