

## EPA's Tier 3 tyranny

High cost, no benefit does nothing to forestall agency's quest for ecological utopia

By Paul Driessen

President Obama's Environmental Protection Agency has already promulgated a tsunami of 1,920 regulations, many of which will bring few health or environmental benefits, but will impose high economic and unemployment costs, often to advance the Administration's decidedly anti-hydrocarbon agenda. The Heritage Foundation has calculated that his EPA's twenty "major" rulemaking decisions (costing \$100 million or more annually) alone could cost the United States over \$36 billion per year.

The latest example involves a third layer (or tier) of rules that the agency says will clean the nation's air and save lives, by forcing refineries to remove more sulfur and other impurities from gasoline. EPA and refiners call the proposal Tier 3 rulemaking. Tier 3 tyranny is more accurate – as the rules would cost billions of dollars but bring infinitesimal benefits, and will likely be imposed regardless.

Since 1970, America's cars have eliminated some 99% of pollutants that once came out of tailpipes. "Today's cars are essentially zero-emission vehicles, compared to 1970 models," says air pollution expert Joel Schwartz, co-author of Air Quality in America.

In addition, he notes, more recent models start out cleaner and stay cleaner throughout their lives. "As a result, fleet turnover has been reducing on-road emissions by an average of about 8 to 10 percent per year." Over time, that has brought tremendously improved air quality, and continues to do so.

Moreover, since 2004, under Tier 1 and 2 rules, refiners have reduced sulfur in gasoline from an average of 300 ppm to 30 ppm – a 90% drop, on top of previous reductions. Those benefits are likewise ongoing. Using EPA's own computer models and standards, a recent ENVIRON International study concluded that "large benefits in ground-level ozone concentrations will have accrued by 2022 as a direct result" of Tier 1 and Tier 2 emission standards and lower gasoline sulfur levels" that are already required by regulation.

By 2022, those existing emission reduction requirements will slash volatile organic pollutants by a further 62%, carbon monoxide by another 51% and nitrous oxides 80% more – beyond reductions achieved between 1970 and 2004.

But even this is not enough for EPA, which now wants sulfur levels slashed to 10 ppm – even though the agency's models demonstrate that Tier 3 rules, on top of these earlier and ongoing reductions, would bring essentially zero air quality or health benefits.

Viewed another way, further Tier 3 improvements would amount to reduced monthly ozone levels of only 1.2 parts per billion (peak levels) to 0.5 ppb (average levels). These minuscule improvements (equivalent to 5-12 cents out of \$100 million) could not even have been measured by equipment existing a couple decades ago. Their contribution to improved human health would be essentially zero.

*Continued to Page 2*

**EPA***Continued from Page 1*

To achieve those zero benefits, the new Tier 3 standards would cost \$10 billion in upfront capital expenditures and an additional \$2.4 billion in annual compliance expenses, the American Petroleum Institute says. The sulfur rules will raise the price of gasoline by 6-9 cents a gallon, on top of new fuel tax hikes and gasoline prices that have rocketed from \$1.79 to \$3.68 per gallon of regular unleaded over the past four years. These and other hikes will ripple throughout the economy, affecting commuting and shipping, the cost of goods and services, the price of travel and vacations. (White House and EPA officials claim the Tier 3 rules would only add only a penny per gallon to gasoline costs, but that is highly dubious.)

EPA believes the additional sulfur reductions are technologically possible. Its attitude seems to be, if it can be done, we will require it, no matter how high the cost, or how minimal the benefits.

Citizens need to tell EPA: “The huge improvements to date are enough for now. We have other crucial health, environmental, employment and economic problems to solve – which also affect human health and welfare. We don’t have the financial, human or technological resources to do it all – especially to waste billions on something where the quantifiable health benefits payback is minimal, or even zero.”

Moreover, there are better ways to reduce traffic-related urban air pollution. Improve traffic light sequencing, to speed traffic flow, save fuel, and reduce idling, emissions, driver stress and accidents, for example. That’s where our efforts should be concentrated.

Another basic problem is that EPA always assumes there is no safe threshold level for pollutants – and pollution must always and constantly be ratcheted downward, eventually to zero, regardless of cost.

This flies in the face of what any competent epidemiologist knows: the dose makes the poison. There is a point below

which a chemical is not harmful. There are even chemicals which at low or trace quantities are essential to proper operation of our muscular, brain and other bodily functions – but at higher doses can be poisonous. There are also low-level chemical, radiation and pathogen exposures that actually safeguard our bodies from cancer, illness and other damage, in a process known as hormesis.

Even worse, this Tier 3 tyranny is on top of other highly suspect EPA actions. The agency has conducted illegal experiments on humans, used secret email accounts to hide collaborations with radical environmentalist groups, and implemented 54.5 mpg vehicle mileage standards that will maim and kill thousands more people every year, by forcing them into smaller, lighter, less safe cars.

EPA also expanded the ethanol mandate to promote corn-based E15 fuels (15% ethanol in gasoline). That means we must turn even more food into fuel, to replace hydrocarbons that we again have in abundance (thanks to fracking and other new technologies) but our government won’t allow us to develop, and to substitute for cellulosic ethanol that doesn’t exist (but EPA tells refiners they must use anyway). So corn farmers get rich, while consumers pay more for gasoline, meat, fish, eggs, poultry and other products.

The agency is also waging war on coal, automobiles and the Keystone XL pipeline – based on assertions that carbon dioxide emissions are causing “dangerous manmade global warming.” Even the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, NASA, British Meteorological Office, and many once alarmist scientists now acknowledge that average planetary temperatures have not budged in 16 years, and hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, droughts and sea level rise have shown no statistically significant variation from century-long averages – even as CO2 levels have “soared” to 395 ppm (0.0395% of Earth’s atmosphere). True scientists increasingly recognize solar and other complex, interconnected natural forces as the primary drivers of Earth’s ever changing and unpredictable weather and climate.

*Continued to Page 7***DeWeese Report**Vol. 19, No. 6  
June 2013Published by  
The American Policy  
CenterEditor  
Tom DeWeeseCorrespondence/  
Fulfillment  
Lola Jane Craig  
Eve CraigGraphics/Layout  
CJ Scrofani  
Jeff CraigDeWeese Report  
PO Box 129  
Remington, VA  
22734Web Page:  
[www.deweese-report.com](http://www.deweese-report.com)Copy Right  
2013 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

## The great warmist retreat has officially begun...

### UK Telegraph: ‘Global warming: time to rein back on doom and gloom?’

**QUOTES**

By Marc Morano

**QUOTES**

**Climate Depot Note:** “The mainstream media cannot maintain the official man-made global warming narrative any longer. With the lack of warming and the failure to shift the climate debate to “extreme weather”, warmists are now losing once stalwart members of the media in promoting man-made climate fears. These are not good times for the promoters of global warming. Earth is failing to follow global warming predictions and the new study claiming current temperatures are the “hottest ever” may be facing a full scientific retraction.

**Shock: The Great Warmist Retreat Has Begun! UK Telegraph: ‘Global warming: time to rein back on doom and gloom?’ — Global temp lull ‘raises the possibility that Carbon dioxide may be less potent than has been thought in heating the planet’** -- UK Telegraph's Geoffrey Lean: 'Some recent research suggests that climate change might not be as catastrophic as the gloomiest predictions suggest...Until now, they have therefore placed much weight on the rapid temperature increases in the Eighties and Nineties. But for at least a decade, these have dramatically slowed, even as carbon dioxide emissions have continued to increase. None of this justifies the frequent claim by climate sceptics that global warming has stopped, and may now reverse. Long lulls have occurred before, only for temperatures to resume their relentless rise...But it may be less guilty than once supposed. And this is reinforced by recent findings that emissions of soot, or black carbon – which patient readers may remember I have been banging on about for years – are causing twice as much warming as previously estimated, meaning that the contribution of CO2 must be correspondingly less.' When even zealots like Lean are in retreat it's fair to say that something significant has changed..

**UN IPCC’s Kevin Trenberth redefines global warming: Warming No Longer Requires Warming** --'Global warming is continuing but it’s being manifested in somewhat different ways,' said Kevin Trenberth, of the U.S. National Center for Atmospheric Research. Warming can go, for instance, to the air, water, land or to melting ice and snow...'pauses in surface warming could last 15-20 years'

**Retreat?! Et Tu Wash. Post?: WaPo Opinion writer Ed Rogers: ‘Voters are cool and the planet is too’ — ‘Fewer and fewer Americans say global warming is a serious problem’ & ‘the globe is not getting warmer — or at least, it hasn’t in the last 15 years’** -- 'Just as voters are cooling to global climate alarmists, the planet has stopped warming...Politically, the bottom line is that global warming is fading as an issue. Given the bad economy and the undeniable temperature stasis, it will be interesting to see if the Democrats who must face voters in 19 months will continue to stay silent as Obama pursues higher energy prices and bogus government spending on useless 'green energy' boondoggles'

**Media Sea Change?! Der Spiegel Stops Believing...’Hot Debate Over Climate: How Reliable Are The Prognoses?’ Growing Doubts Over Models!** -- The flagship German news magazine writes: 'Global warming has stalled for 15 years. Experts thus are having doubts on the reliability of their prognoses. The temperature development is moving along the lowest margins of the UN scenarios.' Science reporter Axel Bojanowski at Spiegel here looks at the performance of climate models, claiming that some aren’t doing too bad, while the alarmist ones are failing...'For this reason some scientists now harbor the hope that the pessimistic climate prognoses could be wrong.'

**‘If we get no warming for another year or two, there will be no school children who have experienced global warming’**

# The Growing Threat of Smart Meters

by Tom DeWeese

Sustainable Development is code for a policy designed to transform human society, essentially eliminating individual life decisions and replacing them with top – down, one-size-fits-all government control. In steady fashion, the agenda for this new policy, designed at the international level, is put into place piece by piece with a new government council here, and new regulation there, each designed to appear as a “local” development program. Like the proverbial frog in the slowly boiling pot, many Americans fail to notice the rise in government heat.

The main course of action to impose the new agenda is through the pretense of environmental protection; “Sorry about your rights, but if we don’t save the planet, then we will all perish!” And so with the devastation of a thousand pin pricks, America and its form or government is being changed through the creation of non-elected boards, councils and regional governments, designed to enforce the new regulations and “assure that we protect the environment.”

The pin pricks come disguised as such issues as controls on community development; controls on use of private property; controls on use of open space; creation of development areas, many times under the excuse of historic preservation; communities designed on the blue print of pack and stack housing; making it harder to drive as roads are narrowed, even forcing cars to share the road with bicycles; the enforcement of expensive mass transit boondoggle projects; and the never ending spending spree on inefficient, unworkable alternative energy, such as wind and solar power.

In fact, control of energy and water are the two most effective tools in the enforcement of the Sustainable Development agenda. Without energy and water, human society stops. Using strict controls on how, or even if, energy and water can be used provides government with the power to dictate every aspect of society.

So how is that control carried out? There are obviously several ways, including regulations and taxes on production of gasoline; EPA restrictions on energy production; and government subsidies to create and enforce the use of alternative energy, specifically wind and solar.

However, controlling energy use in individual

homes provided a more difficult obstacle than mere taxes or regulations. Government needed to be able to monitor energy use and individual habits in every single home. And so, the Smart Meter was born.

The Smart Meters are being installed on homes across the country, replacing the old style analog meters. The power companies are telling their customers that the Smart Meters will help them save money on electric bills by helping control usage. They also claim that the Smart Meters will help the power companies operate more efficiently by eliminating the need for meter readers to physically read the meters as they do with analog meters. However, these sales pitches from the power companies hide the real facts behind the push to replace every analog meter in the nation with the Smart Meters.

There are several major problems for homeowners as the Smart Meters are installed. Here are just a few:

- The cost of heating and cooling homes with Smart Meters is going up because of the inefficient alternative energy that is more expensive than coal and nuclear power.
- Homeowners with Smart Meters in place are discovering that they can’t heat or cool their homes during peak power usage as the electric companies control the thermostats and automatically cut back on usage.
- Property rights are being violated by Smart Meter installers who come onto property against the will of the owners.
- A 2012 Congressional Report now reveals that power companies are able to read data from the meters that reveals residents’ daily schedules and their personal behavior, the types of appliances they use, even if there are certain types of medical equipment in use in the home. This information can then be sold to private concerns or placed in government files. It can lead to identity theft and unwarranted government surveillance.
- Evidence is now emerging that the Smart Meters, which operate by emitting electromagnetic signals, has become a health hazard, as thousands of Smart Meters in neighborhoods blast a non-stop signal, creating what is called Electromagnetic Smog. The electromagnetic radiation is dangerous for the elderly, children, pets, and those subject to such disorders as epilepsy, heart disease and more. It can lead to disruptive sleep patterns, chronic fatigue, depression, headaches and much more.

*Continued to page 7*

# A Good-for nothing Congress Prepares to Exempt Itself from ObamaCare

By Tom DeWeese

Even in this day and age of power-mad, money mad, out of touch politicians, some things can still surprise me. This is one of them. As more and more companies are announcing cut backs of employee hours because of the coming massive costs and penalties of ObamaCare, And just as the nation's jobless rate hits new, devastating levels, Congress is actually considering exempting itself – because the costs are too high! According to the Capital Hill publication “Politico.” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/04/obamacare-exemption-lawmakers-aides-90610.html>

*“Congressional leaders in both parties are engaged in high-level, confidential talks about exempting lawmakers and Capitol Hill aides from the insurance exchanges they are mandated to join as part of President Barack Obama’s health care overhaul, sources in both parties said.*

*The talks — which involve Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.), House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio), the Obama administration and other top lawmakers — are extraordinarily sensitive, with both sides acutely aware of the potential for political fallout from giving carve-outs from the hugely controversial law to 535 lawmakers and thousands of their aides. Discussions have stretched out for months, sources said.*

*A source close to the talks says: “Everyone has to hold hands on this and jump, or nothing is going to get done.”*

Now Members of Congress understand what Nancy Pelosi meant when she said we need to pass the bill in order to find out what’s in it. No one in Congress read the bill before they dumped it on the American people. And now they don’t like what it will do to them. Suddenly they see the train wreck that is headed their way. What about the rest of us? Continues the Politico article:

*“There is concern in some quarters that the provision requiring lawmakers and staffers to join the exchanges, if it isn’t revised, could lead to a “brain drain” on Capitol Hill, as several sources close to the talks put it.*

*The problem stems from whether members and aides set to enter the exchanges would have their health insurance premiums subsidized by their employer — in this case, the federal government. If not, aides and lawmakers in both parties fear that staffers — especially low-paid junior aides — could be hit with thousands of dollars in new health care costs, prompting them to seek jobs elsewhere. Older, more senior staffers could also retire or jump to the private sector rather than face a big financial penalty.”*

As these “leaders” face the reality of what THEY have done to all of us, apparently their empty promises that ObamaCare would cut the cost of health care, and even reduce federal spending, are long forgotten. Now they are just looking for a way to survive their own hangman’s noose.

So congressional leaders have spent months discussing and searching for a way out of this train wreck. Yet, they are apparently unconcerned, perhaps even numb to the fact that the same train wreck is about to hit all Americans with the same force.

Is Capitol Hill so isolated that these leaders can actually sit in such meetings and not see the irony of their actions? Do they never go home to face real Americans? Do they not read their mail or answer their phones? How can anyone be so deaf, dumb and blind?

Here is a prime example of how out of touch they can be. Republican House Speaker John Boehner is, of course, right there in the secret meetings of the negotiations by these self-appointed elites who believe they don’t have to live by their own rules. Incredibly, when asked about his position on the subject of exempting Congress for ObamaCare, Michael Steel, a Boehner spokesman, said: *“The speaker’s objective is to spare the entire country from the ravages of the president’s health care law. He is approached daily by American citizens, including members of Congress and staff, who want to be freed from its mandates. If the speaker has the opportunity to save anyone from ObamaCare, he will.”* So, apparently, the Speaker sees it as a heroic act to save Congress from itself as the rest of us hang separately.

There is only one heroic position for any politician to take: REPEAL OBAMACARE FOR EVERYONE. NO EXCEPTIONS.

**Rockefellers***Continued from page 8*

Keystone represent “a globally significant threat” – with “Global Warming,” and “Oil Addiction” as the two “thought leader slogans” in the parade of old shibboleths that trigger brain freeze in Big Green followers. The rest was a coldly calculated, very practical plan to destroy Canada’s single most important export, with Rockefeller giving \$7 million per year to activist groups to do the job.

Thinking people understand that being “addicted to oil” is like being addicted to breathing, better living standards, improved health and life itself. Just try getting along without it in a world where fossil fuels (oil, gas and coal) contributed 82% of US energy use in 2012. The “green alternative” (wind and solar) provided a mere 3.3% of our overall needs in 2012; the rest was nuclear, hydroelectric and biomass (mostly wood). Relying on the “green alternative” is like trying to inhale only 3.3% as much as you usually do. There’s an energy gap there we need to account for.

Canadian researcher Vivian Krause exposed the Rockefeller funding for campaigns against Canadian energy exports in her October 2010 Financial Post story, “US foundations against the oil sands.” Five US foundations, including the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, funneled vast sums of money through the Tides Foundation’s Canadian organization, Tides Canada. The Tides family of operations is a notorious California-based funder of left-wing activists.

Krause wrote, “A large part of Tides Canada’s funding comes from the Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation, the William & Flora Hewlett Foundation, the David & Lucile Packard Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. These are The Big Five. They give away about US\$1.2-billion every year.” In a chilling reminder, she concluded, “If these foundations decide to undermine a foreign industry, they probably can.”

Later that fall, Krause testified before a Canadian House of Commons committee, prompting an audit of the Canadian arm of the Tides Foundation by the Canada Revenue Agency (Canada’s equivalent to the IRS). By Krause’s calculations, Tides, a co-funder of the Rockefeller oil sands campaign, has distributed \$19 million to anti-Keystone groups since 2008.

Krause explains that the campaign strategy is intended to foster renewable energy by shifting investment capital away from so-called “dirty oil” and toward so-called “clean energy.” To this end, she said, “they ‘educate’ media, consumers and voters. They

stigmatize fossil fuels as bad, thereby facilitating the positioning of renewables as good. It’s basic product positioning and ‘depositioning’ the competitor.”

Not surprisingly, the “education” is slanted. “We get only bad news about fossil fuels and good news about solar and wind,” Krause observes. “We don’t get the whole story.” What gets left out are the advantages of fossil fuels – and the limitations and harmful effects of renewables, like the tiny amount of energy they provide, and the terrible impacts they have on birds, bats and wildlife habitats. “Furthermore, some of the information that is perpetuated is out-dated, and some is plainly false.”

I asked Krause why the Rockefeller presence behind the anti-XL propaganda campaign was virtually invisible. She told me that it has been done quietly but not secretly. “The grants have been disclosed in online databases for years,” she said. “But nobody bothered to add them up and connect the dots.” Krause connected the dots to the networks of foundations that work together on targeted projects.

She directed me to a revealing but obscure source, “Design to Win: Philanthropy’s Role in the Fight Against Global Warming,” which was sponsored by six of “the usual suspects” I have learned to expect to find behind any global warming campaign: the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, Energy Foundation, Joyce Foundation, Oak Foundation, and William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

Another source was, “A Strategy Planning Tool for Western Conservation,” prepared for the Hewlett Foundation by the Redstone Strategy Group, a brain pool of Ivy League hotshots not to be trifled with. Their strategy is to create eight massive national parks, each the size of Switzerland, as a way to stop the development of fossil fuels. Just fence industry out with parks – or Antiquities Act designations.

Anyone who thinks their local grassroots green group just pops up spontaneously in occasional protests needs to read either of these documents. They will find that the “roots” under the environmentalist “grass” are fertilized with bales of hundred-dollar bills. Rockefeller’s actions are quite open, if quiet. Krause said, “The strategy is articulated in discussion papers, but who reads them?”

Nobody except Vivian Krause, evidently. Her Twitter account, @FairQuestions, says, “I follow the money & the science behind enviro campaigns.” Her research and writing are impressive. Her blog profile states, “I work

*Continued to page 7*

**Rockefellers***Continued from Page 6*

from my dining room table, using Google, on my own nickel. Not part of any political party, any industry, or any campaign.” Her work deserves more attention in the United States.

Krause’s discovery and exposé of the Rockefeller millions behind the anti-Keystone XL campaign could become a factor in Obama’s pipeline construction decision. It has already created Canadian suspicion of environmental groups dancing on the strings of US foundation money.

It’s not the money itself Canadians fear. It’s the way bales of US foundation cash can buy pressure by proxy, to impose undue foreign influence over Canada’s national energy policy and sovereignty.

One must hope Mr. Obama does not wish to be suspected of dancing on the same Rockefeller policy puppet strings as the Big Green bigwigs who were recently arrested protesting at his front door.

*Columnist Ron Arnold is executive vice president of the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise. Portions of this report appeared originally in the Washington Examiner and are used by permission. ●*

**EPA***Continued from Page 2*

These inconvenient truths have apparently had no effect on Administration thinking. Perhaps rising indoor CO2 emissions from larger EPA and White House staffs have “weirded” their thinking. The EPA’s yellow brick road to Eco-Utopia is not one our nation should travel. It will not take us to an economic recovery, more jobs, a cleaner environment, or improved human safety, health and welfare.

Nothing in the Clean Air Act says EPA needs to promulgate these rules. But nothing says it can’t do so. It’s largely discretionary, and this Administration is determined to “interpret” the science and use its executive authority to restrict and penalize hydrocarbon use – and “fundamentally transform” America.

EPA administrator nominee Gina McCarthy says EPA will “consider” industry and other suggestions that it revise greenhouse gas and other proposed rules. However, neither she nor the President has said they will modify or moderate any policies or proposals, or retreat from their climate change agenda.

We are desperately in need of science-based legislative standards, commonsense regulatory actions, and adult supervision by Congress and the courts. Unfortunately, that is not likely to be forthcoming anytime soon, and neither Republican Senators nor the House of Representatives seem to have the power, attention span or spine to do what is necessary. Where this all will end is therefore anyone’s guess. ●

**Smart Meters***Continued from Page 4*

As Americans become aware of these threats they have begun to oppose the installation of Smart Meters on their property. Some local and state government’s, when faced with the health complaints, have offered opt out provisions. Others have responded using force, resulting in arrests, as in Naperville, Illinois. In other places, power companies have shut off electricity to homes of those protesting the Smart Meters.

As the battle against the Smart Meters grows across the nation, Americans need to understand the issue, the dangers, the real reasons behind the government’s drive to force them on angry and protesting homeowners, violating their property rights and endangering their health in the process.

Smart Meters are designed to provide government with detailed information of your energy use, your movements in your home, the way you use your personal private time, and even how many people are in your home at any given time. It is an unconstitutional invasion of your home by government, as set down in the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

My organization, the American Policy Center (APC), has produced a comprehensive special report entitled “Sustainable Development and the Control of Energy (The growing battle over Smart Meters).” This report details the real reasons behind the government’s enforcement of the Smart Meters, the health and privacy violations, and the political agenda behind it all. This special report is available free at <http://americanpolicy.org/smart-meters-report/> I urge every concerned American to get a copy.

Every American has a duty to preserve freedom by protesting and stopping the forced installation of these devices. ●

# How Rockefellers battle the Keystone pipeline

Rockefeller billions vs Canadian energy and sovereignty – and US jobs, security and families

By Ron Arnold

Americans concerned about gasoline prices were encouraged by the Pew Research Center's new poll, whose headline blared, "Keystone XL Pipeline draws broad support." A score box showed 63% supporting and only 23% opposing the pipeline that would transport oil from Canada's vast Alberta oil sands deposits through the Plains states to Texas refineries.

"Every one-cent increase at the pump steals about \$1 billion from the larger economy that consumers would have otherwise saved or spent on something else," the Wall Street Journal has pointed out. High gasoline prices thus translate into lost jobs, lost tax revenues and lower living standards. Americans are beginning to understand that, as the Obama "recovery" gives them real-world economic lessons.

Unfortunately, the Pew report quickly deflated optimism over this support, when it tersely identified who the minority is: "liberals" – stanchions of Big Green's circus tent. We have seen time and again that the liberal 23% can be a "majority" to President Obama, who wields executive orders to bypass the people.

As his administration approaches a decision, lame-duck politics says he could go either way – even with his own State Department's second favorable environmental impact report on the KXL's construction permit. Even with Alberta Premier Alison Redford saying that an Obama rejection would damage U.S.-Canada relations. "Canada relies on the U.S. for 97% of its energy exports," Redford said, and "sees the new pipeline as critical to its economic well-being." And even with ten governors and 22 lieutenant governors sending letters to the President, urging pipeline approval.

What is Obama likely to do? Some 82% of Republicans favor the pipeline, so revenge is not an

unthinkable motive for a possible rejection. However, 70% of independents and 54% of Democrats also favor the KXL. Fogging the crystal ball is the ideological split among Democrats: 60% of the party's conservatives and moderates support building the pipeline, compared to just 42% of liberal Democrats. That considerably flattens Obama's upward slope toward a potential rejection, but doesn't level it.

Obama's decision may hinge on pleasing his base of global-warming advocates. This whole Keystone XL controversy was carefully conceived and organized as a "globally significant response" to global warming. Shutting down Alberta's oil sands – by blocking both the US-bound Keystone XL pipeline and any other Alberta oil conduit, particularly a proposed link to Vancouver, British Columbia harbors and oil tankers bound for Asia – would supposedly reduce global warming. That's propaganda, not reality.

As Environment Canada has observed, oil sands production contributes a mere 0.14% of global greenhouse gases, notes, and would add an undetectable 0.00001 degrees C per year to global warming, even if carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases really do drive climate change.

The anti-oil sands campaign – activists call them "tar sands" to evoke ugly images – was devised by the New York City-based Rockefeller Brothers Fund, using earmarked grants to recruit "a network of leading US and Canadian NGOs" and establish a "coordinated campaign structure" to act as its public face, according to a leaked PowerPoint presentation.

The first slide says, "The Tar Sands Campaign, Michael Northrop, Program Officer, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, July 2008." Seven slides drive home the message that Rockefeller wants its paid campaigners to emphasize: Oil sands and

*Continued on page 6*