

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 19 - Issue 7

July 2013

Exxon Funding...? Nope, Never Got The Check?

By Tom DeWeese

It's almost funny to watch. The radical left "Progressives" see our Agenda 21 and Global Warming victories over their well-orchestrated plans to restructure America, and they just can't understand how it's happening. Their only theory is that there must be some massive source of secret money driving us. We couldn't possibly be a true grassroots movement, doing this on our own.

So, the Progressives are using all of their impressive resources in government, the news media and the Internet to publish articles and plant their attempts to ridicule, cast doubt and spread their own creative conspiracy theories about our unexplained successes.

Here are just a very few samples. The *New York Times* launched a Front Page, Sunday addition, attack entitled "Activists Fight Green Projects, Seeing UN Plot." *Mother Jones* magazine offered its version of the anti Agenda 21 battle with this headline: "We don't need none of that Smart-growth Communism." Then came *The Atlantic* magazine's offering under the title of "Is the UN Using Bike Paths to Achieve World Domination?" And then *The Atlantic Cities* publication decried "How the Tea Party is Upending Urban Planning." And that, of course, is the center of the matter. Anti-Agenda 21 activists are scoring victories in community after community, seriously curtailing or even stopping "urban planning" which has damaged citizen's rights to use their own bought and paid for private property. How outrageous.

In addition to the articles in main stream media, they have dedicated whole web sites and blogs to the task of "exposing" the leaders of this unexplained movement, digging deep to find our hidden funding, and searching for "suspicious" links to others guilty of the

"conspiracy." The witch hunt is searching for the roots of Hillary Clinton's proclaimed "Vast Right Wing Conspiracy."

The web sites and blogs include *Wing Nut Watch*, through which they breathlessly alert readers to the latest right wing threat; *Desmogblog.com*, which declares its purpose to "Clearing the PR Pollution That Clouds Climate Science." Meaning, of course, that anyone who questions the "science" of global warming theories is nothing more than a public relations huckster bought and paid for by evil big oil.

Exxon Secrets and Greenpeace

Along those same lines is *Exxonsecrets.org*, created by Greenpeace. The site claims that most of the vast right wing conspiracy is funded by Exxon. Which, so the theory goes, is the reason why the poor Greens just can't get any respect or traction for their dire warnings that Global Warming is about to destroy the Earth. And so, they claim, as the Earthen pot boils, Exxon funds the "deniers" so it can continue to make obscene profits.

According to the site, Exxon is supposed to have accomplished this feat by funneling \$22,123,436 to more than 100 groups since 1998. That would average out to about 1,474, 895 per year, meaning each group would receive about \$14,700 per year. Now the real mystery is how that tiny amount could influence anything. But the site presses on, including an elaborate mapping system designed like a spider web to show the direct ties between all of the right wing groups, their leaders, their funding and their ties to Exxon. Amazing stuff. Even more amazing is how utterly inaccurate are the charges from such sources.

Continued to Page 2

IN THIS
ISSUE

PAGE 3 - SHORTS: HERE IT IS ...THE SMOKING GUN THE DIRECT LINK BETWEEN AGENDA 21 AND LOCAL PLANERS

PAGE 4 - SHORTS: THE BATTLE AGAINST FEDERAL COMMON CORE EDUCATION STANDARDS

PAGE 5 - SHORTS: PETA, PUTTING DRONES BEFORE HOMELESS PETS

PAGE 8 - TYRANNY: BIG GREEN HELPS BIG WIND HIDE BIRD AND BAT BUTCHERY

EXXON

*Continued from Page 1***Lazy reporters and inaccurate claims**

Yet, the real danger in such postings is that lazy, uneducated reporters use such websites and blogs as sources for stories. For example, the Washington Post used Desmogblog.com as a source for an attack on the Heartland Institute. Heartland is one of the leading organizations attempting to bring balance and scientific accuracy into the Global Warming debate. It has sponsored several international conferences featuring scientists who have dared to disagree with the Chicken Little scare tactics making the Institute the alarmist's favorite target.

The Post claimed that Heartland received more than \$7.3 million from Exxon Mobil between 1998 and 2010, and nearly \$14.4 million between 1986 and 2010 from foundations affiliated with Charles and David Koch. In fact, during that time period, Heartland received only \$700,000 from Exxon Mobil (not \$7.3million as the Post claimed). Worse, the Institute received only \$25,000 from the Kochs, and that wasn't for the Global Warming issue, but for work concerning health care issues.

Greenpeace has charged that Exxon Mobil was funding respected scientist Dr. Willie Soon. He is a research scientist who earned notoriety by exposing the fallacies of Michael Mann's so-called "Hockey Stick" graph of warming temperatures in 2003. Dr. Soon also wrote that polar bears were not threatened by a decline in Arctic ice in 2007. Recently Greenpeace was forced to admit that Exxon Mobil was not financing Dr. Soon. Nor was Exxon Mobil sending checks to such Global Warming truth warriors as the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT) and the Frontiers of Freedom. Yet all are listed on Exxonsecrets.org as receiving such funding. As Joe Bast of Heartland Institute puts it, such false reports are designed to "*add to the false narrative that the only persons and organizations that question the dogma of man-made global warming are shills for the oil industry.*"

Only paid shills would support Global Warming denials

Of course, my favorite use of such misinformation concerning the funding of the Vast Right Wing Conspiracy deal with funding of my American Policy Center. On more than one occasion, as I appear on radio interviews to discuss the issue of Global Warming or Sustainable Development, the host charges that I am a paid shill of Exxon Mobil. They try to make the claim that it's the only reason I could possibly take such a position. Such charges have also appeared in several letters to the editor in newspapers in cities where I was invited to speak and in opinion articles all over the internet.

Most recently the charge was made by the Mayor of Whitney Point, New York, David Downs. When anti-Agenda 21 activists presented American Policy Center materials as part of their presentation, the Mayor answered by saying, "*I am aware that the American Policy Center is funded by super-rich individuals (like the Kochs) and large corporations with vested interests (like Exxon).*" And the Mayor went on about me, saying, "*Tom Deweese(sic) has had fundraising schemes going back many years. He is a very experienced and highly skilled PR man. It is even likely that he believes much of this stuff that he is being paid to promote.*"

Now, where did a mayor, who has never met me, never spoken to me, get such ideas? Obviously it wasn't first hand knowledge. Here's one clue. In an article appearing on www.treehugger.com, entitled "Exposing the Influence Behind the Anti-Agenda 21 Anti-Sustainability Agenda," author Lloyd Alter did his best to paint me as "the loudest mouthpiece of the anti-Agenda 21 crowd." He believes (as he quotes Robin Rather of something called *Collective Strength*) that the only way such an "innocuous 20 year old document" has become such a nationwide battle is because "the Agenda 21 phenomenon is highly manufactured." Says Rather, "It's not out there in the mainstream." "Yet, the scale of the Agenda 21 campaign is enormous. Who is manufacturing it," asks Rather.

Continued to Page 6

DeWeese Report

Vol. 19, No. 7
July 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.comCopy Right
2013 The American
Policy Center
Issn 1086-7937
All Rights ReservedPermission to photocopy,
Reprint and quote articles
from the DeWeese Report
ishereby 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

Here it is... The Smoking Gun

The direct link between Agenda 21 and local planners!

When the fight started against Agenda 21, those of us working to expose it were largely ignored by the main stream media and even the established Conservative movement and its media. Too far out there, they said, to be taken seriously.

Then, as more and more Americans began to experience the dire effects of Sustainable Development in their daily lives, suddenly our message began to take hold. Today, thousands of Americans have taken up the fight. And anti-Agenda 21 activists are storming planning meetings, demanding answers. State legislatures and even some county and city governments are passing legislation against it. It seems the Agenda 21 fight is everywhere.

So, now, proponents of the Sustainable Development policy are alarmed and working feverishly to counter our claims that such controls over local development and energy policy have their roots in international policy. In particular, our claims that these planning policies come from the UN's Agenda 21, that was introduced to the world at the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992.

Their most often used description of Agenda 21 is an "innocuous, 20 year old document that has no enforcement power." Continuously we hear that local planning programs, especially from such groups like the American Planning Association (APA) have no connection to Agenda 21 or the UN. It's all local – or as the APA says in its document, Glossary for the Public, "There is no hidden agenda." In its "Agenda 21: Myths and Facts" document found on the APA website, the group goes to extreme measures to distance itself and its policies from Agenda 21, specifically saying "The American Planning Association has no affiliation regarding any policy goals and recommendations of the UN."

Well, then it would be interesting to hear the APA explain this information found in one of its own documents from 1994. The document was an APA newsletter to its members in the Northern California (San Francisco Area). The article was a commentary entitled "How Sustainable is Out Planning, by Robert Odland. It was written just two years after the UN Earth Summit at which Agenda 21 was first introduced to the world.

The fifth paragraph of the article says, "Vice President Gore's book, Earth in the Balance addressed many of the general issues of sustainability. Within the past year, the President's Council on Sustainable Development has been organized to develop recommendations for incorporating sustainability into the federal government. Also, various groups have been formed to implement Agenda 21, a comprehensive blueprint for sustainable development that was adopted at the recent UNCED conference in Rio de Janeiro (the "Earth Summit.")

In one paragraph, this document brings together the APA, Agenda 21, the UN's Earth Summit, Al Gore, Sustainable Development, the President's Council on Sustainable Development, NGO groups with the mission of implementing Agenda 21 and the description of Agenda 21 as a "comprehensive Blueprint" for Sustainable planning. It sounds like it came verbatim from one of my speeches!

A couple of paragraphs higher in the article, it says, "*A common misconception is that sustainability is synonymous with self-sufficiency; on the contrary, sustainability must recognize the interconnections between different levels of societal structure.*" That "societal structure" is "social justice," as described in Agenda 21. A visit to the PlannersNetwork.org, which the APA is a member, will find in its Statement of Principles this quote: "*We believe planning should be a tool for allocating resources...and eliminating the great inequalities of wealth and power in our society ... because the free market has proven incapable of doing this.*"

The United Nations blatantly advocates that Capitalism and private property rights are not sustainable and pose the single greatest threat to the world's ecosystem and social equity. And, while sometimes using different words, the APA is helping communities across the nation enforce these ideas, while swearing it is all a local idea, designed from local input.

As George Orwell masterfully put it in his epic novel "Animal Farm," it's become difficult to see the difference between the pigs and the farmers – or the APA and the UN.

Sustainable Development is not implemented in the open, as the APA claims, but in back rooms filled with the proper NGO organizations, which surround your elected officials and pressures their actions. In that way it is changing our American society and form of government, making government more powerful and more invasive in our daily lives. Sustainability is anti free enterprise, anti private property, and anti individual – and that's why we oppose it. ●

The battle against federal Common Core Education Standards is raging across the nation.

By Karen R. Effrem, MD
President, Education Liberty Watch

HERE IS THE GOOD NEWS FIRST:

Florida - In a great combined effort between a statewide coalition of activists under Floridians Against Common Core Education and Education Liberty Watch, Florida's invasive data mining/tracking bill, SB 878 was stopped. This bill connected Florida's data collection system to the National Center of Education Statistics data elements that contain 300-400 pieces of very person and private data as well as gathering data on students through their work lives. For a bill that had passed both chambers of the legislature unanimously with the difference of a small amendment to be stopped is unprecedented, even miraculous. It speaks to the intense concern about and passion of parents to protect the privacy of their children's and families data from government bureaucrats and corporate profiteers, as well as the inspired research and lobbying team that fought for parental rights in Tallahassee. Details are here. Legislative leaders, the chairman of the state Republican party and the governor are no longer using the phrase "Common Core" in press releases. This combined with some language that will hopefully slow the pace of Common Core implementation in Florida will allow the battle to continue next year.

Indiana - Governor Mike Pence heard the voice of the people of Indiana whose elected representatives passed by wide margins a bill to take a pause on the Common Core by allowing public hearings and a fiscal analysis before further implementation. Passage of this bill makes Indiana the first state in the nation to pause or withdraw on Common Core after having adopted it. Heather Crossin and Erin Tuttle along with their statewide coalition Hoosiers Against Common Core deserve great credit for their perseverance and passion despite attacks by the always big government promoting Chamber of Commerce and the other corporate and foundation interests. Details are available here.

Michigan - The Michigan House passed an amendment to defund the Common Core. There is a rally to continue that effort in Lansing on May 14th.

U.S. House of Representatives - Congressman Blaine Luetkemeyer (R-MO) has written a letter to U.S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan with concerns about the lack of congressional oversight into Common Core and the irregular process by which the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) was changed to weaken student privacy without Congress via regulation. Education Liberty Watch is thankful to Rep. Luetkemeyer and all of the 33 cosigners including Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-MN 6), Rep. Trey Radel (R-FL 19), and Rep. Ted Yoho (R-FL 5) for this effort that will hopefully lead to legislation restoring the privacy protections of FERPA.

U.S. Senate - Senator Charles Grassley (R-IA) and eight other senators [Senator Mike Lee (R-UT), Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK), Senator James Inhofe (R-OK), Senator Deb Fischer (R-NE), Senator Rand Paul (R-KY), Senator Pat Roberts (R-KS), Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) and Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX)] sent a letter to Senate Appropriations Chairman Tom Harkin (D-IA) requesting the defunding of the Common Core standards and tests in compliance with federal law. We can only hope that this effort is successful, but it will be difficult given the partisan divide of the Senate.

The Republican National Committee - The RNC unanimously passed a resolution at their Spring meeting condemning the Common Core and its associated data collection system. It is available here. This sets up a needed debate between the freedom minded, limited government and the corporate and foundation backed establishment elite.

NOW FOR THE BAD NEWS:

Minnesota - Despite many valid legal, legislative, and content concerns, an administrative law judge approved the Common Core linked Minnesota Social Studies standards. The judge's decision may be viewed here and a cogent analysis by attorney Marjorie Holsten may be viewed here. Legal options are still being considered.

In addition, Minnesota's education finance bills seem to be performing a stealth implementation of the Common Core math standards that they had so wisely and on a bipartisan basis rejected. That implementation is being accomplished by using the ACT or SAT as the graduation exam. Because these tests are aligned to the Common Core standards, Minnesota students

Common Core

Continued from Page 4

will in essence have to learn the Common Core math standards in order to pass this exam. This is despite the fact that experts like James Milgram, professor emeritus at Stanford, and who refused to sign off on the final version of the math standards while serving on the validation committee sees the standards as being behind international norms by at least two years at the end of eighth grade.

Florida - The education finance bill is still going ahead with an implementation plan for the Common Core assessments.

Georgia - This state's Common Core withdrawal bill was tabled in the state senate.

Alabama - Alabama's bill to withdraw from Common Core was killed by the Senate President Pro Tempore.

There are starting to be cracks in the dam of the once inevitable Common Core system, but as one can see there is much work still to be done. Education Liberty Watch appreciates your support. Please stay engaged with both your activism and your finances.

*Education Liberty Watch 9601 Annapolis Lane North * Maple Grove, MN 55369 * 952-361-4931 * office@edlibertywatch.org*

PETA, Putting Drones Before Homeless Pets

A heartwarming story from Portsmouth, Virginia is crossing the wires: A dog found near death by animal control and sent to the Portsmouth Humane Society has been adopted and is doing well in the care of her new owner, a veterinary technician. The dog — named “Hope” by Portsmouth Humane staff — was lucky to survive, as news reports indicated that she was so emaciated and swarmed by flies that animal control officers thought she was dead when they found her.

The dog was lucky for another reason, too. Portsmouth sits across the Elizabeth River from Norfolk, home of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals' shelter of horrors, where last year the group killed nearly 90 percent of the pets in the group's care. If circumstances were different, Hope might have needed to abandon all hope.

PETA defends this wanton slaughter of pets by protesting that they are compassionate. Ingrid Newkirk, PETA's president, argues thusly:

We run a shelter but in the most merciful way. We help--because no one else will--the animals who are society's rejects in the area near our Virginia headquarters. These animals are aggressive, feral, on death's door (often with large tumors hanging from their bodies), or otherwise unadoptable.

While there is plenty of evidence that disputes the “death's door” claim by Newkirk, it stands to reason that Hope, having been found so emaciated that trained dog wardens thought her dead, would not have any hope in PETA's shelter. Perhaps they should call the recovering dog “Lucky,” since she not only survived a delinquent former owner but avoided being the recently killed subject of a PETA self-defending “but we only kill desperate animals” blog post.

As for “aggressive” dogs, what about the animals seized as part of the Michael Vick dogfighting case in Surry — again, not far from PETA's HQ? Many of the animals were rehabilitated through hard work and have new homes. They may well have been put down if they had been given to PETA.

So if PETA isn't saving these pets with its \$30 million annual budget, what is the animal liberation group that hasn't seen a press event it didn't like up to? Buying drones. No, seriously: U.S. News reports that PETA will “soon have some impressive new weapons at its disposal [...]” and that it is “shopping for one or more drone aircraft.” The drones would be used by PETA to “stalk” hunters. Even though the group denies that it wants to arm its new, expensive spy toys, given PETA's history of supporting violent extremists the rhetoric about “weapons” is chilling. But this all may be pointless, because if armed hunters don't like drones...

So, donors have a choice: Rehabilitate sick dogs by donating to their local shelters, or help a multimillion dollar national group buy drones, while it kills pets in the name of mercy. Sounds like an easy choice to us.

EXXON*Continued from page 2*

Alter builds on his conspiracy theory, saying, “Usually when you listen to complaints of Tea Party members, they are different inflections, a much wider variation. But this isn’t organic and local, the same talking points come up everywhere. **They are being played and used.** Alder’s emphasis). *The whole campaign serves no interest to anyone who isn’t trying to ensure that we keep burning as much fossil fuel as we can for as long as possible.*”

There it is again. The only possible explanation they are able to consider is that big oil is funding such a conspiracy in order to stuff their pockets with big bucks. Of course they would believe that, because that’s exactly how the Left operates in most cases. There is very little leftist grassroots movement. They usually find a big funder to create the image of citizen involvement, such as the bogus Occupy Wall Street movement.

So who is driving the Anti-Agenda 21 bandwagon, according to Alter? The John Birch Society and Tom DeWeese!

And how am I and the American Policy Center funded? Well, since he can’t find any direct link between me and big oil (because there isn’t any) he goes into great detail about the connections that members of the APC board of directors have with other groups. My directors, including Dr. Bonner Cohen and John Meredith each have dealings with other groups, like CFACT and the National Center for Public Policy Research. Hey, I don’t have the money to pay these guys, so they have to work with other groups which can. And where did Alter get these links? Exxon Secrets, of course.

Alter also goes into great detail about how Dr. Cohen and I once published a newsletter called “*EPA Watch*.” And for two years in 1993 and 1994, we did receive two grants from the Phillip Morris company (\$50,000 each). Those were the last and only grants ever received by APC for any reason. And just to note, *EPA Watch* was positively received by many members of Congress who were greatly relieved to finally have information to counter Green lies on environmental issues. Until then it had all been a very one sided argument. APC and *EPA Watch* began to change that and have continued that effort for the past 25 years.

Tom DeWeese is everywhere!

Alter digs even deeper to tie me to the Koch Brother’s “evil” coal money. It seems that on a few occasions I was paid to speak at anti Agenda 21 meetings by Americans for Prosperity – a group that receives funds from the Kochs. Says Alter “*AFP branches from Kansas to Oregon appear to have Tom DeWeese (I wish he could at least spell my name right) consistently on the rubber chicken circuit, he is everywhere.*” That makes it sound like I covered a vast part of the nation on AFP’s behalf. No, it was just Kansas and Oregon, period. And so, the conspiracy grows. The fact that I have no other ties to AFP other than making a couple of speeches isn’t noted. Guilt by association is the crime.

For the record, the American Policy Center has never received a dime from Exxon Mobil, the Koch Brothers or any other major (or minor) corporation (except from Phillip Morris 19 years ago). However, after being accused time and time again for being a paid shill for big oil, I did write a letter in 2009 to the Chairman of the Board of Exxon Mobil and told them I was taking their heat –so where was my check? I never received a reply. That’s funny treatment, don’t you think, for one so important in the vast anti-green propaganda battle! In truth, APC has approximately 25,000 individual donors who give an average, occasional contribution of \$25. We live and operate on a shoe string.

However, here is the real tactic that’s being played against us. Alter’s last few paragraphs let the real conspiracy out of the bag. He points to the Green’s successful efforts to stop California’s Proposition 23, which would have cut back on over-reaching air pollution controls that were strangling the state’s economy. The Greens used a common tactic – that big corporations were funding the Prop 23 effort. “So, says Alter, “*to counter efforts against Agenda 21, the same tactics need to be employed.*” “*Big Oil is paying...*” “*The Kochs are promoting it like mad...*” Alter sums it up by saying, “*And that is how we have to paint them: not concerned citizens worried about the United Nations, but representatives of big oil out to preserve their turf.*”

Like scared little children hiding under their blankets with a flashlight, telling each other ghost stories, they frighten each other with tales of the boogie man – Tom DeWeese – who is coming to destroy their well laid plans. Like I said, it’s pretty funny to watch. ●

Big Green*Continued from Page 8*

Shawn Smallwood estimates that in the U.S. in 2012, some 573,000 birds (including 83,000 raptors) were killed by wind turbines, at a rate of 11 birds per MW of installed capacity.

That's ridiculously low-balled, says Jim Wiegand, California raptor specialist and Berkeley-trained wildlife biologist. I asked Wiegand what the real number was. "At least 2 million birds per year," he told me, "and I wouldn't be a bit surprised if over 10 million birds were killed each year by wind turbines."

Wiegand is an on-the-ground, count-the-corpses type of wildlife biologist who does not take anyone's word for the facts – a basic requirement of real science. Wiegand's motto could be "Go and look."

Therein lies Wiegand's most potent argument for the Smallwood study's underestimation: The wind industry has adopted bird-death counting standards that limit counts, so the results look lower than reality: Counters go and look only every 30 to 90 days – letting scavengers remove and devour large numbers of dead birds, artificially lowering the body count. Counters examine only a very small footprint around the windmill tower base – artificially lowering body counts. Rotor blade tips can be whirling at 200 miles per hour, enough to whack an unfortunate bird "out of the ball park" – far beyond the little counting circle, out where nobody looks, artificially lowering body counts even more. Some critics accuse counters of simply burying some troublesome corpses – the old "slice, shovel and shut up" routine.

Rebutting Smallwood's report, Wiegand told me, "In my opinion, there are at least 35 bird deaths per megawatt per year across the country. Some turbines kill several hundred birds per megawatt, depending on their location. In high bird use areas like the Kennedy Ranch turbine site in Texas, I believe proper studies would easily show several hundred bird deaths per megawatt per year."

The wind power industry must also share responsibility for bird deaths caused by super-long high-tension lines from distant turbines to cities. A 2007 report estimated the number of such mortality due to collisions on the wing to be at least 130 million, possibly as high as 1 billion, birds per year.

And these numbers are just for birds. We don't

often think about bat benefits, but the U.S. Geological Survey estimates bats are worth \$74 in pest control costs per acre – and windmills may have killed more than 3 million bats by last year. A small bat eats about 680,000 insects a year, so 3 million dead bats means 2 billion mosquitoes and other insects that shouldn't be here are still flying around.

Those numbers are likely way too low, as well. Windmill-caused bat mortality statistics, like bird death numbers, are hotly contested with estimates running into the multi-millions every year.

Wind is usually touted as using no fuel, particularly no fossil fuel. That's a clever deception. Windmills don't work when it's too hot or too cold, or when the wind blows too hard or not at all. So they need a backup, which is usually a coal- or oil- or gas-fired power plant.

Also, every windmill comes with a power line, which comes with a maintenance road, which comes with CO2-emitting traffic. Nobody's counting that. Why not?

Then there's SF6, sulfur hexafluoride, the most potent greenhouse gas evaluated by the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, with a global warming potential 22,800 times that of CO2. It's used to insulate equipment inside wind turbines, their related infrastructure and transmission lines. It may leak during installation or maintenance. or from damaged, aging or destroyed equipment.

Speaking of which, the average service life of a windmill is between 10 and 15 years – not the 20 to 25 years claimed by turbine operators, says a 2012 study by Britain's Renewable Energy Foundation.

Falmouth, Massachusetts has the right idea. The town voted 110-91 to remove its two 400-foot industrial wind turbines for health and nuisance reasons. The only problem is paying the \$15 million price tag for removal. They need to borrow \$8 million to get the job done.

Maybe some powerful Big Green group – think the Sierra Club or Natural Resources Defense Council – will step forward to save Falmouth? Fat chance. They're in love with bird and bat butchering turbines.

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. ●

Big Green helps Big Wind hide bird and bat butchery

Why do taxpayers have to subsidize this? Why do environmentalists give it a free pass?

By Ron Arnold

It uses tons of fossil fuels every day, emits a greenhouse gas that's like CO2 on steroids, can't do the job it's made for, costs taxpayers exorbitant fees, and makes the federal government look mentally ill for giving it outrageous subsidies. It also chops up birds, bats and scenery with roads and monstrous 400-foot-tall machines. "It" is wind power, of course.

These harsh facts were condensed into a preliminary draft study of wind subsidies by researcher Teresa Platt, who circulated it to specialists for vetting. I obtained a copy of the extensively footnoted working draft, which gave chilling reality to the truth behind wind industry claims.

"Every year since the 1980s," Platt's study said, "the 5,000 turbines at NextEra's Altamont Pass in California kill thousands of slow-reproducing red-tailed hawks, burrowing owls, kestrels, as well as iconic golden eagles, and bats." The birds Platt mentions are raptors – birds of prey – particularly valued for their agricultural role in killing mice and other crop-damaging rodents. Eagles, both golden eagles and bald eagles, have long impressed Americans for their majesty, and the bald eagle was selected by our Founding Fathers as our national emblem.

I asked Bob Johns, spokesman for the American Bird Conservancy, about wind farm eagle mortality. He confirmed Platt's study and told me the Altamont operation alone has killed more than 2,000 golden eagles. But that's not all. "Nationwide, the wind industry kills thousands of golden eagles without prosecution," Johns said, "while any other American citizen even possessing eagle parts such as feathers would face huge fines and prison time."

Huge is right. Violate either the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the Eagle Protection Act, and you could get fined up to \$250,000 or get two years imprisonment.

Not a single wind farm operator has yet been prosecuted for killing birds, yet in 2009 ExxonMobil got whacked with a \$600,000 fine for killing 85 common ducks and other birds that flew into uncovered tanks on its property. Other similarly outrageous revenge-style penalties have been assessed on oil companies by the viciously ideological anti-fossil fuel Obama administration.

So Big Oil clearly doesn't have an Obama Big Wind Get Out of Jail Free card. This unaccounted wind industry bird-killer subsidy reveals a federal multiple personality disorder that must be cured.

Domestic oil and gas production is setting records – thanks to fracking on state and private lands, despite efforts by Obama, Cuomo, Brown and environmentalist lunatic groups to slow or stop it, and despite Obama and Comrades continuing to shut down ANWR, OCS and other federal drilling opportunities.

We could totally end reliance on Middle East oil, if we would drill more here and permit Keystone XL pipeline. Instead, Obama is still pushing wind and solar, and working with "green" industry to minimize or conceal impacts, while subsidizing renewable energy to the tune of \$11.4 million per permanent job.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service hedges its annual windmill bird death estimates at between 100,000 to 444,000 dead birds. That smells like political appointees and staff biologists had both insisted on publishing their numbers – and too many staff biologists promote Big Wind, don't want bird butchery to hurt Big Wind's "eco-friendly" image, and don't want to cross swords with subsidy-hungry politicians.

This body count issue has become a genuine data war, with experts hurling "my data are better than your data" cudgels at each other in the press and scientific literature. For example, a 2013 report by K.

Continued on page 7