



Bringing in the GREEN

It's hard to believe that 2010 is flying past so quickly. Spring will soon be here and we're all looking forward to *bringing in the green* with our lawns, flower beds, golf courses, crops and *bringing in the green* with our crop protection products and seeds.

 As quickly as this year is going, we would be remiss not to be sure that you have these dates on your calendar and will join us if at all possible.

 The **SCPA Washington Hill Trip** is scheduled for May 10-11. Participants will arrive in Washington on Monday, May 10 for an issues briefing session and dinner and visit congressmen and senators from our fifteen southern states on Tuesday, May 11. This is your opportunity to bring our concerns to your representative's or senator's attention. If your schedule will allow you to attend, please let the SCPA office know so that we can place you on a team. Appointment request letters will be sent out soon and teams must be finalized before the letters are sent.

The **SCPA Annual Meeting** will be held October 24-27 at the Don Cesar Beach Resort in St. Pete Beach, FL. The program committee is already hard at work planning another outstanding meeting. The meeting is designed to provide participants with an educational and informative program, ample time for small intimate business meetings and time for some fun things as well - golf tournament, two tours, and silent auction. Registration packets will be mailed out this summer. In the meantime, be sure to mark your calendar. We don't want you to be *green* with envy when you hear how much fun we had and you missed it! See you there!!



AT A GLANCE	
Viewpoint	2
USDA Misleads on Farming Climate Future	3
Climate Change	4
Add USDA to your anti-ag list	5
Short Takes	6

View points...

"Uphill Climb"

by Edgar W. Duskin, Executive Vice President

The election of 2008 is beginning to affect agriculture and our industry more and more. Many of the issues now coming into sharper focus have been around for a long time. Attacks on pesticides and our industry as a whole by anti-pesticide groups and now even more so by the government – EPA in particular - are coming more frequently and on a broader scale. The following paraphrased extract from the legal department of CropLife America succinctly states the problem.

“For decades, opponents have attempted to restrict, if not eliminate entirely, the lawful sale and use of beneficial crop protection products through both lawsuits filed in the courts and petitions filed with the government. The last year has seen an increase in these challenges. Activists have received assistance, coordinated and not, from allies within the government itself. Recently appointed political officials in EPA and other agencies have also attempted to implement a new regulatory regime that would make it exceedingly more difficult and costly for the pesticide industry companies to develop, sell, and market their products.”

Our opponents, we believe with EPA acquiescence, are using the courts to maximum advantage. The **Endangered Species Act** seems to allow it to lend itself to maximum misuse. In particular, the requirement for consultation between EPA and the National Marine Fisheries Service and Fish and Wildlife Service on the effects a pesticide might have on an endangered species is a nightmare. Attitude and inadequate staffing make these two organizations a favorite vehicle. Certain federal courts, i.e., the 9th circuit compound the issue.

Closely tied to the ESA problems are recent decisions by other circuit courts which affect the **Clean Water Act**. Of particular note is the recent decision by the 6th Circuit Court which declares legitimately applied pesticides as wastes in most circumstances. The decision ends up by negating labels approved under **FIFRA** – the statute that has served to register and regulate pesticides since its passage many years ago. When an applied pesticide “becomes a waste,” the next step is that waste is to be controlled by another statute – the Clean Water Act which requires a permit (NPDES) for its discharge as a “point source”. An appeal to the Supreme Court is awaiting decision for a hearing or not. The new EPA strongly has tried to have it both ways. It has publicly and on record opposed the request by industry for a Supreme Court hearing, but at the same time has stated that it does not agree with the 6th Circuit Court’s decision (cont. p. 6)

"The Silly Season"

by Bucky Kennedy, Director of State Affairs

Once again we have reached everyone’s favorite season, the silly season. This is the time when all of the legislatures come back into session and look for ways to make everyone’s life better or worse depending on your view. Some will introduce legislation relating to taxes, others will propose establishing an animal welfare board, and some will introduce legislation to make sweet tea mandatory in the state.

Our industry will of course see its fair share of legislation both positive and negative. The legislation on the positive will far be outweighed by harmful legislation but your state affairs committee will be diligent in fighting it. Some legislation will be introduced with the caveat that it will be for the benefit of the environment or the protection of human health. Others will just come out and try to ban some of our products. It is our duty to educate and inform them of the drastic effects and consequences that their legislation will have. Other times we will have to rely on our friends in the legislatures and have direct conversations with them to make them aware that what they are proposing would not allow us to produce the safest, most abundant food supply in the world.

We have already seen legislation to increase fees in Maryland, Mississippi, and Oklahoma. Your fees that you pay to register products are to pay for and maintain a viable and productive pesticide program. Some states will try to take the money from these fees and balance strained budgets. It is our position that fees and money from the state treasury should be used to fund these programs because it is a benefit for the citizens of the state as well. This is going to be a busy year for budget shortfalls and it could even carry over into 2011.

As we keep you aware of what is happening at the state and federal level, please stay in contact with your local legislator and congressman and let us know what you are hearing. You are an important link to these elected officials. Continue to be diligent and promote our industry.



USDA Misleads on Farming's Climate Future

by Dennis T. Avery - The U.S. Department of Agriculture has issued new report that attempts to forecast the impact of climate change on American farming in the next 50 years. USDA seems to expect serious climate-related farming problems ahead, but the recent changes in global climate have been tiny—and in the “wrong” direction! The earth’s temperatures are now slightly cooler than when NASA’s James Hansen first warned the U.S. Senate about “runaway global warming” in 1988.

Senior climate researcher Kevin Trenberth of the National Center for Atmospheric Research recently admitted to colleagues “we have no idea why the earth isn’t warming, and it’s a travesty that we don’t know.” That’s a quote from one of those e-mails leaked at Britain’s University of East Anglia.

That pretty much tells us how much faith we dare to put in the new USDA climate-change forecasts.

The USDA report’s timing couldn’t have been worse. Since 2007, the earth seems to have passed a “tipping point” into global cooling—at least temporarily. NASA told us in 2008 that the Pacific Ocean had shifted into a cool cycle, after strong warming both globally and in the Pacific from 1976-1998 and cooling from 1940-1975.

What does USDA predict from its new computer-generated look into the future?

- Grain and oilseed crops will mature more rapidly, because of shorter, warmer winters—although rainfall may be more variable, perhaps even with more

- drought. (*Seems reasonable and generally beneficial—but hardly earth-shaking.*)
- Horticultural crops may be more vulnerable to climate change than field crops, since climate factors impact appearance and quality of the produce. (*How much did this big report cost*)
- Livestock mortality will decrease with warmer winters, but USDA claims this will be more than offset by greater death losses during hotter summers. (*More cattle die in blizzards than in summer pastures equipped with shade opportunities*)
- Weeds may grow more rapidly with elevated levels of atmospheric CO₂. (*But so do crop plants. It’s a wash.*)
- Disease and insect prevalence will escalate as a result of shorter, warmer winters. (*Vaccines and medications have been more important than modest temperature changes—for both human and livestock diseases.*)
- The trends toward reduced mountain snowpack and earlier spring snowmelt runoff in the western U.S. imply changes in the availability of irrigation water. (*We’ve had lots of snowpack since 2007. Can the USDA tell us when that will change back again, and why?*)

USDA left out the most important information about CO₂ and farming’s future: More CO₂ in the atmosphere

raises crop yields substantially, acting like fertilizer for the plants and increasing their water use efficiency. Doubling CO₂ in the air raises the yields of herbaceous plants 30–50 percent, and of trees by 50–80 percent, based on hundreds of studies in dozens of countries.

Higher CO₂ levels should mean higher crop and livestock yields! Talley ho!

Resources:

B.A. Kimball, 1983, “Carbon Dioxide and Agricultural Yields: An Assemblage and Analysis of 430 Prior Observations,” *Agronomy Journals* 75, pp 779-788.

K.E. Idso and S. B. Idso, 1994, “Plant Responses to Atmospheric CO₂ Enrichment in the Face of Environmental Constraints, A Review of the past 10 years’ Research,” *Agriculture and Forest Meteorology* 69, pp 153–203.

R.R. Nemani et al., 2003, “Climate-Driven Increases in Global Terrestrial Net Primary Production from 1982 to 1999,” *Science* 300, pp 1560-1563.

DENNIS T. AVERY is a senior fellow for the Hudson Institute in Washington, DC. He is an environmental economist and was formerly a senior analyst for the Department of State. He is co-author, with S. Fred Singer, of Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1500 Hundred Years, Readers may write him at PO Box 202, Churchville, VA 24421 or email to cgfi@hughes.net



Climate Change: Back to the future?

Excerpted from Patriot Post - written by Mark Alexander, Jan 14, 2010

Three decades ago, scientists coldly calculated that another ice age was imminent. But, no longer. Today, they are prophesying that ice caps will melt within the next hundred years and swamp coastal lowlands. That is unless, and only unless, an international governing authority is established posthaste to control economic/ industrial development that is blamed for global warming.

What is the truth? Earth's climate *is* changing. It always has, and it always will. Mean global temperatures might, in fact, have trended upward, though recently, many climatologists are now suggesting that the planet might be in a 10-30 year cooling trend.

If anthropogenic (manmade) CO₂ really has been responsible for a global warming trend over the last two decades, then why, with more man-caused CO₂ today than at any other time in history, would the climate be cooling now? CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere are estimated to have increased from 280 parts per million before 1750 (industrialization) to 387ppm today — a 38% increase, so the ice age hype of the 1970s notwithstanding, how could a warming trend be interrupted?

The Obama administration and their Leftmedia minions are double-talking this apparent contradiction, claiming that global warming is responsible for global cooling, and the lemmings are buying it wholesale.

Moreover, why would those scientists who insist they can predict the temperature 100 years from now, fail to predict the current cooling trend?

There are many factors influencing climate. Variations in solar cycles, solar radiation deflection/absorption, the earth's core, ocean currents, complicated climate cycles, urban islands, rain forest depletion in some regions, reforestation in other regions and volcanic eruptions are just a few. The influence and interaction of all these factors and many more are much too complex to model precisely enough to draw conclusions about temperature rises and drops next month, much less next century.

According to the best scientific evidence available, much of our planet has been buried under ice for most of the last million years. The duration of the ice ages was about 100,000 years, the most recent beginning approximately 114,000 years ago when global temperatures abruptly plummeted. Just as suddenly, about 10,000 years ago the planet warmed and glaciers receded.

I checked, and there were no coal-burning fuel plants or SUVs in 8000 BC, but that will, of course, not deter the climate alarmists and their cult following.

Despite scandals involving global warming alarmists — most recently the suppression of contradictory evidence by climatologists at the University of East Anglia - and Albert Gore's outright lies at Copenhagen, it is important to understand that there is a relationship between CO₂ levels and global temperature — the “greenhouse effect.”

Though 99% of our atmosphere consists of nitrogen (78% by volume) and oxygen (21% by volume), without greenhouse gasses, primarily in the form of water vapor, in the remaining 1% of air, the mean temperature of earth's climate might be as much as 40C degrees lower.

However, the overriding question is not whether the climate is changing — it is — but *why* is the climate changing? Answering that question requires steady, rational analysis and conclusions, not hyped-up fear mongering driven by political agendas and bolstered by phony so-called “carbon credit” scams.

Though we mere mortals have a natural desire to predict the future and be the arbiters of our own destiny and that of our planet, when it comes to our ability to control global climate, the fact is we probably have less control than a butterfly has in a tornado.

Of course, all the hyperbole about climate change is not so much about global warming or cooling as it is about centralization of the global economy and usurpation of national sovereignty by supranational governing entities.

Though the climate may be cooling or warming, Leftists never let facts impede their power grabbing agenda, and such is the case with Obama's “cap and trade” tax legislation. After usurping the banking, investment, insurance and auto industries and attempting to slice up the national health care sector, the Obama administration will be redoubling its efforts to enact CO₂ legislation in order to control the industrial sector of our economy.

The bottom line is this: Human activity does affect the climate. Every time you exhale CO₂, you increase the concentration of that minuscule greenhouse gas in the atmosphere - but if you want to make a positive impact upon the environment, don't hold your breath. Roll up your sleeves and promote liberty, because, per capita, it is the free nations of the world that have the cleanest environments.

But make no mistake; those who are attempting to enact global mandates are advancing, first and foremost, socialist economic agendas under the guise of concern for the global climate. The implication for liberty, in those few pockets of the world where it still exists, is ominous.



Add USDA to Your Anti-Ag List

Excerpted from Feedstuffs, January 4, 2010, written by Trent Loos

As we charge into 2010, those of us in agriculture have come to realize that we must deal with groups outside of agriculture that want to forever change the structure of food production, and in most cases, simply eliminate the production of meat, milk and eggs in this country.

Today, I am adding another group to the list of those working against the heart of agriculture. You may have heard of it: the U.S. Department of Agriculture. If you think that sounds extreme, allow me to explain.

Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack when speaking in Denmark at the December “climate change” conference said, “While climate change will affect us all, there are particular vulnerabilities and challenges for farmers, ranchers and those who make a living off the land. Higher temperatures, changing rainfall patterns and more frequent extreme events like droughts and flooding threaten to reduce yields and increase the occurrence of crop failure.”

History shows that the worst blizzards occurred before 1900, the worst hurricanes happened in 1900 and we called the decade of the 1930s the “dirty 30s” for a reason. My point is that farmers and ranchers have always dealt with climate change, and it has nothing to do with fossil fuels or carbon sequestration.

The USDA report “The Effects of Climate Change on U.S. Ecosystems” suggests that global warming could have a negative impact on livestock. Warmer temperatures could reduce mortality in the winter, but hotter summers will reduce productivity and increase death loss.

Excuse me. The U.S. produces more than 9 billion animals each year, and the majority is in concentrated animal feeding operations. That means they are in a totally controlled environment, so no matter how hot or cold it is outside, the animals inside are experiencing no effects from weather.

Vilsack not only supports this global warming campaign but also rejected the advice of his own Chief Economist Joe Glauber, whose data indicate that the carbon

program the government is hoping to implement is not beneficial or plausible for American farmers.

The authors of the report clearly state that there is no way to say whether humans had anything to do with climate change in the past, but “we need to change our farming practices” because we believe in our theory. On page 21, there is something that no one at USDA will likely include in their presentations to the media and the public. It reads, “For the moment there is no viable alternative to using the existing systems for identifying climate change and its impact on U.S. agriculture, land resources, water resources and biodiversity. The authors of this report also have very limited confidence in the ability of current observation and monitoring systems to provide the information needed to evaluate the effectiveness of actions taken to mitigate or adapt to climate change impacts. Much of our understanding of the direct effects of temperature, elevated carbon dioxide, ozone, precipitation and nitrogen deposition has come from manipulative experiments.”

Yes, it appears that now have a new group looking to forever change the production of food in the U.S. through the use of an agenda and carefully selected bits of partial information that support its mission. The U.S. Global Change Research Program is housed at 1717 Pennsylvania Ave. in Washington, DC and is working with the Heinz Center to develop “observation and monitoring systems that are able to support their analyses that can aid this management challenge.”

Doesn't that mean gathering only data that support their theory? I believe this may well be just another pr stunt by the Obama Administration to scare the American public into believing that U.S. agriculture and food production are in jeopardy so they can implement massive legislative and regulatory changes.

I, for one, am not buying it, and I will not budge off of my notion that global warming is the largest manmade hoax the world has ever seen.



SHORT TAKES

Trevor Thorley, former President and CEO of Valent USA Corp. has joined **Amvac Chemical Corp.** as Exec. VP and COO.

We're so happy to report that **Joe Will** with Southern States is back at work now!

Chemtura Corp. announced the election of **Craig Rogerson** to the position of President, CEO, and chairman of the board.

Agrian, Inc. and **Farm Press Publications**, a member of **Penton Media, Inc's Agricultural Group**, have announced an agreement in which Farm Press will become the national sales arm of Fresno-based Agrian's advertising division.

In Memoriam . . .

Dave Redmond with Stoller Chemicals (formerly with BASF Corp.) passed away on Jan. 24 from pancreatic cancer.

Johnny Mack Brown, formerly with Stauffer Chemicals and ChemNut passed away on Feb. 4 from an aneurysm.



Uphill Climb - cont. from page 2

which caused the problem in the first place.

Compounding the CWA problem for pesticides, a tangential problem exists concerning what are “waters of the United States” and “navigable waters.” Until this is settled, even if an NPDES permit is required under the 6th Circuit Court decision – we won’t know where it is applicable and where it is not.

The **Clean Air Act** and potential greenhouse gas (GHG) can have a yet undetermined effect on pesticide applicators through possible focus on volatilization. Potential problems for manufacturers under a “cap-and-trade” or similar program are too onerous to imagine.

Spray drift and the potential for lawsuits therefrom and EPA’s attempt to set rules through labeling requirements is just one more major potential problem area.

There are many more issues out there – any one of which could blow up into a major problem. We list a few hereafter:

Exposure assessment

Alleged **endocrine** effects of pesticides

Antitrust implications of possible “industry concentration” and control of “bio” traits

Efforts to **eliminate use of pesticides around schools and children**

Efforts to **blame sites of pesticide manufacturing, storage and distribution** as deliberate efforts to take advantage of poverty stricken neighborhoods and **homeland security site** problems

Global warming – climate change – greenhouse gases (GHG), carbon dioxide are being made a vehicle for environmental activism at many levels.

The list can go on and on. Suffice it to say that with an “anti pesticide”, anti-business administration staffed with pro radical environmentalists, we’re in for an uphill fight in the next four years. As has happened before, overreach at some point will reel them in. We’ve got to fight and stay afloat – tell our story and convince the public that we are a needed and useful adjunct to society.