

SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY



The 'Coal is Filthy' Ad-Scam

Gas company ad campaign harms US energy policies and consumers



By Paul Driessen

Even in this “era of corporate social responsibility,” employing legislative processes to promote ideological agendas and higher profits is still Job One for many organizations.

The recent “Coal is filthy” ad campaign is a perfect example. Featuring misleading claims about pollution from coal-fired electrical generating plants, and a CleanSkyCoalition.com website, it urged citizens to tell government officials, “No more filthy coal plants.”

But the Coalition wasn’t another gaggle of environmental pressure groups, like those listed on the website. It was a cabal of natural gas companies, led by Chesapeake Energy of Oklahoma. Their goal wasn’t really helping Americans get “clean skies” and “live longer.” It was fattening corporate wallets.

The cabal hoped new laws would make it harder to build more coal plants or retrofit old ones to meet tougher air quality standards. Utilities would have to switch to natural gas, supplies would tighten, prices would surge, and Coalition partners would get rich.

Every \$1 increase in natural gas prices costs US consumers another \$22 billion a year for heating, air-conditioning, food, consumer goods and services – many of which use gas for energy or raw materials – says the Energy Information Administration. Indeed, consumers paid \$140 billion more in 2006 for gas and electricity than they did in 2000 – an extra \$1900 a year for every family of four.

That hit poor families especially hard, and the US manufacturing sector lost 3 million jobs.

Chesapeake has 9 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of proven gas reserves. That sounds like a lot, but US demand for natural gas has outstripped domestic production since 1985, forcing us to import the difference, largely from less than friendly countries and in competition with other nations. Substituting gas for coal-fired electricity, as the ads suggest, would exacerbate these problems.

Geologists say the US Outer Continental Shelf could contain 420 Tcf – enough to meet current demand for 15 years. But over 85% of these areas are off limits to drilling; the situation is similar with onshore public lands; and eco purists want to keep it that way.

Electricity provides 40% of the energy we use, and the

United States will need 100,000 megawatts of new electricity by 2020, according to analysts. Conservation and efficiency efforts would reduce demand somewhat. But growth in population and technologies that use electricity mean we will need every available source: gas, nuclear, hydroelectric, wind, biofuels, waste-to-energy – and coal. Right now, coal generates 50% of our electricity, and there are no viable alternatives in the near term.

The ads and environmental group websites say coal-fired power plants are responsible for scary-sounding portions of total US air pollution. But under scrutiny, some inconvenient facts make their Pollution Monsters look more like Sesame Street Cookie Monsters.

Between 1970 and 2004, the US population grew by 40% ... its Gross Domestic Product by 187% ... miles traveled by 171% ... electricity consumption by 115% ... and coal burning by 80 percent. And yet, during this period, aggregate air pollution was halved, thanks to improved efficiency and pollution control, air quality expert Joel Schwartz points out. New rules require large additional reductions during the next decade that will eliminate most remaining power plant emissions by 2017.

Coal-fired power plants are now the primary source of US mercury emissions, not because their emissions are large or increasing, but because the real sources (incinerating wastes and processing ores containing mercury) have been eliminated. America now accounts for only 2% of global mercury emissions, and new EPA rules require a further 70% reduction from power plants over the next decade, Schwartz says.

Total air pollution is now so low that it poses no significant health risks, even for children. (Asthma rates have been rising as air pollution was falling, so air pollution cannot be a factor.) Moreover, coal-generated electricity costs much less per kilowatt hour than alternatives – leaving families with more money to spend on nutrition and healthcare.

Climatologist John Christy points to another consideration. In 1900, the world supported 56 billion human life years: 1.6 billion people times a 35-year average life span. Today it supports 429 billion life years: 6.5 billion people times a 66-year average life span – and they are living far better than anyone in history.

(Cont'd on Pg. 2)

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.AMERICANPOLICY.ORG

WHO'S TO BLAME FOR THE SELLOUT?

By Henry Lamb

The nation’s transportation experts have identified the top three priorities: a national freight network; urban congestion; and connecting new urban centers with the interstate system. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, meeting in national conference last month, heard futurists predict that the cost of meeting the transportation needs would be \$3.1 trillion over the next 25 years. State and local governments are turning to “public-private partnerships” (PPP) to produce the funding.

The City of Chicago was happy to partner with a Spanish-Australian group that paid \$1.83 billion for a 99-year lease to operate the Chicago

Skyway. The same outfit paid Indiana \$3.85 billion to operate the Indiana Tollway for 75 years. The same Spanish company has partnered with a Texas firm to give the state of Texas \$7.2 billion to build and operate the first leg of the Trans-Texas Corridor. And Pennsylvania’s Governor Rendell is expecting a bid of between \$15-18 billion for the Pennsylvania turnpike.

Most states have already enacted, or are considering, legislation to authorize this PPP financing of public infrastructure.

Public opposition to PPP financing encouraged the Texas legislature to adopt a two-year moratorium on the state’s PPP projects. The governor’s veto, however, along with threats from the U.S. Department of Transportation, forced the legislature to pass a watered-down compromise bill that blocks only future PPP projects, but allows the current Trans-Texas Corridor to go forward.

Public opposition to PPP financing encouraged Chairman of the House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee, James Oberstar, and Transit Subcommittee Chairman,

Rep. Peter DeFazio, to issue a May 10 letter to governors and state transportation officials that warned about rushing into PPPs that did not fully protect the public interest.

“We don’t need their advice, frankly,” said Governor Mitch Daniels. He said the letter was “nothing but Congressional posturing.” Daniels’ criticism was typical of the response from state officials.

National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Commission Vice Chairman, Jack Schenendorf, told the conference attendees that the federal program no longer has a sense of mission, which has led to competition among the states for federal funds, and to the proliferation of “earmarks” for local political advantage.

Regardless of the finger-pointing, the fact remains that driving in urban areas is a nightmare, and driving on the interstate system is like playing tag with 18-wheelers, and it’s getting worse, not better. The people want relief, but not at the expense of bondage to PPPs.

Officials claim that transportation revenues from traditional sources

IN THIS ISSUE:

3. RESISTANCE TO REASON
Fear and Loathing in the Pantry;
Is Obesity Just a State of Mind?
4. ABSOLUTES:
Stupid Human Tricks: The Sad
Case of the Spotted Owl;
Global Warming and its Evil Twin
'Climate Change' Predictions
Wrong on Both Counts
6. INSIDER'S REPORT:
Scuttle the Law of the Sea Treaty!
8. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:
The 'Coal is Filthy' Ad-Scam

are barely adequate to maintain existing roads, and do not provide for future construction. If this contention is true, the next question to be answered must be: is this the result of inadequate fuel tax rates, or have the revenues from fuel taxes been siphoned off for other purposes?

This question directed at transportation officials produces an incredible array of slippery answers. Legislators, at every level of government, should insist that transportation taxes be spent on nothing but transportation. If transportation taxes are used exclusively for transportation needs, and the revenue is inadequate, then a tax increase is required to meet the needs of the people.

Realistically, with gas prices above \$3 per gallon, no politician will suggest increasing the gasoline tax, when it is so much easier to sell off a highway to a PPP, and reap billions in new money - without having to ask the voters for a tax increase.

The voter still pays; he just won't have a vote. And the price he pays will be more. Toll-roads built or operated by PPPs must pay a profit to the shareholders of the firms that put up the money. If the state builds and operates the infrastructure, that profit does not have to be built into the price, and therefore, the voter saves a bundle.

Infrastructure sales to PPPs is the hottest ticket in town. It's going to take a monstrous effort by the people to reverse this trend that is clearly rushing across the nation like a tidal wave. Transportation officials see PPPs as the answer to their revenue problems. Legislators tend to "go along" with the budget committee, unless they are peppered by contacts from their constituents.

Texas voters tried valiantly to put a moratorium on the sale of the Trans-Texas

Corridor to Cintra-Zachry, the Spanish-Australian PPP that wants to pay \$7.2 billion to the state. They succeeded in the legislature, but threats from the governor and the federal government ignored what the people want.

In every state, and every community, someone is planning, right now, to sell public infrastructure to a public-private partnership. Chances are better than good that the PPP has its roots in another country. This can't be good for America.

Henry Lamb is the Executive Vice-President of the Environmental Conservation Organization (ECO), and Chairman of Sovereignty International. 

COAL ... (Cont'd from Pg. 8)

For that we can thank energy, primarily fossil fuels. And in exchange for this incredible progress – if fossil fuels are the primary cause of global warming – we have had a net increase in average global temperature, over the past 100 years, of about 1 degree F. (As a percentage of Earth's atmosphere, carbon dioxide emissions from US coal-fired power plants equal the thickness of a single human hair on a football field.)

In sum, the Chesapeake & Collaborators ad campaign added greatly to the pervasive misinformation that drives so much US energy, health and environmental policy. It will doubtless be used to justify global warming legislation, such as the Sanders-Boxer bill (S. 309) that a new MIT study concludes would impose a tax-equivalent of \$4,500 annually on every family of four by 2015 – and more thereafter.

As Congress conducts additional experiments on constituents – with mandates, cap-and-trade, tax incentives and other pork-laden "environmental" legislation – the problem will only get worse. Unless citizens demand a change in business-as-usual.

Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, and author of Eco-Imperialism: Green power-Black death (www.Eco-Imperialism.com). 

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 13, No. 7 July 2007

Published by
American Policy Center

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Copy Editor
Virginia DeWeese

Correspondence/Fulfillment
Sascha McGuckin
Carolyn DeWeese

Graphics/Layout
Kristy Wilson

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

Phone: (540) 341-8911
Fax: (540) 341-8917

E-mail:
ampolicycenter@hotmail.com

Web Page:
www.americanpolicy.org

© 2007 American Policy Center
ISSN 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

Newsletter of the
American Policy Center

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 The 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.

1. Contact the leadership and members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Joseph Biden is the Chair, and Senator Richard Lugar is the Ranking Republican. You can write the committee at:

439 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510
Call the committee at: (202) 224-4651
Fax to: (202) 224-0836

2. Contact your Senators. Find your Senators' contact info by going to www.thomas.gov.

3. Contact Senator Mitch McConnell, Senate Minority Leader. Senator McConnell leads a block of 49 Republican votes – we only need 34 to stop LOST. Pressure on Senator McConnell is one of our best chances to stop this treaty.

Mitch McConnell
361-A Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
Call him at: (202) 224-2541
Fax him at: (202) 224-2499

4. Contact the White House, that address is:
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20500
For Comments call: (202) 456-1111
For the Switchboard call: (202) 456-1414

Tell these guardians of We The People your categorically oppose the Lost of the Sea Treaty for the following reasons:

- LOST accession exceeds the Senate's Constitutional authority, as the Senate may not obligate the United States and its citizens to an international agreement that contravenes our Constitution.
- LOST seeks to redistribute wealth and technology to irresponsible Third World governments with a history of corruption and squandering foreign aid.
- LOST seeks such financial transfers even to "peoples who have not attained full independence or other self-governing status." Can anyone spell P-L-O?
- LOST creates a complicated multinational bureaucracy that would be highly politicized, potentially discriminatory against Americans, and a subsidized competitor.
- LOST mandates transfer of mining technologies to Third World companies if these Third World competitors are "unable to obtain" desired equipment commercially.
- LOST's mining scheme cannot guarantee that seabed mining will ever be commercially viable.
- LOST contains no transparent system for recognizing

mine sites and resolving disputes.

- LOST's provisions which could be considered beneficial (provisions regarding the environment, resource management and rights of transit) reflect what is already customary international law – so there is no need to ratify the treaty.

- LOST's provision restricting and regulating intelligence and submarine maneuvers would achieve what the Russians (navy rusting in port) and the Chinese (no blue water naval capability) cannot.

- LOST accession by Brazil, China, India, Malaysia, North Korea, Pakistan, and others has not prevented these countries from making ocean claims deemed excessive by others.

- LOST does not define the "military activities" exempted from control.

- Admiral Michael G. Mullen, the vice chief of naval operations, states a LOST tribunal could rule adversely and harm U.S. "operational planning and activities, and our security."

- Further, Adm. Mullen warned that treaty ratification did not "suggest that countries' attempts to restrict navigation will cease once the United States becomes a party to the Law of the Sea Convention (Treaty)."

- Free passage on the seas would be problematic at best if the power of the U.S. Navy was anchored by LOST.

- International law did not prevent North Korea from seizing the USS Pueblo in 1988, and approval of LOST would offer no real additional protection.

Phone calls and letters are the most effective way to contact your elected representatives.

E-mails and faxes are many times ignored. Members of Congress have been changing their e-mail addresses and fax numbers when we send out alerts. If you prefer, though, you can send an e-mail by going to each member's website at www.thomas.gov.

Alternatively, you may phone the United States Capitol switchboard at (202) 224-3121. A switchboard operator will connect you directly with the Senate office you request.

If you choose to write, and do not know your Senators' mailing addresses, you may simply address your letters as follows:

Office of Senator (Name)
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510



INSIDER'S REPORT

Scuttle the Law of the Sea Treaty!

By Kathy Lehman / Editor - APC NewsWire

The Law of the Sea Treaty (LOST) is another grand scheme of the United Nations. LOST would give control of roughly 70% of the Earth's surface to the U.N., establishing rules which would govern the use of the world's oceans. LOST is back, and on a fast track for ratification because the Bush Administration is now calling for accession to this convention. We have stopped LOST several times in the past, and we should be able to stop it again, with enough outcry.

It's important to remember the United Nations is not a country or government. It is a private organization that tries to tell sovereign nations when to jump, and how high, under threat of military intervention.

For an excellent education on the legal consequences of treaties on domestic Americans, please read *Reid v. Covert, 354 U.S. 1 (1957)*, a Supreme Court case very relevant to the issue of international treaties. As Justice Black opined in this case, under our U.S. Constitution, our civil liberties cannot be subordinated by a treaty, stating:

"It would be manifestly contrary to the objectives of those who created the Constitution, as well as those who were responsible for the Bill of Rights – let alone alien to our entire constitutional history and tradition – to construe Article VI as permitting the United States to exercise power under an international agreement without observing constitutional prohibitions. The court has regularly and uniformly recognized the supremacy of the Constitution over a treaty."

The LOST convention, part of the United Nation's redistributionist agenda known as the "New International Economic Order," was cobbled together in the 1970s to benefit Third World countries wanting to fine and punish the wealth and technological advantages of the industrialized West.

For instance, a seabed mining company would be required to pay a \$250,000 application fee for access to a mining site AND for a bonus site the International Seabed Authority (ISA) could utilize for its own mining efforts.

That corporation would have to pay an annual royalty fee of \$1 million (up to 7% of annual profits) and agree to "principles" that guide the use and distribution of mining and navigational technology. That corporation would be unable to file suit, but must rely upon its country of origin to address its concerns before the ISA. It should be noted here that the United States would have one vote out of 140, and no veto power as it has on the U.N. Security Council.

Former President Ronald Reagan torpedoed LOST in 1982 as it conflicts with the basic free market principles of private property, free enterprise and competition. Former President William Clinton floated a revised version to the U.S. Senate in 1994. The Senate refused to ratify it, and the U.S. provisional participation expired in 1998. The treaty bobbed back up in 2004 under the sponsorship of Senator Richard Lugar, R-IN, (then Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee). It was again sunk, this time by then Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, R-TN.

Apparently hoping to take full advantage of the power shift in D.C, President George W. Bush has announced his intention to salvage LOST. This decision was immediately and forcefully opposed by conservative grass-roots organizations such as Eagle Forum, the Center for Security Policy, the Leadership Institute, the Free Congress Foundation, and the Heritage Foundation.

President Bush claims the U.S. military sought reintroduction of LOST, as it would place 12-mile territorial limits on other nation's claims to coastal waters. Perhaps our military has not read the restrictions and regulations the treaty would impose of intelligence and submarine maneuvers in territorial waters. Or, perhaps the American people face a graver threat than traitors in Congress.

Action To Take

The Law of the Sea Treaty (LOST) remains a seriously flawed document, designed to transfer wealth and technology from industrialized states to those of the Third World. It is anathema to our Founding Principles and will threaten our national sovereignty.



RESISTANCE TO REASON

REVEALING FACTS OF THOSE WHO HAVE DECLARED WAR ON LOGIC



FEAR AND LOATHING IN THE PANTRY

Food cops like Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI) executive director Michael Jacobson pride themselves on "finding something wrong with practically everything." And their killjoy campaigns are not without effect. As the *Santa Fe New Mexican's* Barbara Ferry pointed out on Sunday:

[We] spend too much time studying nutrition facts on food packages, weighing ourselves, feeling guilty about what we're eating, exercising like robots on equipment and hating our bodies ... we spend far too little time simply enjoying a meal or moving our bodies for the fun of it.

Amen to that.

Last year, a survey released by the Pew Research Center found that since 1989 the number of Americans who truly enjoy eating has dropped by 25 million. A recent feature on Calorie Restriction (the latest dieting craze) in *New York Magazine* describes a dinner host "weighing arugula on an electronic postage scale, carefully adding a leaf here, removing one there, like a drug dealer parsing out dime bags." And - according to a study co-sponsored by the American Psychological Association - young girls today are "more afraid of becoming fat than they are of cancer, nuclear war or losing their parents."

With government agencies and activist groups pushing for more and more extreme restrictions on what, when, where and how our nation eats, it's no surprise younger generations are learning to fear - rather than take pleasure in - food. World-renowned chef Julia Child foresaw this threat when she told the *Associated Press* in 1989 that in a world dominated by the food police, "[s]itting down to dinner is a trap, not something to enjoy." 

IS OBESITY JUST A STATE OF MIND?

Food activists love to blame "Big Food" for turning a profit from obesity. But few ever wag their fingers at those most responsible for the hype about the "obesity epidemic": the diet and pharmaceutical industries, which stand to gain the most from a population obsessed with weight.

Consumer demand for diet books, powders, programs, and pills has driven the growth of the weight loss industry (with \$61 billion in profits projected for 2008) and drug companies. And now health-insurance coverage for obesity procedures and prescriptions promises a new way to guarantee the green. Many insurance policies don't cover weight loss interventions, but an editorial in the May issue of the *American Journal of Psychiatry* wants insurers to break out their checkbooks:

[T]his condition [obesity] is not only a metabolic disorder but also a brain disorder ... Here, we propose that some forms of obesity are driven by an excessive motivational drive for food and should be included as a mental disorder in DSM-V ... Obesity is characterized by compulsive consumption of food and the inability to restrain from eating despite the desire to do so.

The DSM-V handbook (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders) will be the next edition of the standard reference book used by doctors, policy makers, and insurance companies to diagnose and treat established mental disorders. Turning love-handles into a *mental* illness would affect everyone, regardless of their girth. Premiums would go up to offset costly treatments (donut interventions?) for this newly defined disease.

The psychiatric establishment should remember that obesity is a mouth-related and leg-related (exercise, anyone?) condition - not a brain disorder. 

Find these and other articles at *The Center for Consumer Freedom* - www.consumerfreedom.com.

ABSOLUTES....!

STUPID HUMAN TRICKS:**THE SAD CASE OF THE SPOTTED OWL**

By Tom DeWeese

Environmentalists are quick to lecture the rest of us about the ways of nature. Don't clean the dead trees off the forest floor, it's natural. Cattle and horses on the range aren't native, so let the grizzlies and wolves devour them, it's natural. Man isn't part of the ecology, lock him out of vast areas of land, it's natural. It's interesting to note how the "natural" argument only applies when it is used to impose the radical environmental agenda. Case in point, the Northern Spotted Owl.

Spotted owls, we were told a decade ago, were disappearing because big bad timber companies were cutting down "old growth" forests." So the environmental movement rushed to the forests, hugged the trees and issued news releases to decry the evils of the logging industry. Save the owl. Save the trees. Kill the timber industry.

Of course, that was exactly the point. Kill the timber industry. As a result of the hysteria to save the "endangered" owls, U.S. timber sales were reduced by 80-90%, forcing saw mills to close, loggers to go broke and whole towns which depended on the industry to literally disappear. The federal crackdown on the industry caused a shift in U.S. domestic lumber supplies to foreign soils. In short, American industry suffered in the name of protecting the spotted owl. Turns out it wasn't true.

A decade and thousands of broken dreams later, comes this report from the federal government on the real reasons for the spotted owl's endangerment: "Oops."

According to a new government draft plan to save the species, scientists are no longer saying the greatest threat to the Spotted Owl is logging activity. "The draft recovery plan recognizes the primary threat to northern spotted owls as *competition with barred owls*." According to the report, barred owls are less selective about the habitat they use and the prey they feed upon and are out competing northern spotted owls for habitat and food, causing its decline.



In fact, for the entire decade since the issue emerged on the political scene, the property rights and land use movements have been reporting the fact that the spotted owl is only a sub-species of Mexican spotted owls, which are not endangered at all. Some experts will say the only way to tell the difference between the two is by their accents. (OK, I'm kidding, but this ridiculous story needs some humor). It was no secret that the spotted owl didn't need "old growth forests" to survive, since spotted owls were found living under bridges and in McDonald signs. What it needed was a good food source like any other species. Now we know it was undercut by another owl – a completely natural occurrence.

What was accomplished during the ten-year fight besides the destruction of an entire industry? The establishment of a very radical and dangerous political agenda called the environmental movement. Its power is now so great that no politician dare oppose them. Yet, that power, we now know for certain, was built on a lie. Some in the movement have even candidly admitted that if they didn't have the spotted owl they would have invented something like it to drive their agenda. In fact they did invent it and the purpose was to destroy the timber industry and private property rights. They called it an environmental emergency.

Now the truth has come out. So, will the same federal government which rushed to impose harsh treatment of innocent property owners and industry now roll back those stifling regulations and let freedom breathe? Of course not. Agendas are agendas, regardless of the facts.

So instead, after the nation spent millions of dollars to destroy an industry's private property rights, still, the government plans to spend \$200 million more on a "barred owl removal plan" in order to save the spotted owl.

And as usual, when a new government debacle is rolled out, there is always an emergency to drive the policy. Now, according to Ren Loheofener, director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Pacific Region, "Because the range
(Cont'd on Pg. 4)

...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

**Global Warming and its Evil Twin "Climate Change"
Predictions Wrong on Both Counts**

By Tom DeWeese

Global warming alarmists are a clever bunch. They have very carefully changed the issue from "global warming" to "climate change." Now any change in weather, be it mild winters or cool summers can be attributed to "climate change." Whatever the weather, the news is very bad.

One claim threatens massive storms thrashing our communities. Such a threat was an easy sell in 2005 as Katrina was blamed for nearly destroying New Orleans in a hurricane season that seemed without end. Surely it could not be denied that climate change Armageddon was upon us.

To make the point, in September, 2005, Bjorn Carey, Staff Writer for the website, LiveScience.com reported that the "Increase in major hurricanes (was) linked to warmer seas." Said Carey, "the number of severe hurricanes has doubled worldwide even though the total number of hurricanes has dropped over the last 35 years." Carey continued, "The increase in major storms like Katrina coincides with a global increase of sea surface temperatures, which scientists say is an effect of global warming."

Based on such "scientific" studies and having just experienced such a horrific hurricane season, the world braced for the 2006 season. Nothing happened. No severe storms. All was quiet on the oceanfront.

Were the alarmists wrong? Could the predictions be mistaken? Was this the end of the hysteria? Of course not. With huge monetary rewards and government grants at stake, the climate change artists knew just what to do – switch gears. No muss. No fuss.

In April, 2007, Andrea Thompson, another staff writer for the same website, LiveScience.com wrote, "Global Warming could hinder hurricanes." Said Thompson, "Global Warming might not fuel more intense hurricanes in the Atlantic after all. Despite increasing ocean temperatures that feed monster

SPOTTED OWL.... (Cont'd from Pg. 4) and numbers of barred owls are expanding rapidly, our effectiveness in addressing this threat depends on immediate action..."

Here's an immediate action sane folks could recommend: Let the barred owls alone to do what comes natural to them. If the Spotted Owl can't keep up – then good riddance. It's been used to cause enough pain and obviously its time is up. It's a natural process. Species

storms, climate change may also be ramping up the winds that choke off a hurricane's development..." Nothing, not even facts stop the dedicated climate change alarmist.

The truth is, global warming and climate change have nothing to do with how severe the hurricane season is. Those who have documented hurricanes since we had the tools to study them report that how severe the season is depends on a well-known natural phenomenon which comes in two parts – El Nino and its evil sister La Nina.

Every few years certain elements in the weather cause the oceans to either warm or cool. An El Nino is a warming of the water temperature and actually tends to produce a milder storm season. An El Nino is the reason for last year's mild hurricane season. A La Nina, on the other hand, is a cooling of the mid-Pacific equatorial region causing ocean temperatures to cool resulting in greater storm activity and velocity.

Storm watchers issued a prediction that the 2007 hurricane season will possibly be a severe one because indications are a La Nina is forming. Forecasters admit they don't know how severe the weather will be because they don't know how strong the La Nina is. However, it typically means more hurricanes in the Atlantic, fewer in the Pacific, less rain and more heat for the southern U.S. and a milder spring and summer in the north. Conrad Lautenbacher, NOAA Administrator, the federal agency responsible for hurricane watching further explained, "The central plains of the United States tend to be drier in the fall during La Nina, while the Pacific Northwest tends to be wetter in the late fall and early winter.

So this year, if your region is experiencing unusually dry weather, perhaps a drought, or a cool spring, or a mild summer, rest assured it's completely natural and has nothing to do with the wit or wisdom of Al Gore. He's just trying to scare you into giving him another Oscar. Don't be fooled. It's not "climate change," it's just weather. 

come and go. We've got plenty of Mexican spotted owls to play with if we get homesick for them.

Of course, the final chapter is yet to be written. Soon, if the new "recovery plan" is successful, it won't be long before the environmental movement has a new emergency – man's wanton destruction of the barred owl. Creating false environmental disasters just comes natural for some people. 