

Editor's Note: Jay Lehr is one of the nations premier experts on environmental policy and its impact on freedom. In the following article Dr. Lehr delivers the facts, step by step, about the fictions of global warming. Every public school student should have a copy of this document to help counter the propaganda found in school text books and in the repeated showings of Al Gore's flawed film, "An Inconvenient Truth." --TAD



## Significant Evidence that Mankind Has an Insignificant Impact on the Climate of Planet Earth

By Jay Lehr. Ph.D.

Science Director of *The Heartland Institute* - [www.globalwarmingheartland.org](http://www.globalwarmingheartland.org)

### SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE

1- Carbon Dioxide is not a pollutant. On the contrary it makes crops and forests grow faster. Mapping by satellite shows that the earth has become about 6% greener overall in the past two decades, with forests expanding into arid regions. The Amazon rain forest was the biggest gainer, with two tons of additional biomass per acre per year. Certainly climate change does not help every region equally, but careful studies predict overall benefit, fewer storms, more rain, better crop yields, longer growing seasons, milder winters and decreasing heating costs in colder climates. The news is certainly not bad and on balance may be rather good.

2- Climate Alarmism is a Terrible Joke. Someday the world will wake up and laugh when they finally understand that the entire pursuit of economic ruin in the name of saving the planet from increasing carbon dioxide is in fact a terrible joke. You see it is an inarguable fact that the portion of the Earth's greenhouse gas envelope contributed by man is barely one tenth of one per cent of the total. Do the numbers yourself. CO<sub>2</sub> is no more than 4% of the total (with water vapor being over 90% followed by methane, sulphur and nitrous oxides). Of that 4% man contributes only a little over 3%. Elementary school arithmetic says that 3% of 4% is .12% and for that we are sentencing the planet to a wealth of damaging economic impacts.

3- The effect of additional CO<sub>2</sub> is limited. The effect of additional CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is limited because it only absorbs certain wave lengths of radiant energy. As the radiation in the particular wave length band is used up, the amount left for absorption by more of the gas is reduced.

A simple analogy is to consider drawing a curtain across a window - a large part of the light will be shut out but some will still get through. Add a second curtain to the first and most of the remaining light will be excluded. A point will quickly be reached where adding more curtains has a negligible effect, because there is no light left to stop. This is the case with the absorption of energy as more carbon dioxide is added to the atmosphere.

4- Higher vs. Lower Level of the Atmosphere. If greenhouse gases were responsible for increases in global temperature of recent decades then atmospheric physics shows that higher levels of our atmosphere would show greater warming than lower levels. This was not found to be true during the 1978 to 1998 period of .3 degrees centigrade warming.

5- Increases in CO<sub>2</sub> Levels Follow Temperature Increases. 900,000 years of ice core temperature records and carbon dioxide content records show that CO<sub>2</sub> increases follow rather than lead increases in Earth temperature. This is logical because the oceans are the primary source of CO<sub>2</sub> and they hold more CO<sub>2</sub> when cool than when warm, so warming causes the oceans to release more CO<sub>2</sub>.

6- Today's Temperature Below Average. While temperatures have fluctuated over the past 5000 years, today's earth temperature is below average for the past 5000 years.

7- Warming is Beneficial. A modest amount of global warming, should it occur, would be beneficial to the natural world. The warmest period in recorded history was the *Medieval Warm Period*, roughly 800 to 1200 AD, when temperatures were 7 to 9 degrees Fahrenheit warmer than today, allowing great prosperity for mankind. During that

time Greenland was actually green.

8- Solar Activity Influences Temperature. Temperature fluctuations during the current 300 year recovery from the *Little Ice Age*, which ended around 1700 AD, following the *Medieval Warming Period*, correlate almost perfectly with fluctuations in solar activity. This correlation long predates human use of significant amounts of fossil fuels such as coal, oil and natural gas.

9- Other Planets Warming Also. The National Aeronautic and Space Agency (NASA) has determined that during the time the Earth has been warming so also was Mars, Pluto, Jupiter and the largest moon of Neptune .

10- CO<sub>2</sub> Levels Much Higher in the Past. We know that 200 million years ago, when the dinosaurs walked the Earth, the average Carbon Dioxide concentration in the atmosphere was 1800 ppm, five times higher than today.

11- Global Cooling Also. All four major global temperature tracking outlets (Hadley UK , NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, University of Alabama Huntsville , and Remote Sensing Systems Santa Rosa) have released updated information showing that in 2007, global cooling ranged from 0.65C to .75C. a value large enough to erase nearly all the global warming recorded over the past 100 years; all in one year's time.

12- 2008 Coldest Year Since 2000. NASA satellites measuring the Earth's atmospheric temperature found 2008 to be the coldest year since 2000 and the 14th coldest of the past 30 years. US climate Monitoring Stations on the surface show greater warmth, but pictures of most of the 1,221 US temperature stations show 90% to be located near human sources of heat (exhaust fans, air conditioning units, hot roof tops, asphalt parking lots and so forth). The conclusion is inescapable: The US land-based temperature record is unreliable.

13- Glaciers Show No Global Trend. While we hear much about one or another melting glacier, a recent study of 246 glaciers around the world between 1946 and 1995 indicated a balance between those that are losing ice, gaining ice and remaining in equilibrium. There is no global trend in any direction.

14- Mt. Kilimanjaro Lacks Precipitation. Some have claimed that snows on Mt. Kilimanjaro were melting due to global warming, but on May 1, 2007 *National Geographic Magazine* reported that the snows on Mt. Kilimanjaro were shrinking as a result of lower precipitation rather than a warming trend. Development of land around the mountain has also influenced precipitation.

15- Polar Bear Populations Are Increasing. Never mind that the overall polar bear population has increased from about 5000 (Variously Estimated at between 5,000 and 12,000) in the 1960's to 25,000 today, and that the only two populations in decline come from areas where it has actually been getting colder rather than warmer over the past 50 years. Also ignore the fact that polar bears were around 100,000 years ago, long before at least one important interglacial period when it was much warmer than the present. Clearly they survived long periods of time when the climate of the Arctic was much warmer than today. Yet they are not expected to survive this present warming without help from government regulators.

16- Computer Models Are Not Accurate. No computer model ever used to compute climate change has been able to calculate our recent past earth temperature, even though all measured data inputs were known and available.

17- A Huge Computer Needed. The inability of current computer hardware to cope with a realistic climate model projection was put in perspective by Dr. Willie Soon, of the Harvard Smithsonian Institute, who calculated that to run a 40 year projection using all variables across all spatial scales would require 10 to the power 34 years of supercomputer time. This is 10 to the power 24 times longer than the age of the Universe.

### **ECONOMICS**

1- Wind, Solar and Biofuels No Substitute For Existing Energy. The Nature conservancy predicts that by 2030 "eco-friendly" wind, solar, and biofuel projects will require extra land  
(Cont'd on Page 4)

## **DeWeese Report**

Vol. 16, No. 6 June 2010

Published by  
Freedom21  
Communications, LLC

Editor  
Tom DeWeese

Copy Editor  
Virginia DeWeese

Correspondence/  
Fulfillment  
Sascha McGuckin  
Carolyn DeWeese

Graphics/Layout  
Kristy Hook

DeWeese Report  
70 Main Street, Suite 23  
Warrenton, VA 20186

Phone: (540) 341-8910  
Fax: (540) 341-8916

Web Page:  
[www.deweese.com](http://www.deweese.com)

© 2009 Freedom21  
Communications, LLC  
ISSN 1086-7937  
All Rights Reserved

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

# The Global Economy and the Redistribution of American Wealth

## (Here's how it works)

John Smith started his day early, having set his alarm clock  
(made in Japan)  
For 6:00 am

While his coffeepot  
(made in China)

Was perking, he shaved with his electric razor  
(made in Hong Kong)

He put on a dress shirt  
(made in Sri Lanka)

Designer jeans  
(made in Singapore)

And

Tennis shoes  
(made in Korea)

After cooking his breakfast in his new electric skillet  
(made in India)

He sat down with his calculator  
(made in Mexico)

To see how much he could spend today, After setting his watch  
(made in Taiwan)

To the radio  
(made in India)

He got in his car  
(made in Germany)

Filled it with gas  
(from Saudi Arabia)

...and continued his search for a good paying American job.  
At the end of yet another discouraging and fruitless day checking his computer  
(made in Malaysia)

John decided to relax for a while. He put on his sandals  
(made in Brazil)

Poured himself a glass of wine  
(made in France)

And turned on his TV  
(made in Indonesia)

And then wondered why he can't find a good paying job in America.  
So now he's hoping to get help for a President  
(made in Kenya)

## Planet Earth... (Cont'd from Page 2)

equivalent to Minnesota, to produce the energy we now get from oil, gas and coal. Interior Secretary Salazar's proposal to have offshore wind turbines replace gas, coal, and nuclear electricity generators would mean 336,000, 3.25 Megawatt behemoths off our coasts - if they operate 24/7/365. It would require far more if they don't. Where exactly will we site those turbines? And where will we get the billions of tons of concrete, steel, copper and fiberglass it will take to build and install the expensive, unreliable, subsidized monsters?

2- Country Can't Run on Renewables. The idea that you can run America on "solar, wind, and biodiesel" is laughable. Since 70% of the electricity generated in the US involves the burning of coal, natural gas or oil and another 20% from nuclear, a real viable alternative energy is decades away. A single 555 Mega-Watt gas fired power plant in California generates more electricity per year than do all 13,000 of the state's wind turbines. The gas-fired plant occupies just 15 acres. The 300 foot tall wind turbines impact 106,000 acres, destroy scenic vistas and kill tens of thousands of birds and bats every year - to provide expensive, tax-subsidized, intermittent, insufficient electricity.

3- Federal Research Dollars Poorly Spent. The federal government has been investing in renewable power research and technology for decades, with virtually nothing to show for it. Billions of federal dollars are diverted to the renewable power industry every year, yet the industry still cannot come close to producing power anywhere near as economically as conventional fuel sources such as coal and gasoline.

4- Energy Will Become Very Expensive. The automotive, coal and oil industries will be hit the hardest by expensive new penalties and mandates regarding carbon dioxide production, increasing the cost of transportation and electrical power to the consumer.

5- Carbon Sequestration Will Be Very Expensive. A typical 1000 Mega Watt power station could burn about 3 million tons of coal per year requiring 300 trains per year to supply the coal. If Carbon, Capture and Burial is required, the extra power needed will call for another 150 trains of coal. And if trains were used to haul the captured CO<sub>2</sub>, the mass of material moved would require another 1150 trains per year, each train carrying 10,000 tons.

6- Carbon Dioxide Reductions are Counterproductive. According to the United States Energy Information Administration's economic models, last year's proposed Lieberman-Warner bill to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, if passed, would have cost the average US household between \$4000 and \$7000 per year, would have increased unemployment by at least 2.5 percent, and would have reduced our Gross Domestic Product by 2.6 percent each and every year.

7- Cap-and-Trade Would Eliminate Many Jobs. One side

effect of President Obama's cap-and-trade plan is the elimination of about 83,000 mining related jobs, 60,000 coal-energy power plant jobs, 31,000 coal transportation jobs and the tens of thousands of indirect jobs that produce products used by the coal sector.

8- Climate Legislation Will Move Jobs Offshore. California and Spain have proved that the war on carbon dioxide will kill real jobs faster than fake green jobs can be created. At the time, the silly claims that alternate energy can provide continuous, economical and reliable power will encourage neglect of a key U.S. reliable low cost electricity source-coal power. When the lights go out industry will migrate to Asia and our power bills will soar and it will be too late to prevent great harm to our national economy, our jobs and our lifestyle.

9- Who Will Foot The Bill? The potential federal revenue stream from cap and trade boggles the mind. White House sources estimate at least \$72 billion per year in new funding for government coffers. They concede it could be much more, depending on auction prices. Who will foot the bill? Energy consumers of course, but those living in coal dependent regions will pay the most.

10- Just a Couple of Examples. In the 15 mid-west states stretching from the Appalachians to the Rockies residential power bills will increase between \$20 and \$26 per month if the CO<sub>2</sub> permit auction price is as low as \$20 per metric ton, but the price will likely be higher. Ohio will be hit the 6th hardest as a result of its energy sources.

### POLITICAL POSITIONS

1- The Folly of Consensus and Settled Science. Historically Michael Crichton said the claim of consensus in science has been the first refuge of scoundrels. It has been a way to avoid debate by claiming a matter to be settled. **Whenever you hear that a consensus of scientists agree on something or other reach for your wallet because you are being scammed.**

2- The United Nations Gains Power. Since credible scientific evidence established that CO<sub>2</sub> from mankind has little impact on temperature and none on public health, the net result of CO<sub>2</sub> limitations will be a transfer of wealth and the ceding of more authority to the United Nations as a global government.

3- Expanded Bureaucratic Meddling. Once we accept the principle that carbon should be monitored, controlled and taxed, we open the door to the most invasive kind of bureaucratic meddling, and to all the carbon cops who want to stick their noses into every aspect of the way we live, whether it is the home in which we live, the kind of car we drive, our holiday destination, our pleasure boat or even the food-miles accrued in our choice of food.

4- Models Did Not Predict Present Temperatures. Computer models of climate are now predicting that there will be no change in global temperature over the next ten years. In some cases, these predictions say no significant warming

will take place until 2030. Take your pick. If these models are so great, how did they miss the time-out we are presently experiencing from global warming?

5- The Real Hottest Years? Surely you have heard that nine of the ten warmest years recorded in the US lower 48 states since 1880 have occurred since 1995, with the hottest being 1998. Well, that also has been shown to be wrong. Less than a decade ago, the US government changed the way it recorded temperatures. No one thought to correlate the new temperatures with the old ones, until Canadian researcher Steve McIntyre did so, correcting the record to show that 1934 was in fact the hottest year, with 1998 second and 1921 third. Four of the 10 hottest years were in the 1930s and only 3 in the past decade. Eight of the 15 hottest years in the past century occurred before carbon dioxide began its recent rise.

6- Unilateral Reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> Are Useless. The world's largest coal supplies are situated in the U.S., China, and Russia, which are all increasing their production. Electricity generated from coal in 2008 was a record, with China increasing production by 200 million tons. Unilateral efforts to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the face of this fact are therefore useless.

7- Waxman-Markey Too Complex To Understand. Representative Waxman and Markey's 648 page discussion draft of the climate bill, with its descriptions of permitted light bulbs, is so complex, confusing and impossible to understand, let alone implement without breaking some regulation, that it will make the old central planning of the Soviet Union seem like a back of the envelope outline by comparison.

8- The Precautionary Principle Cuts Both Ways. The Precautionary Principle (Cut emissions just as a precaution.) often claimed as reason to curtail CO<sub>2</sub> emissions cuts both ways. If we make it harder or more expensive for people in Africa to use their coal it means they will keep inhaling smoke from wood fires, more babies will get lung disease, and more forests will be razed for fuel. Meanwhile electric trucks will cost more to run and that will make fresh food more expensive, refrigerated meat may not be available, malnutrition will increase and money for medical research will shrink.

### **PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

1- There is No Consensus. There is no consensus of scientists in favor of human caused global warming. While opinion polls do not determine truth in science, more than 31,000 American Scientists signed a petition drafted by *the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine* which stated:

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's Atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many

beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.

2- Warming is Generally Beneficial. While global warming is not currently happening perhaps we should wish it were. Far more premature deaths result from cold than from heat. Respiratory and cardiovascular diseases also increase in cold weather. On the other hand longer growing seasons yield larger crops, and increased precipitation in warm weather adds to water supplies in water scarce areas. U.S. heating bills would decline substantially with a warming climate.

3- World Environment Damaged By Misguided Agenda. Paradoxically, the world environment is likely to be damaged far more by misguided attempts to reduce carbon emissions than would be caused by man-made global warming, even if it were real and continued unchecked. If third world countries were prevented from exploiting their natural resources to provide a better standard of living for their citizens, not only would their peoples continue to suffer poverty, disease, and low life expectancy, but they would not have the ability to protect their natural environments -- only wealthy countries can afford to do so.

4- Weather Predictions Are Often Wrong. Nobody believes a weather prediction 7 days ahead but now we are asked to reorder our economy based on climate predictions 100 years hence; climate predictions which are no longer supported by current evidence.

5- Carbon Trading Good Business. Carbon offsetting and trading schemes have the potential to make large profits for those who run them. You can not actually offset carbon emissions by planting trees, as they merely store some of it for a while before releasing it once they rot or burn, and the storage will not even offset the emission for many, many years after planting. Plus, the earth would have to be covered entirely by trees to even theoretically counter the stated impact of man-made emissions.

6- We Will Make Green Producers Wealthy. Subsidies given to develop renewable energy sources, such as wind power, are a license to print money for their operators at the expense of the rest of us. Companies promote green products that may be little more than gimmicks, but can be very profitable.

7- The Public is Not Convinced. Although the court of public opinion already weighs climate change as a very low economic priority, the media continues to uncritically accept and vigorously promote shrill global warming alarmism.

8- Billions For Climate Research. The United States government budgets \$6 billion a year for climate research, supporting a growing industry of scientists and university labs that specialize in the subject. It all adds up to a significant institutionalization of the impulse to treat carbon as a problem.

9- Wind Farms Can Harm Whooping Cranes. More than six decades of painstaking conservation (Cont'd on Page 9)

## Lessons from the Gulf Blowout

### *Learning (the right lessons, hopefully) from the Gulf of Mexico Disaster*

By Paul Driessen

Transocean's semi-submersible drilling vessel Deepwater Horizon was finishing work on a wellbore that had found oil 18,000 feet beneath the sea floor, in mile-deep water fifty miles off the Louisiana coast. Supervisors in the control cabin overlooking the drilling operations area were directing routine procedures to cement, plug and seal the borehole, replace heavy drilling fluids with seawater and extract the drill stem and bit through the riser (outer containment pipe) that connected the vessel to the blowout preventer (BOP) on the sea floor.

Suddenly, a thump and hiss were followed by a towering eruption of seawater, drilling mud, cement, oil and natural gas. The BOP and its backup systems had failed to work as designed, to control the massive amounts of unexpectedly high-pressure gas that were roaring up 23,000 feet of wellbore and riser. Gas enveloped the area and ignited, engulfing the Horizon in a 500 foot high inferno that instantly destroyed the cabin and killed eleven workers. Surviving crewmen abandoned ship in covered lifeboats. A few jumped 80 feet to the waters below.

The supply boat Tidewater Damon Bankston rushed to the scene and helped crewmen get their burned and injured colleagues aboard, as shore-based Coast Guard helicopters tore through the night sky to brave the flames and take critically injured men to hospitals.

Thirty-six hours later, the Deepwater Horizon capsized and sank, buckling the 21 inch diameter riser and breaking it off at the rig deck. That caused three serious leaks that spewed some 5,000 barrels (210,000 gallons) of crude oil a day into the ocean.

As the oil slowly gathered on the surface and was blown toward shore, it threatened a major ecological disaster for estuaries, marine life and all who depend on them for their livelihoods.

Thankfully, after getting rough for a couple days, the seas calmed. Industry, Coast Guard, NOAA, Minerals Management Service and volunteer crews had some time to recalculate the spill's trajectory, deploy miles of containment booms and oil skimmer boats, and burn some of the oil off the ocean surface. They lowered ROVs (remotely operated vehicles) to cap the end of the riser and spray chemicals that break down and disperse the oil.

Aircraft sprayed more dispersants over oil on the ocean surface, and technicians rapidly built heavy collection domes specially designed to sit atop the broken riser and BOP stack, collect the leaking oil and pipe it up to tanker barges. Drill ships are heading to the scene, to drill relief wells, intersect the original hole, cement it shut and permanently stop the leak. ExxonMobil, Shell, ConocoPhillips and at least 16 other companies have offered BP, Transocean and Halliburton assistance on all these fronts.

*How bad will the disaster be?* Much depends on how long the calm weather lasts, how quickly the domes can be installed, and how successful the entire effort is. There is some cause for optimism – and much need for prayer, crossed fingers and hard work.

But it will take weeks to years of uncontrolled leakage, before this spill comes close to previous highs, such as the:

- Santa Barbara Channel oil platform blowout (1969): 90,000 barrels off the California coast;
- Mega Borg tanker (1990): 121,400 barrels in the Gulf of Mexico off Galveston, TX;
- Exxon Valdez tanker (1989): 250,000 barrels along 1,300 miles of untouched Alaska shoreline;
- Ixtoc 1 oil platform blowout (1979): 3,500,000 barrels in Mexico's Campeche Bay;
- Saddam Hussein oil field sabotage (1991): 857,000,000 barrels in Kuwait;
- Natural seeps in US waters: 1,119,000 barrels every year from natural cracks in the seafloor.

Cold water and climate meant Alaska's Prince William Sound recovery was slow; Campeche beaches and coastal waters largely rebounded much more rapidly. Mississippi River flows through the Delta region may help keep some oil from pushing too far into the estuaries and speed recovery of oyster, shrimp and fishing areas, as it did with spills during pre-1960 drilling. Prayers and crossed fingers again.

*Should we stop drilling offshore?* We can hardly afford to. We still need to drill, so that we can drive, fly, farm, heat our homes, operate factories and do everything else that requires reliable, affordable petroleum. Indeed, over 62% of all US energy still comes from oil and gas. And we certainly need the jobs and revenues that US energy development generates.

We've already banned drilling in ANWR, off the Florida, Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and in many other areas. We've made it nearly impossible to mine coal or uranium, or build new coal-fired power plants or nuclear reactors. We've largely forced companies to drill in deep Gulf waters, where risks and costs are far higher, and the ability to deal quickly with accidents is lower.

We've also forced companies to take drilling risks to foreign nations – and then increased the risks of tanker accidents that cause far greater spillage when they bring that oil to America. Meanwhile, Russia, China and Cuba are preparing to drill in the same Gulf and Caribbean waters that we've made off limits – employing their training, technologies, regulations and ecological philosophies.

Despite this blowout and its 1969 Santa Barbara predecessor, America's offshore record is excellent. Since 1969, we have drilled over 50,000 wells in state waters and on the Outer Continental Shelf. There have been 13 losses of well control involving more than 50 barrels: five were less than 100 barrels apiece; one was a little over 1,000 barrels; two (both in 1970) involved 30,000 barrels or more. Only in Santa Barbara did significant amounts of oil reach shore and cause serious environmental damage.

Tankers have spilled four times more oil than drilling and production operations, often in much bigger mishaps – and chronic discharges from cars and boats dwarf tanker spills by a factor of eight.

*What should we do next?* Recognize that life and modern civilization involve risks. Humans make mistakes. Equipment fails. Nature often presents us with extreme, unprecedented, unexpected power and fury. Learn the right lessons from this tragic, catastrophic, probably preventable accident.

Avoid grandstanding politicians and knee-jerk reactions. Support those who have lost their income. Insist on responsible, adult thinking – and a thorough expert investigation to determine what happened.

Why did the BOP and backups fail? What went wrong with the cement and plugs, pressure detection devices and monitoring, supervisor and crew reactions, to set off the catastrophic chain of events? How can we improve the technology and training, to make sure such a disaster never happens again? How can we improve oil spill cleanup technologies and rapid response?

Ask what realistic alternatives we have. Not Sim USA and virtual energy. Real energy.

Can we afford to shut down our domestic oil and gas industry – economically, ecologically and ethically – and import more, as we export risks to other countries and shift risks from drilling accidents to tanker accidents? Can we afford to replace dozens of offshore rigs with thousands of offshore wind turbines, creating obstacle courses for ships laden with bunker fuel or crude oil?

Drilling in deep waters far from shore is a complex, difficult, dangerous business. Let us remember and pray for the eleven who died in fire and water, those who were burned and injured, and their families and loved ones. Let us also salute and pray for all who daily risk life and limb, to bring us the energy that makes our lives, jobs and living standards possible.

*For fascinating glimpses into offshore drilling and production, visit the NOAA emergency response page, Open Choke Deepwater Horizon spill page, and Drilling Ahead oil professionals network.*

# The Forces of Freedom Return to Valley Forge

By Tom DeWeese

Growing numbers of concerned, dedicated Americans are joining the nationwide protests against ever-higher taxes; the outrage of Obamacare; the bailouts and the Federal Reserve; the growing government surveillance society; and the destruction of private property rights through policies including Sustainable Development. The question now among these new activists is “what’s the next step?”

It’s time for action, and to that end, today I am announcing the Freedom Action National Conference, to be held August 12 – 14, 2010 at the Dolce Hotel in Valley Forge, Pennsylvania.

Local action, from strengthening State 10th Amendment rights, to exposing the efforts of organizations like the International Council on Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), is the focus of the Freedom Action National Conference. If we stand firm at home, against federal mandates and international policies, we can go a long way toward limiting the power and growth of the Federal Government.

American citizens can take that stand by first learning the details of dangerous policies like Sustainable Development; biometric surveillance and the growth of Fusion Centers; violations of Second Amendment rights; violations of Constitutionally-guaranteed state sovereignty; the growing government takeover of health care and the use of natural supplements and cures; the reasons why a Constitutional Convention now is the wrong solution at the wrong time; and how many of these bad policies are being enforced through the power and wealth of organized labor. All of these subjects will be detailed at the Freedom Action National Conference.

Featured speakers will begin with a keynote address by Constitution expert **Michael Badnarik** followed by an extensive lineup of experts and national spokesmen, including: **Sheriff Richard Mack**; Washington State Rep. **Matt Shea**; Oklahoma State Rep. **Charles Key**; Pennsylvania St. Rep. **Sam Rohrer**; National Rights To Work Committee President **Mark Mix**; Gun Owners of America Director **Larry Pratt**; International ID expert **Mark Lerner**; Constitutional Convention experts **Chuck Michaelis** and **Larry Greenley**; IRS expert **Steve Hempfling**; Illegal Immigration expert **Jeff Lewis**; Global Warming expert **Marc Morano**; United Nations Expert **William Jasper**; Sustainable Development/Agenda 21 experts **Dr. Michael Coffman**, **Tom DeWeese** and **Michael Shaw**; Property Rights champion **Dan Byfield**; Health Freedom experts **Dr. Jane Orient**, **Scott Tips** and **Dr. Jeff Marrongelle**; Constitution expert and activist **Ron Mann**; Education expert and author **Beverly Eakman**; grassroots activists **Catherine Bleish** and **John Bush**; and alternative media experts **George Shepherd**, **Gary Franchi** and radio personality **Sam Bushman**.

These experts will not only educate on the vital threats Americans are now facing, but will also focus on action all of us can take to fight back. The 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment movement is catching fire as state legislators are finding ways to add “teeth” to law rather than mere resolutions. Rep. Matt Shea will explain how it’s being done. Sheriff Richard Mack is teaching local sheriffs that they have the power to say no to federal agents; local communities are learning how to expel international provocateurs like ICLEI. Michael Shaw will explain how it’s done. A new approach to fighting against federal and state intrusion called “Coordination,” is having tremendous success in helping regain local control. Expert Dan Byfield will not only tell of those victories but will also lead a workshop to teach how it’s done. Ron Mann will lead a training workshop to teach new activists how to run campaigns on very little money. And Beverly Eakman will train activists how to break up the outrageous consensus meetings that are being used in public forums to enforce policy without public discussion and debate. All of these processes lead to diminishing the power of the Federal Government – all based on local action – just like the Constitution intends.

The Conference will also feature a “Radio Row” with national and local radio programs broadcasting live from the conference; the second annual Freedom’s Heroes Awards honoring local activists and singer Jim Worthing.

In 1777, George Washington’s tired, starving, defeated army escaped to Valley Forge, Pennsylvania to regroup and train for the fight ahead. They went on to defeat the most powerful army in the world.

On August 12, 2010, the forces of Freedom return to Valley Forge to once again regroup, train and rekindle the spirit of Freedom for the coming battles. All concerned Americans should join the Freedom Action National Conference on the hallowed grounds of Valley Forge and begin the drive to Take America Back.

Go to [www.freedomactionconference.com](http://www.freedomactionconference.com) for all the details and to register today.

## Planet Earth... (Cont'd from Page 5)

efforts that have brought the majestic whooping crane back from the brink of extinction may come undone because of the proliferation of wind farms in the United States.

10- Are Polar Bears Really Threatened? Pick up almost any magazine on the environment, almost any book, or film and you will see a picture of a poor polar bear swimming for his life, or standing on an ice sheet with a very forlorn look, or even on a dying iceberg with his friends, isolated from any hope of survival. The polar bear has become the cause célèbre of the environmental movement. Children are taught that in just a short time, if something radical is not done to stop man-caused global warming, the polar bear will be gone (along with a lot of other species). **IN FACT POLAR BEARS ARE THE BEST SWIMMERS OF ALL LAND MAMMALS, they are insulated from the cold so well that they do not even have a thermal image, and they have been found to swim large distances - distances up to 200 miles.** Only two polar bears have ever been found actually drowned, and those were believed to have drowned in a storm.

**IN** reality polar bear numbers, which only fifty years ago were around 5,000, **NOW, AFTER very expensive longitudinal studies, ARE SHOWN TO BE between 20,000 and 25,000.** Even knowing this fact the Secretary of the Interior has listed the polar bear as threatened.

The following comments were culled from a paper by H. Sterling Burnett with the *National Center For Policy Analysis*.

The World Wildlife Fund (WWF), a strong supporter of environmental issues, has studied endangered species for 50 years and they believe that Polar Bear populations are threatened. However their own research indicates that there are approximately 22,000 living polar bears worldwide, that while some distinct populations appear to be decreasing, total numbers are either holding steady or are increasing.

Sterling went on to note:

Moreover, when the WWF report is compared with the Arctic air temperature trend studies discussed earlier, there is a strong positive (instead of negative) correlation between air temperature and polar bear populations. Polar bear populations are declining in regions (like Baffin Bay) that have experienced a decrease in air temperature, while areas where polar bear populations are increasing (near the Bering Strait and the Chukchi Sea) are associated with increasing air temperatures. Thus it is difficult to argue that rising air temperatures will necessarily and directly lead to a decrease in polar bear populations.

**Conclusion.** Are human activities causing a warming in the Arctic, affecting the sea ice extent, longevity and thickness? Contradictory data exists. What seems clear is that polar bears have survived for thousands of years, including both colder and warmer periods. There may

be threats to the future survival of the polar bear, but global warming is not primary among them.

11- Climate Change Simply a Political Agenda For Control. Climate change is not a scientific problem that found political support; this is about eco-activists and politicians who found a scientific issue they feel can leverage them into power and control. The environment is a great way to advance a political agenda that favors central planning and an intrusive government. What better way to control someone's property than to subordinate one's private property rights to environmental concerns.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

1- Environmental Zealots Convince the Gullible. While the most extreme environmental zealots may be relatively few in number, they have managed to gain undue influence by exploiting the gullibility of many ordinary and scientifically illiterate people, who are only too willing to believe that the planet needs saving from man's excesses. Perhaps it is a psychological throwback to those earlier civilizations that offered human sacrifices to the gods, to assuage their sins and spare them from punishment in the form of drought, flood, famine or disease. There are certainly many parallels between modern environmentalism and religion.

2- Our Priorities: Clean Water, Good Food, and Sanitation. By focusing our priorities on future generations we focus less on improving the lives of people who are alive today. These future generations bear no closer relationship to us than those now living in developing countries whose lives we disdain to save. Why are we not feeding people in the world who are hungry? Why are we not giving clean water to the almost one billion people who don't have clean water? The greatest source of environmental degradation is poverty. Why aren't we helping eliminate poverty? One answer is that perhaps it is a lot easier worrying about future generations than trying to fix present day problems.

3- Global Warming is a Major Industry Today. Between 1992 and 2008 the US Government spent \$30 billion on climate change research and now contributes \$6 billion a year. This finances jobs, grants, conferences, international travel and academic journals. It not only keeps a huge army of people in comfortable employment, but also fills them with self righteousness and moral superiority, regardless of the fact that real science did not support it.

It is clear that with the deep roots of the global warming scare it is not about to go away. It has the added advantage of not being able to be proven false in our life time. In the mean time the sanest course for us would be to gain what limited perspective we can (remembering the global cooling alarm of a generation ago) and proceed cautiously. We are going through a scare with many causes, and we need to step back from it, take a long second look at the scientific evidence, and not do anything rash.

## Questions Posed for Kerry, Lieberman on New Climate-Energy Bill

By Paul Driessen

The new Kerry-Lieberman climate bill mandates a 17% reduction in US carbon dioxide emissions by 2020. It first targets power plants that provide reliable, affordable electricity for American homes, schools, hospitals, offices and factories. Six years later, it further hobbles the manufacturing sector itself.

Like the House-passed climate bill, Kerry-Lieberman also requires an 83% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 2050. Once population growth and transportation, communication and electrification technologies are taken into account, this translates into requiring US emission levels last seen around 1870!

House Speaker Pelosi says “every aspect of our lives must be subjected to an inventory,” to ensure that America achieves these emission mandates. This means replacing what is left of our free-market economy with an intrusive Green Nanny State, compelling us to switch to unreliable wind and solar power, and imposing skyrocketing energy costs on every company and citizen.

Meanwhile, the Environmental Protection Agency is implementing its own draconian energy restrictions, in case Congress does not enact punitive legislation.

It's time to ask these politicians some fundamental questions.

1) Even slashing carbon dioxide emissions to 83% below 2005 levels would reduce projected global average temperatures in 2050 by barely 0.2 degrees F, according to a study that used the UN's own climate models. That's because China, India and other developing countries are building new coal-fired power plants every week, even as the United States and Europe shackle their economies and send more jobs overseas. How do you justify such destructive, punitive, meaningless legislation?

2) Reflecting agreement with thousands of scientists, most Americans now say climate change is natural, not manmade. Fully 75% are unwilling to spend more than \$100 per year in higher energy bills to “stabilize” Earth's unpredictable climate. What provision of the Constitution, your oath of office or your duty to the overall health and welfare of this nation permits you to ignore the will of the people, the mounting evidence that “climate disasters” are the product of manipulated data and falsified UN reports, and the job-killing impacts of the laws and regulations you seek to impose?

3) If carbon dioxide is causing “runaway global warming,” why have average global temperatures not risen since 1995, and why have they been COOLING for the past five years – even as atmospheric carbon dioxide levels have continued to rise to levels unprecedented in the modern era?

4) What properties does man-made carbon dioxide have that enable it to replace the complex natural forces that clearly caused the Ice Ages, Medieval Warm Period, Little Ice Age, Dust Bowl, ice-free Arctic seas in 1822 and 1922, Alaska's 100 degree F temperature record in 1915, and all the other climate and weather changes and anomalies, blessings and disasters that our planet has experienced during its long geologic and recorded history?

5) What physical or chemical properties does man-made carbon dioxide have that would enable it to overturn the laws of thermodynamics – and cause temperatures in Antarctica to rise 85 degrees F (from an average of minus 50 F to plus 35 F year-round, or 48 degrees C, from -46 C to +2 C), to melt that continent's vast ice masses, raise sea levels 20 feet or more, and flood coastal cities?

6) Precisely what chemical, physical and thermodynamic processes would drastic carbon dioxide reductions alter, and how? Precisely what weather and climate improvements would those reductions achieve? Precisely how will CO<sub>2</sub> reductions stabilize planetary temperature, climate and weather systems that have been turbulent,

unpredictable and anything but stable throughout Earth's history?

7) Is there ANY direct physical observation or evidence that would falsify your climate crisis thesis, and cause you to say human greenhouse gas emissions are not causing a planetary climate disaster? Or do you think everything that happens confirms your climate disaster hypothesis: warmer or colder, wetter or drier, more snow and ice or less, more hurricanes and tornadoes or cyclical periods with few such storms?

8) Replacing hydrocarbons with unreliable, subsidized "green" energy will require millions of acres of land for wind turbines, solar panels and transmission lines – plus hundreds of millions of tons of steel, copper, concrete, fiberglass and rare earth minerals for all those facilities.

Do you support delaying wind, solar and transmission projects for years, to protect the rights and property of local communities and private landowners? Or do you favor regulatory edicts and eminent domain actions, so that government can seize people's property and expedite construction of these projects?

Do you support opening US public lands for renewed exploration and development, so that we can produce these raw materials and create American jobs? Or do you intend to keep US lands off limits, and force us to depend on imports for renewable energy, too?

Do you support relaxing environmental study, endangered species and other laws, to fast-track approval of these projects, despite their obvious impacts on wildlife and habitats? Or do you want them subjected to the same rules that have stymied thousands of other energy projects, so that renewable energy projects cannot be built, either – and we have massive blackouts?

9) Over 1.5 billion people in Africa, Asia and Latin America still do not have electricity, for even a light bulb or tiny refrigerator. Millions die every year from diseases that would be largely eradicated with electricity for refrigeration, sanitation, modern hospitals, and industries that generate greater health and prosperity. How can you justify using taxpayer money to finance UN and environmental activist programs that claim global warming is the biggest threat they face, and they need to get by on wind and solar power, and give up their dreams of better lives, because YOU are worried about global warming? Doesn't that violate their most basic human rights to improved living standards, and even life itself?

10) If you're so sure about your data and conclusions – and intend to use climate disaster claims to justify sending our energy costs skyrocketing, killing millions of factory jobs, controlling our lives, and totally overhauling our energy, economic and social structure – why do you refuse to allow fair, open and balanced congressional hearings and debates on climate science and economics? Why do you refuse to debate skeptical experts in a public forum, or even answer questions that challenge your alarmist thinking? Why do you refuse to require that scientists who get taxpayer money for their research must share and discuss climate data, computer codes, methodologies and analyses?

11) How much money and campaign help have you gotten from companies and activist groups that benefit from renewable energy mandates and subsidies, carbon offset and trading schemes, coal mining and oil leasing bans, and other provisions of climate and energy legislation?

12) What if you vote for these job-killing, anti-growth, anti-poor, anti-human-rights "climate disaster prevention" laws – and it turns out you are WRONG on the science or economics? What will you do? Give up your congressional seat, home, pension and worldly wealth – and pledge yourself and your children to an austere life of service to the people you have harmed? Or just say, "Oh I'm so sorry," and then pass more intrusive, oppressive laws, before retiring to collect a nice government pension – while millions freeze jobless in the dark?

13) If you can't or won't answer these questions, then why do you think you have a right to tell anyone on this planet that we have a "climate crisis," and dictate how they must live their lives – especially when you've done virtually nothing to slash your own air travel, staff, and home and office energy use?

## The Racist Roots of Gun Control Laws... Is the Brady Campaign a Closet Klavern of the Klan?

By Alan Gottlieb and Dave Workman

They opposed a landmark court ruling that struck down the handgun ban in District of Columbia, a city with a predominantly black population.

They later opposed legislation that would grant the District full voting rights in Congress, because the measure contained a provision expanding gun rights for those same citizens.

They filed a court brief opposing a lawsuit filed against the City of Chicago's handgun ban by Otis McDonald, an African-American whose life story would make inspiring material for a movie.

"They" are the leaders of the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence and one is left to wonder how this bunch would have reacted to the plight of Robert Hicks, a black man who rose to civil rights prominence in the mid-1960s. The 81-year-old Mr. Hicks passed away April 13, and is remembered for being, among other things, the last known surviving member of the Deacons for Defense and Justice.

Hicks was a worker in a paper mill, and his home in Bogalusa, LA was targeted by racist thugs for a bombing because he had the audacity to house two white civil rights workers. On Feb. 1, 1965, Hicks was warned that the Ku Klux Klan was coming, and the local police essentially stood aside, claiming there was nothing they could do, according to an account in the *New York Times*.

So Mr. Hicks and his wife sent their children to the homes of friends and neighbors, and did something that would no doubt cause the Brady Camp to erupt in shrieks. They called other friends for protection and, the *Times* noted, "Soon, armed black men materialized. Nothing happened."

Mr. Hicks was to become a leader in the Deacons group, which was organized in Jonesboro, LA in 1964 and lasted for about four years. The traditionally anti-gun *New York Times* described the Deacons as a "secretive paramilitary organization of blacks."

They might just as accurately have been described as a "black militia." The Brady Campaign has argued that the right to keep and bear arms applied only to the organized militia, but we have yet to see a Brady endorsement for the Deacons. Hicks also rose to be a leader in the local N.A.A.C.P. and also was once the head of the Bogalusa Civic and Voters League.

The Brady Campaign and their soul mates at the Violence Policy Center have consistently avoided discussing the racist underpinnings of gun control because they know it is a political minefield. Historian Clayton Cramer noted in his essay on the racist roots of gun control that, "The historical record provides compelling evidence that racism underlies gun control laws — and not in any subtle way. Throughout much of American history, governments openly stated that gun control laws were useful for keeping blacks and Hispanics "in their place" and for quieting the racial fears of whites."

How much longer can the Brady Bunch and its allies conceal the ugly true nature of gun control laws? These laws were the cornerstone of the Black Codes in the Reconstruction South, designed to keep free blacks defenseless against the night riders who would eventually become the Klan.

Failure to address the racist roots of gun control makes every other argument professed by the Brady Campaign to be little more than a subterfuge. Municipal gun bans disproportionately affect inner city minorities, yet nobody in the gun prohibition movement dares to broach the subject, because once the lid is off of that Pandora's Box, it is not going to close again, and anti-gunners know it.

---

*Alan Gottlieb is founder of the Second Amendment Foundation. Dave Workman is senior editor of Gun Week. They are co-authors of Assault on Weapons: The Campaign to Eliminate Your Guns.*