

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 20 - Issue 2

February 2014

Obamacare: The Terrifying Consequences To Healthcare

By Tom DeWeese

As the Obamacare debate rages, we hear much about insurance companies, costs and people's ability to pay. We here the policy defended as proponents tell us it will provide health care to those who never had it. Of course, these proponents never seem to explain how those who couldn't afford healthcare when it was a choice can now afford an even more expensive cost now that government mandates it.

However, these debates about the pros and cons of Obamacare all focus on money. What about the real issue – healthcare? What will Obamacare do to our medical system? How will it affect the quality of our care? How will it affect doctor's decisions as they attempt to take care of our health needs? And, ultimately, in a system controlled by government bureaucrats and government-written manuals – who will really be making the decisions that determine our quality of life? These are the real questions that need to be the center of the debate. And the answers are terrifying.

I recently received a report from an Oncologist, DR John Conroy, who is fighting the desperate battle to treat cancer. All of those concerned Americans who wear their pink ribbons and dash for miles in their stop-cancer marathons should take a long hard look at what Dr. Conroy reports to be the future of all American medicine. They may want to start running straight at Congress to save their own lives.

Obviously, Oncology is a very detailed science, difficult for the layman to understand. That's why American health care has always promoted specialists. Let's begin with a patient who has discovered a lump on her breast. She takes a mammogram, undergoes a biopsy and is found to have adenocarcinoma. She is seen by an Oncologist and certain questions need to be addressed.

As Dr. Conroy explains the process, first, doctors must determine the "Stage" or extent of the disease. The most common system for determining classification of malignant tumors and the extent of a person's cancer is

called the TNM system. "T" measures the size of the tumor and if it's invaded nearby tissue. "N" determines regional lymph nodes that are involved. "M" measures the distance the cancer has spread from one part of the body to another. These measurements are critical in determining how sick the patient may be.

In fact, there are four stages, classified under the TNM system, with multiple possible results determined by a large variable of TNM data. With an adenocarcinoma cell type under the microscope, there are about 40 pathological (histology) types which could lead to as many as 36,000 possible variable combinations of the cancer. The grade or aggressiveness of the cancer is 10 grades. So, $10 \times 36,000 = 360,000$ possibilities. Next, hormone sensitive status = 8 possibilities. So, $360,000 \times 8 = 2,880,000$ and menopausal status = 5,760,000 possible computer input combinations. These are the possible combinations on just one page of data in staging. So the computer system has to evaluate these combinations.

Whew! That's a lot of data to determine how sick a patient may be, with what kind of cancer, at what stage. It's all necessary data to determine the most effective course for treatment. Again, that's why we have specialists who focus entirely on certain diseases and other maladies that affect our bodies. No one individual could possibly be knowledgeable in all aspects of the human body.

But now, with the growing control by government over health care decisions, things are changing. Over the past several years, a growing number of bureaucrats from insurance companies have been armed with manuals, guidebooks and calculators to step in to the decision making process to decide what treatment procedures are allowed. And it's going to get far worse under Obamacare, as a new layer of government bureaucrats is added to affect what doctors can do to save your life.

As Dr. Conroy explains, to look into the body and

IN THIS
ISSUE

PAGE 3 - SAUL ALINSKY'S 12 RULES FOR RADICALS

PAGE 4 - LETTUCE FORGET CHAVEZ BY TOM DEWEESE

PAGE 8 - A CLIMATE OF FEAR, CASH AND CORRECTITUDE BY PAUL DRIESSEN AND DENNIS MITCHELL

make a determination on where to start planning treatment, he uses x-rays and cat-scans (c-ts). "I generally cat-scan head to toe and look for metastasis and get a baseline." However, such decisions for care by the doctors are now being decided by others. Says Dr. Conroy, "In the past, it was ok (to X-Ray and CT), not now. Over the last few years all the X-rays have to be approved, so there are companies now that have algorithms to evaluate your request (for a cat-scan or X-ray)." He explains that these companies, which work in partnership with hospitals and insurance companies, "process thousands of requests a day. " They decide who gets to use the machines for what purposes. "So," he explains, "if there's no headache, then there is no cat-scan of the brain. If a normal chest x-ray is taken, then no cat-scan of the chest."

Here's where these rules and regulations start to really get scary. If he, as the doctor, wants to challenge the decision by the company as to whether he can get both a cat-scan and X-Ray, he will call them to do so. "I have to discuss this with the 'medical director' who will say yes -- if I use certain 'key' words" Or the medical director will say "no," the procedure does not fit the guidelines. Without having the medical background of the doctor or all of the data he has been trained to read, the company medical director can make the call – all based on a manual written to one size fits all!

Meanwhile, the doctor is responsible for the health of his patient, tasked with the job of making the right decision as he is forced to move forward blindly. He's unable to get the complete information he needs to make an educated evaluation, because a bureaucrat rejected his request for the proper testing. Yet, if the doctor makes the wrong decision and the patient suffers or dies, he is liable for legal action by the patient's family. He has no legal protection if he missed a lesion in the brain. Says Dr. Conroy, "I am liable, let alone the damage to patient."

How "Red Tape" Strangles Treatment

The most important detail to expose here is that, while the doctor has had years of training and experience in the field - the medical director does not have to be qualified.

He's an employee! Dr. Conroy provided a resulting horror story that is certain to be repeated over and over again once Obamacare gets control of the medical system. He reported, "I had a young patient with Hodgkin's disease and I needed a follow-up cat-scan of the chest. It was refused (by the company medical director). I challenged the decision (I challenge all of them) and called the company. The medical director was a retired General Practitioner, playing golf in Florida." Says Dr. Conroy, "the review companies intentionally have out of state physicians as medical directors so they do not have a state license that can be challenged."

Then there is the massive mountain of paperwork required for each patient and each procedure. The official guideline for treatment paths for patients with malignancy is called "Pathways," found at www.nccn.com. There are over 30 medical issue paths to choose. A doctor needs to match a pathway with his data, as described above. As mentioned, that can be a huge number of possible combinations. The insurance companies are already restricting treatment options by forcing doctors to accept their approval for therapy, or they won't pay for it.

Now, follow the bureaucratic ball created by this mass of rules. Explains Dr. Conroy, "We are still on the first visit by the patient, (or second visit if something was challenged). It now takes 45-60 minutes to register a new patient. I get an hour for the history, exam discussion of treatment plan and then we have to load everything into the computer and fill out the required forms. With each patient visit we review all the data for accuracy, and again report it."

All this for one patient on the first visit. And with each visit it all has to be continually rechecked and reported. If the doctor makes an error on a Medicare bill submission, the fine is \$5,000 PER LINE. A typical chemotherapy visit may have 20 or more lines of code per visit. Says Dr. Conroy, "one year we used 250 cc bags of IV fluids for chemotherapy. It was more than enough fluid for treatment, but Medicare retroactively decided not to pay for 250 cc bags so, we had to repay Medicare Reimbursement for all the

Continued to Page 6

DeWeese Report

Vol. 20, No. 2
February 2014

Published by
The American Policy
Center

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/
Fulfillment
Lola Jane Craig
Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout
CJ Scrofani
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report
PO Box 129
Remington, VA
22734

Web Page:
www.deweese-report.com

Copy Right
2014 The American
Policy Center
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

Saul Alinsky's 12 Rules for Radicals

Saul Alinsky's tactics for controlling political action have been at the root of the radical Left for decades. His Rules for Radicals have helped launch many crusades that most originally thought to be folly. The rules are specific, subtle and effective in taking control of debates, media, and the political process. The Right must learn what tactics are being used against them, before victory can be achieved. Learn these rules, counter them, and perhaps even use them. If the situation calls for it, to further the cause of freedom. TAD

* **RULE 1: "Power is not only what you have, but what the enemy thinks you have."** Power is derived from 2 main sources – money and people. "Have-Nots" must build power from flesh and blood. (These are two things of which there is a plentiful supply. Government and corporations always have a difficult time appealing to people, and usually do so almost exclusively with economic arguments.)

* **RULE 2: "Never go outside the expertise of your people."** It results in confusion, fear and retreat. Feeling secure adds to the backbone of anyone. (Organizations under attack wonder why radicals don't address the "real" issues. This is why. They avoid things with which they have no knowledge.)

* **RULE 3: "Whenever possible, go outside the expertise of the enemy."** Look for ways to increase insecurity, anxiety and uncertainty. (This happens all the time. Watch how many organizations under attack are blind-sided by seemingly irrelevant arguments that they are then forced to address.)

* **RULE 4: "Make the enemy live up to its own book of rules."** If the rule is that every letter gets a reply, send 30,000 letters. You can kill them with this because no one can possibly obey all of their own rules. (This is a serious rule. The besieged entity's very credibility and reputation is at stake, because if activists catch it lying or not living up to its commitments, they can continue to chip away at the damage.)

* **RULE 5: "Ridicule is man's most potent weapon."** There is no defense. It's irrational. It's infuriating. It also

works as a key pressure point to force the enemy into concessions. (Pretty crude, rude and mean, huh? They want to create anger and fear.)

* **RULE 6: "A good tactic is one your people enjoy."** They'll keep doing it without urging and come back to do more. They're doing their thing, and will even suggest better ones. (Radical activists, in this sense, are no different than any other human being. We all avoid "un-fun" activities, and but we revel at and enjoy the ones that work and bring results.)

* **RULE 7: "A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag."** Don't become old news. (Even radical activists get bored. So to keep them excited and involved, organizers are constantly coming up with new tactics.)

* **RULE 8: "Keep the pressure on. Never let up."** Keep trying new things to keep the opposition off balance. As the opposition masters one approach, hit them from the flank with something new. (Attack, attack, attack from all sides, never giving the reeling organization a chance to rest, regroup, recover and re-strategize.)

* **RULE 9: "The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself."** Imagination and ego can dream up many more consequences than any activist. (Perception is reality. Large organizations always prepare a worst-case scenario, something that may be furthest from the activists' minds. The upshot is that the organization will expend enormous time and energy, creating in its own collective mind the direst of conclusions. The possibilities can easily poison the mind and result in demoralization.)

* **RULE 10: "If you push a negative hard enough, it will push through and become a positive."** Violence from the other side can win the public to your side because the public sympathizes with the underdog. (Unions used this tactic. Peaceful [albeit loud] demonstrations during the heyday of unions in the early to mid-20th Century incurred management's wrath, often in the form of violence that eventually brought public sympathy to their side.)

Continued to page 5

Lettuce Forget Chavez

By Tom DeWeese

A new film entitled “Cesar Chaves, American Hero,” will invade American theaters this Spring. I’m calling on all patriotic Americans to boycott and picket this piece of Hollywood propagandist trash and give Cesar Chavez the place in American history he actually deserves. Cesar Chaves was a left wing con artist of the first order. I expect as much honesty from a film based on Hollywood’s version of his life.

Cesar Chavez is portrayed to the American public as a hero and champion of poor Hispanic migrant workers who were paid mere pennies to work in the grape and lettuce fields of California. According to the tale, the farmers got rich off the backs of the migrant labor, selling the lettuce and making expensive wines from the grapes. Meanwhile the poor, misused migrants carried meager belongings on their backs and traveled from farm to farm, hoping to find work, perhaps a meal, and a place to sleep. Even little children were forced to work in the fields – just to keep the family alive. So goes the tale.

Into the breach of this John Steinbeck vision of misery steps one of the workers who braved the wrath of the “MAN.” Cesar Chaves, so the tale continues, stood bravely against threats of bodily harm, maybe even death, to help bring the poor migrant workers a decent wage and stable working conditions. He organized the United Farm Workers Union (UFW), organized protests and set up picket lines, staged fasts to get the media’s attention. His minions took on the battle cry “Huelga” (strike) and called on all Americans to boycott “non-union” lettuce and wines.

In an era of unrest and college protests, students across the nation took up the battle cry and participated in the boycotts. It became fashionable for liberal leaders to stand with Chavez. California Governor Jerry Brown (the first term) joined Chavez and all the usual Hollywood celebrities in protest marches in Sacramento. Bobby Kennedy flew in to embrace him for the cameras during his fasts.

Chavez was hailed a hero to the oppressed poor. Streets and schools all over the state of California are named after him. Children wear tee shirts with his name and image emblazoned across the front. And now, Chavez is to be forced again into the nation’s reconstructed memory through a major motion picture about his life that calls him an American hero. Labeling Cesar Chavez an American hero is akin to labeling Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky as Russian heroes.

Here are facts about Cesar Chavez that you will never read in a school text book, current history book or see in the film.

- There is no evidence that Cesar Chavez ever worked in a farm field in his life. He was a pool room thug selected and hand picketed by radical communist organizer Saul Alinsky to create unrest among farm workers.

Chavez was well trained in the Alinsky propagandist and organizing techniques that are, still today recognized as the most effective tools to misdirect and force radical ideas into the general population.

- Cesar Chavez never tried to organize real migrant workers – those who had no real home, who carried their belongings on their backs and were basically nomads on the road.

For the most part, the workers Chavez picketed on lived in nice homes, in stable neighborhoods and made a decent wage. The only migration they did was to move from farm to farm in their area to harvest the crops. It provided them steady work with farmers who regularly employed them. At night, they slept in their own beds.

- Chavez never organized “non-union” workers. They were already members of the Teamster’s Union. What Chavez sold to the nation as a fight against “non-union” lettuce and grapes was really a jurisdictional fight against the Teamsters. Pretty hard to call the Teamsters “non-union.”

And so, for more than ten years, Cesar Chavez used the media, politicians, Hollywood, and college students to change the buying habits of the nation and paint a picture of big business oppressing the poor.

In 1974, when I served as Ohio Chairman of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) I was also running for a seat in the Ohio state legislature. My district was a small slice of Columbus that included the Ohio State University. My opponent was a dedicated left wing radical. Our district contained no farm land other than the agriculture department of the university. Yet, the main issue of our campaign became the debate over Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers.

In March of that year, Chavez came to the OSU campus. My opponent in the legislative race, Mike Stinziano was seated next to Chavez on the stage. I was out front of the auditorium manning a picket line and protest. Eventually, as Chavez prepared to speak, I and my picketers marched inside the auditorium, straight down the aisle and sat on the edge of the stage. Stinziano and I eyed each other in this strange setting for a political campaign.

Chavez began to speak to the wide-eyed college students, teaching them organizing songs and getting them to shout “Huelga.” Then Chavez began to spin a tale of the terrible conditions of the non-union workers in the fields. Paul Bunyon would have been impressed. He told the students that to get around paying for his union workers, the farmers had developed a mechanical device to pick the grapes. He said it was a huge vacuum designed to suck the grapes off the vine. But, said Chavez in a hushed tone, the machine also sucked up spiders, snakes and rabbits, all to be processed into the wine. As the crowd began to stir and make faces at the thought of it, Chavez quickly added, “so, if you won’t boycott Boonesfarm wine for our cause, at least do it for your own health.” That was Cesar for you... always concerned about the well being of others!

Two months later I was invited to Toledo University by the local YAF chapter there to provide rebuttal to a separate appearance by Delores Huerta, Vice President of the United Farm Workers Union.

She taught the students the same organizing songs, peppered with the chants of “Huelga.” Then she proceeded to tell the same story of the great machine. Only this time she described it, not as a great vacuum cleaner, but as a picker with huge fingers that plucked the grapes along with the snakes, rabbits and spiders. I pointed out to the audience that if the UFW was going to fan out across the country to tell lies, they should at least be consistent lies.

Huerta proceeded to call for a boycott of all “non union” lettuce and grapes. I again pointed out that many of the farm workers picking the grapes were, in fact, members of the Teamsters Union and had been so for many years. I asked when the Teamsters became non union and the only response offered was that I was a Teamster lackey! Sigh...

Huerta went on with her well rehearsed tale of the terrible lives of the non-union farm workers, and demonstrating the success and power of the UFW by claiming that 200,000 farm workers had now joined their union. An interesting trick, since there weren’t 200,000 farm workers in the state.

What both Chavez and Huerta both failed to tell the audience was:

- How the UFW formed “goon squads” designed to intimidate the workers in the fields by threatening them with physical harm if they continued to work.
- How the UFW used Catholic priests to intimidate the deeply religious workers by calling them scabs.
- How the majority of those on the UFW picket lines were actually college students bussed in from across the country.
- How UFW negotiations actually resulted in less pay for farm workers.

Now, in this age of Obama, double speak and rewritten history, a movie about Chavez is coming out – and it calls him an American hero. If this is the kind of America we have become, where a pool room thug trained by a Marxist can be honored as a hero, then there truly has been a silent American revolution and truth, justice and the American way has lost.

The farm workers in California, in the 1970s, knew what a threat Chavez was to them and they hated him. They tried to tell America then, but the media, Hollywood and liberal politicians had their own agenda to promote. Does that sound familiar? So, puffed up on their own “compassion” and in the name of their version of justice for the poor, they sacrificed the very people they claimed to help... all for the “cause.”

Boycott this film, tell others the truth and work to see that the film and Chavez are relegated to the trash heap where both belong. It’s time to push back. ●

12 Rules *Continued from page 3*

* **RULE 11: “The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative.”** Never let the enemy score points because you’re caught without a solution to the problem. (Old saw: If you’re not part of the solution, you’re part of the problem. Activist organizations have an agenda, and their strategy is to hold a place at the table, to be given a forum to wield their power. So, they have to have a compromise solution.)

* **RULE 12: Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it.”** Cut off the support network and isolate the target from sympathy. Go after people and not institutions; people hurt faster than institutions. (This is cruel, but very effective. Direct, personalized criticism and ridicule works.)

List provided by www.bestofbeck.com ●

Obamacare *Continued from Page 2*

250cc bags for an entire YEAR! We then changed to 1000 cc bag, Charged more, threw out most of it but got paid.”

So, now the patient has had surgery, some radiation treatment, and chemotherapy and the cancer is in remission. All of those procedures would have had to go through the bureaucratic review process.

Are there “Death Panels” in Obamacare?

Let’s say, after treatment, unfortunately, the patient goes into relapse- the cancer returns. In the past, the doctor would start again, repeat treatment and keep the patient alive over multiple cycles of chemotherapy. But things are changing.

Reports Dr. Conroy, “enter the ‘death panels.’ I actually read the ACA law. They are not death panels per say, but panels appointed by the President, NOT reporting to Congress, that establish the funding and treatment for patients.” Those on the appointed panels are not physicians .

And what are the potential results of the decisions of such panels? Dr. Conroy explains what happens through the example of a pediatric lung transplant case, involving a young boy who needed the treatment. According to Dr. Conroy, the case required official approval from Kathleen Sebilous, now the nation’s top health care official and in charge of Obamacare. Ms. Sebilous refused to approve the transplant and the family had to go to a federal court. She followed the official guidelines as outlined in Pathway. According to its rules, the transplant was not approved for a child of that age, so “the kid was out of luck.”

These panels can decide whether care can be provided or refused based on age, finances and the treatment required. That brings us back to the whole debate based on money. This time it becomes the “government’s money”. And, suddenly, when the government decides it doesn’t want to spend “its” money it can become very stingy. It saves money by not providing care for the elderly which it says are a burden to society. Or, in the case of the lung transplant victim - too young. The result is the same if care cannot be provided – death of the patient. Death panels? Perhaps not in name – but in practice. The panels do not report to Congress, but to higher bureaucratic panels As Dr. Conroy describes it, “more like a central committee in the Soviet System.”

Another example provided by Dr. Conroy is the NCCN Guidelines (National Comprehensive Cancer Network). There are a comprehensive set of guidelines

detailing the sequential management decisions and interventions for the malignant cancers that affect 97 percent of all patients living with cancer in the United States. In addition, separate guidelines provide recommendations for some of the key cancer prevention and screening topics as well as supportive care considerations.

Explains Dr., Conroy, “they are fantastic for guidance in treatment plans, but imagine writing a program for any of the guidelines and then constantly changing them to meet new changes in care.” He goes on with another example, “Check out the Palliative Care guidelines, there is a section explaining how to order an IV infusion to sedate a terminal patient, the plan is for them to not wake up. The guidelines recommend that nurses who feel uncomfortable ethically with this order should be assigned elsewhere. This is a concern because Hospice is recommended over and over in the guidelines more than ever before.”

This is the real cost savings in Obamacare, as money runs out, you change the parameters for treatment. Age, stage, and diagnosis care exclude aggressive therapy. In the past, this was a decision of a patient, minister and family, now you have an insurance company/ government IRS agent making an "impartial" decision of no further treatment.

In a progressive secular society, ethics are not based on God or morality or individual wants and needs, but on the “common good” of the state. Concludes Dr. Conroy, “Obamacare is not about medical care but rather social and government control of the population.”

Over the past decade or more, government rules have been slowly creeping into health care decisions, making it more and more difficult for doctors to care for their patients. Obamacare, and its avalanche of rules and regulations; the reporting required of every doctor; every step of the way in treatment; can only result in short cuts and less care in the medical procedures. The result will be a bureaucratic takeover of the system, as unqualified political hacks will make life and death decisions for patients. It will lead to the end of innovation and advancement of medical treatments. Free thinkers seeking new ways will be swallowed whole by the bureaucratic system. The victim will be the American health care system. Quality doctors will quit, and mediocrity will rule the system, just like in every other socialist health care system from England to Canada. Welcome to the coming Utopia of Obamacare.

The Supreme Court called Obamacare a tax. And that is exactly what it is. It is not a health care system. It is simply another way to redistribute individual American’s wealth into the bottomless pit of government control. The health of the patient is not even in the equation. ●

Climate of fear *Continued from Page 8*

Racial and sexual diversity is applauded, encouraged, even required, on campuses, as is political diversity across the “entire” spectrum from communist to “progressive.” But diversity of *opinion* is restricted to 20x20-foot “free speech zones,” and would-be free speech practitioners are vilified, exiled to academic Siberia, dismissed or penalized – as “climate skeptics” from Delaware, Oregon, Virginia and other institutions can testify. Robust debate about energy and climate issues is denounced and obstructed.

As The Right Climate Stuff team points out, we cannot possibly model or distinguish *human* influences on climate change, without first understanding and modeling *natural* factors. But solar, cosmic ray, oceanic and other natural forces are dismissed in the corridors of alarmism. Even the adverse effects of climate change and renewable energy policies on jobs, economic growth, human health and welfare, and bird and bat populations receive little attention. Sadly, science has been subjected to such tyranny before.

When Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo found that science and observations did not support Ptolemy’s clever and complex model of the solar system, the totalitarian establishment of their day advised such heretics to recant – or be battered, banished or even burned at the stake. Today’s climate models are even more clever and complex, dependent on questionable assumptions and massaged data, unable to predict temperatures or climate events, and employed to justify costly energy and economic policies.

The modelers nevertheless continue to enjoy fame, fortune, power and academic glory – while those who question the garbage in-garbage out models are denounced and ostracized.

A particularly ugly example of junk science occurred in Stalin’s Soviet Union, where Trofim Lysenko rejected plant genetics and promoted the idea that traits were acquired by exposure to environmental influences. His delusions fit the regime’s utopian fantasies so well that a generation of scientists accepted them as fact, or at least said they did, so as to stay employed, and alive. Meanwhile, Lysenko’s crackpot ideas led to agricultural decline, crop failures, starvation, and finally the demise of the centrally planned Soviet economic system that

perpetrated and perpetuated suffering for millions of people.

Skepticism and debate would have saved resources and lives. However, the Stalinist political machine would not tolerate dissent. Today’s scientific disease is less pernicious. However, politically driven science still frames critical public policies, because ideologically driven government has become the dominant financier of science. The disease has already crippled Europe’s industry and economy. It now threatens the vitality of the once powerful and innovative American system.

We’re all familiar with the Third World “democratic” process, where voters are “persuaded” by fear, fraud, deception, free meals and sham theatrics to give tin-pot dictators 97% of the “freely” cast votes.

Today we’re told 97% of climate scientists agree that the science is “settled” on climate change. This sham “consensus” is based on 75 of 77 scientists who were selected from a 2010 survey that went to 10,257 scientists. It ignores the 700 climate scientists, 31,000 American scientists and 48% of US meteorologists who say there is no evidence that humans are causing dangerous climate change.

More important, science is not a popularity contest or a matter of votes. As Galileo and Einstein demonstrated, one scientist who is right, and can prove it with evidence, trumps hundreds who have nothing but models, old paradigms, scary headlines and government cash to support their hypotheses.

Few scientists would say the Dust Bowl was caused by humans, even though poor farming practices clearly exacerbated it. Few would say cancer research should be limited to manmade chemicals, even though they may be responsible for some cancers.

Nebraskan and other researchers should end their focus on human causes – and start working to understand *all* the complex, interrelated factors behind global climate changes and cycles. Government financiers and policy makers must do likewise. Our future well-being depends on it.

Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (www.CFACT.org) and author of *Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death*. Dennis Mitchell, CPA/QEP, has been professionally involved in environmental and tax compliance, monitoring and education for 40 years and is an avid student of climate change. ●

A climate of fear, cash and correctitude

Trashing real science to protect grants, prestige, and desire to control energy, economy, lives

By Paul Driessen and Dennis Mitchell

Earth's geological, archaeological and written histories are replete with climate changes: big and small, short and long, benign, beneficial, catastrophic and everything in between.

The Medieval Warm Period (950-1300 AD or CE) was a boon for agriculture, civilization and Viking settlers in Greenland. The Little Ice Age that followed (1300-1850) was calamitous, as were the Dust Bowl and the extended droughts that vanquished the Anasazi and Mayan cultures; cyclical droughts and floods in Africa, Asia and Australia; and periods of vicious hurricanes and tornadoes. Repeated Pleistocene Epoch ice ages covered much of North America, Europe and Asia under mile-thick ice sheets that denuded continents, stunted plant growth, and dropped ocean levels 400 feet for thousands of years.

Modern environmentalism, coupled with fears first of global cooling and then of global warming, persuaded politicians to launch the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Its original goal was to assess possible human influences on global warming and potential risks of human-induced warming. However, it wasn't long before the Panel minimized, ignored and dismissed non-human factors to such a degree that its posture became the mantra that *only* humans are now affecting climate.

Over the last three decades, five IPCC "assessment reports," dozens of computer models, scores of conferences and thousands of papers focused heavily on human fossil fuel use and carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas emissions, as being responsible for "dangerous" global warming, climate change, climate "disruption," and almost every "extreme" weather or climate event. Tens of billions of dollars have supported these efforts, while only a few million have been devoted to analyses of all factors – natural and human – that affect and drive planetary climate change.

You would think researchers would welcome opportunities to balance that vast library of one-sided research with an analysis of the *natural* causes of climate change – so that they can evaluate the relative impact of *human* activities, more accurately predict future changes, and help ensure that communities, states and nations can plan for, mitigate and adapt to those impacts. Unfortunately, that's rarely the case.

In autumn 2013, Nebraska lawmakers budgeted \$44,000 for a study of climate cycles and natural causes –

avoiding additional speculation about manmade effects. Several Nebraska researchers rejected the idea, saying the budget was insufficient and they would not be interested unless human influences were made part of the study. They would not compromise their integrity or let politics dictate their research, they said. Ultimately, the project was cancelled in favor of yet another study of human influences.

Integrity is an important concern, especially when so many scientists have accepted far larger sums for research that emphasizes human causes, including some at Penn State, Virginia, George Mason and other institutions associated with the IPCC and EPA. Such grants have brought us "studies" connecting "dangerous manmade global warming" to dwindling frog populations, shrinking Italian pasta supplies, clownfish getting lost, cockroaches migrating, and scores of other remote to ridiculous assertions.

It is essential that some studies now begin to assess, understand and calibrate the powerful, complex, interrelated *natural* forces that drive climate fluctuations, cycles and changes. Only then will we be able to discern and separate significant human influences – and begin to predict why, when, how and where Earth's climate is likely to change in the future. Even \$44,000 would have enabled these accomplished Nebraska researchers to examine existing scientific papers and prepare a valuable report on natural factors that would help to put human influences in context. Only such comprehensive knowledge will enable us to predict, prepare for, mitigate and adapt to future climate variations with sufficient accuracy.

American taxpayers alone are providing billions of dollars annually for research focused on human factors, through the EPA and other government agencies. The universities and other institutions routinely take 40% or more off the top for "project management" and "overhead." None of them wants to derail that gravy train, and all fear that accepting grants to study natural factors or climate cycles would imperil funding from sources that have ideological, political or crony corporatist reasons for making grants tied to manmade warming, renewable energy and related topics. Peer pressure, eco-activist harassment, politically correct posturing, and shared ideologies about fossil fuels, forced economic transformations and wealth redistribution via energy policies also play a major role, especially on campuses.

Continued to Page 7