

OBAMA IS “WARMING” TO AL GORE’S MESSAGE

– Will He Mortgage the U.S. Based on Global Warming Speculation?

Stephen L. Bakke – May 31, 2009

No Longer Just Warming, the Debate’s Gettin’ Hot

One of Obama’s main ambitions is to increase the role of government in the lives of Americans. He’s sincere about it, which isn’t good news. If he were insincere, he would be more subject to change based on the facts (or lack thereof) and public opinion. One of his top three initiatives is passing environmental legislation, the “stated” purpose of which is to reverse global warming caused by CO2 emissions. The President, Al Gore and others in the current administration totally disregard any arguments against impetuous action by proclaiming “the debate is over”.

Debate over? Not even close, but the climate alarmists do their best to stifle it! In fact, during April of 2009, an international expert on climate change and a former “minister of science” in the U.K., was brought to Washington to testify in front of the House committee considering the new legislation. Ultimately, he was denied entry to the hearing because of his status as a skeptic of man-made global warming.

I intend to provide evidence that the debate truly is continuing. In December 2007 I completed a large project and report about global warming facts. My purpose at that time was to assure the unsure that the debate was not only ongoing, but actually accelerating. Since the House is expected to vote on their version of the legislation **very soon**, I figured I’d better jump on my horse again and see what’s been happening in the last 18 months. I reviewed my original report, portions of several new research reports and books, and hundreds of pages of other material I have been accumulating. I am pleased to report that I couldn’t find much in my original report that doesn’t remain relevant and accurate – and the debate is as alive as ever. But the balance of executive and legislative power has changed and the alarmists are seeking an opportunistic panic reaction. Remember Rahm Emanuel’s comments about not letting a good crisis go to waste?

I want you to evaluate the very bold proclamation that **“zero” percent of scientists and scientific writing is in disagreement** with the most ominous assertions about man-made global warming. I believe there is no clear consensus, and debate remains as real and vigorous as ever. We would be absolutely foolish to venture into the expensive and pointless policies now being considered by Congress.

Please Recall

Here are a few points from my original report followed by some updates (for those not wanting a repeat of from my prior report, skip ahead 2+ pages to **“There’s More”**):

- In March 2007, there was an Oxford-style debate in New York sponsored by Intelligence Squared, a debating society. Brenda Ekwurzel of the Union of

- Concerned Scientists, Gavin Schmidt of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies and Richard Somerville of the Scripps Institution for Oceanography argued that global warming is a crisis. Michael Crichton, Dr. Richard Lindzen of MIT, and Dr. Philip Stott of the University of London argued that it was not. The audience was polled both before and after the debate with 57% believing in the crisis before the debate, and only 42% after hearing the arguments. The more facts people learn, the less they tend to agree with the alarmists.
- At a recent (2007) debate over global warming sponsored by National Public Radio, the audience was polled beforehand and was solidly on the side of alarmist predictions. Afterwards, they switched to a slight majority the other way.
 - There seems to have been a shift in momentum in climate science. Many former believers in the catastrophic theory have recently reversed themselves and are now skeptics. (At this point my original report presented a sampling of those reputable scientists who have spoken out to oppose the "consensus" theory.)
 - Climate researcher **Dr. Tad Murty**, former Senior Research Scientist for Fisheries and Oceans in Canada, co-authored a 2006 letter to the Canadian Prime Minister which stated in part, "If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist." He was one of 60 who sent the letter urging the PM to undertake "a proper assessment of recent developments in climate science".
 - Referring to the letter from the prior item, also signing the letter were **Fred Singer**, former director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service; **Ian Clark**, hydrogeology and paleoclimatology specialist at the University of Ottawa; **Hendrik Tennekes**, former director of research at the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute; physicist **Freeman Dyson** of the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies; the University of Alabama's **Roy Spencer**, formerly senior scientist in climate studies at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama. There were 55 more qualified individuals, but I will stop there.
 - While everyone was castigating the U.S. for not jumping onto the Kyoto bandwagon, we were the only country at the meeting in Bali (December 2007) with CO2 emissions having declined in 2006.
 - In 2003, environmental scientists Dennis Bray and Hans von Storch surveyed 530 of their peers in 27 countries on topics related to global warming. One question asked, "To what extent do you agree or disagree that climate change is mostly the result of anthropogenic (human) causes?" On a scale of 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree), the average score was 3.62, reflecting no clear consensus.
 - In October 2007, in the British High Court of Justice, Mr. Justice Burton ruled that Mr. Gore's film could not be shown in British schools unless opposing opinions and information was also communicated (i.e. separate appropriate guidance has to be provided). His ruling referred to nine specifically identified errors, exaggerations, and misrepresentations in the film. Some of the glaring flaws in research and presentation are becoming clear to more than just a few.
 - In 2004 a panel of 8 world-renowned economists (including three Nobel laureates) met to discuss and prioritize proposals that addressed ten of the world's greatest challenges. This group was referred to as the "Copenhagen Consensus". The challenges and solutions, presented as alternatives to be prioritized, were

those identified by the United Nations. The climate related challenge (global warming) and the suggested solution (e.g. Kyoto) were rated at the absolute bottom of the list of priorities. Diseases and malnutrition were ranked one and two. For comparison, a group of scientists also gathered, and the results were very similar. And here is something surprising – a sampling of U.N. ambassadors also were given this challenge and results were again similar. They all had to choose between alternatives, while being limited by resources, and having been given information on projected results of various actions or inactions. In other words, we should deal with facts, not submit to panic and emotions.

- In August 2007, NASA acknowledged it had accidentally inflated its official record of surface temperatures in the U.S. beginning with the year 2000. A Canadian statistician discovered the error. Al Gore had emphasized these statistics when he reported that nine of the ten hottest years in history have been in the last decade, with 1998 the warmest on record – he made it a “big deal”. The revised data show 1998 falling to second place behind 1934 as the warmest year, followed by 1921, 2006, 1931, 1999, and 1953, 1990, 1938, and 1939. Note that only one year in the last five is on this list, and only three (rather than nine as Al Gore had stated) in the top ten are from the past decade. The 1930s now had 4 in the top ten. Mr. Gore has avoided dealing with this disclosure.
- The U.N. can be scary when you consider how it is involved in any multi-national movement to address climate change (IPCC, Kyoto, or Bali). I found a quote by Maurice Strong, founder of the U.N. Eco-Summit and an Undersecretary General, as follows: “Isn’t the only hope for the planet that the industrial civilizations collapse? Isn’t it our responsibility to bring about?” This isn’t much different than a quote by environmental activist Paul Ehrlich: “Economic growth in rich countries like ours is the disease, not the cure.” Or, Matt Lauer who stated: “Us homo sapiens are turning out to be as destructive a force as any asteroid....consume too much....” What’s the motive? Take it for what it’s worth.
- CO2 is only 3.6% of total greenhouse gases (the largest by far is water vapor).
- At present, the average global temperatures are at very low levels if all historically available information is considered – back centuries and beyond.
- Over very long periods of time, covering millions of years of available data, there is no close relationship between CO2 levels and temperature. However, over the much shorter term (looking at the last 400,000 years), it is clear that the two have moved together, i.e. positively correlated, but with temperature fluctuations occurring **in advance of** CO2 fluctuations (so, what is causing what?).
- The CO2 increases since the industrial revolution began (about 1750) have been significant – about 35%. But 80% of that increase occurred prior to 1950.
- The U.S. has slowed the growth of its emissions far more than the European Union – despite larger population growth and higher economic growth. And in 2006, the U.S. emissions of CO2 showed an absolute decrease.
- Sea levels have been rising since the Earth began to come out of the last ice age. However, the rate of sea level rise since 1961 (less than 1/8 inch) is far lower than the historical average. The rise in levels has been slowing for quite some time.
- There are approximately 20 different polar bear “populations” (geographical groups) on earth. Only two of these are decreasing, and recreational hunting can

- account for the reduction in at least one of these groups. The two populations which are decreasing are in habitats which show measured cooling in recent years. Overall, polar bear numbers increased dramatically from about 5,000 in the '50s to about 25,000 today. This is higher than at any time in the 20th century.
- Mean Antarctic temperature has actually fallen throughout the past half-century. Total Antarctic sea ice spread to a 30 year record in 2007. In fact, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reports that Antarctic sea ice is currently at its greatest extent in recorded history, showing that sea ice retreat is local rather than global. For example, Mr. Gore specifically dealt with a reduction of a specific ice shelf which is located on the Antarctic Peninsula. This is the northernmost section of Antarctica and it is wrong and very misleading to imply that this small area should represent the entire continent.

There's More

All of the above items from my original December 2007 report are still accurate and relevant. Following are additional observations, mostly from reports and research since the date of that report. Remember, the goal of this update is to assess whether the issue is truly decided or whether a legitimate debate continues.

- In a United States Senate Environmental and Public Works Minority Report (EPW), more than 650 international scientists are listed as official "global warming" dissenters as of December 2008. This is constantly growing and up from 400 listed in the 2007 version of the report.
- Award winning Princeton Physicist Dr. William Happer, who was reportedly fired by Al Gore in 1993 for failing to adhere to Gore's views, has now publicly made declarations that fears about warming are wrong. He said: "I am convinced that the current alarm over carbon dioxide is mistaken." He has requested to join others listed in the Senate EPW Minority Report as an official dissenter.
- Dr. Arthur Robinson of the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine continues his petition project which has been in process for at least 2 years. As of the 2008 report, there are more than 31,000 scientists who have joined a petition rejecting claims of human-caused global warming. The purpose of this project is very simple – to dramatically demonstrate the absurdity of claims of "settled science" and "consensus". Based on the wording of this petition, these scientists are not merely skeptics – they are committed deniers.
- There is no denying that "George W." was no "warrior" fighting for the advancement of science. He wasn't opposed to it, but my impression was he was distracted at best, ambivalent at worst, as regards advancing science and technology. Stem cell research as one example where he parted company with many conservative scientists and researchers. So it is no surprise that in October 2008, over 70 Nobel Science Laureates endorsed Obama for president. But that's only part of the story. Regarding the issue of global warming the cheese gets "sliced" differently. Obama declared re: global warming, that "The science is beyond dispute..." That single statement gave rise to a group of 116 scientists signing a letter to the then president-elect. They wrote: "With all due respect Mr.

- President, that is not true” (That was followed by assertions of fact regarding global warming). Many of these scientists were involved with the IPCC report - e.g. as endorsers or reviewers. And it is interesting to note that one scientist who signed the endorsement in October '08 also, in November, signed this rejection of Obama's global warming opinions and goals. That was Nobel physics laureate Dr. Ivar Giaever. I think that says a lot! The debate isn't over!
- Regarding global sea ice, in January of 2009 there was 200,000 sq km more than in 1980. Looking at Antarctic in particular, sea ice is up by 43% compared to the same March date in 1980. Arctic sea ice is down, but less than 7% according to what I have read (I believe the square miles of coverage has gone down by more than that). Which do you hear about? You still hear about any sort of reduction of Antarctic ice – usually from the far northern peninsula. The fact remains, total Antarctic and global ice has been increasing in recent decades. Some alarmists suggest that this is due to increased snowfall from warming temperatures. But interior Antarctic temperatures are actually lower. The interior is where snowfall can increase total continental ice. What we are talking about is sea ice which is increased by lower temperatures where it forms – not from increased snowfall.
 - In February of '09, Al Gore was forced to withdraw a slide from his famous PowerPoint presentation. The slide in question was part of Gore's presentation on environmental doom which appeared in his famous documentary movie “An Inconvenient Truth”. After dramatic slides of plagues, fires, famines, and dramatic human suffering, this slide purported to show data demonstrating that global warming “is creating weather-related disasters that are completely unprecedented”. The problem was that the data simply wasn't accurate in its representations. He had to quietly remove the slide from his presentation.
 - The Associated Press published an article in December 2008 entitled “Obama Left With Little Time to Curb Global Warming”. There was an unusual amount of hyperbole in the account. This aroused much criticism from around the world from scientists who criticized the AP for disguising the alarmist non-objective report as scientific reporting.
 - I have examined a graph of the IPCC report's temperature and CO2 “scenarios” (range of predictions) by year from 2001 through 2008. Both temperature and CO2 levels are **BELOW!** the extremes of possible results predicted by the IPCC.
 - In May 2009, Christopher Monckton, former chief scientist in Britain's Thatcher administration, issued a report in which he felt compelled to emphasize certain points – some repeating what he has been saying for years: The IPCC process is a political process and science is not done by consensus - unlike politics; the crucial chapter of the IPCC's 2007 report, attributing most global warming to anthropogenic influences, was written by just 53 people, not all of them climate scientists; for almost 1½ decades since 1995, there has been no statistically-significant “global warming” and since 2001 there has been measurable global cooling; it is not true that all 2500 scientists listed in the IPCC report agree with everything in the report (and many are retracting their names – see other portions of my reports); and while there is no proof that the warming will occur, there is less indication that it will be significant enough to be dangerous.

- It's interesting to note that both the Gallup and Rasmussen polls show changing public opinion. Looking specifically at the Rasmussen results, only 34% believes that global warming is caused by human activity, while 48% believes that it is caused by long-term planetary trends. That's almost exactly opposite of what was found 12 months earlier. Only what Rasmussen refers to as the "Political Class" (the elite) still have almost 50% of them believing in man-made global warming.

A Survey

A recent survey conducted by The Heartland Institute shows that while there are many scientists who believe in man-made global warming, they do not believe the debate is over. Climate scientists were asked to score this statement: "Natural scientists have established enough physical evidence to turn the issue of global climate change over to social scientists for matters of policy discussion." As expected, the scientific community split – this time down the middle. 45.8% disagreed, while 44.1% agreed. 10.2% were undecided. In summary, 56% couldn't say they agree with that statement.

About a third of the climate scientists who answered this question said the uncertainty has not been reduced in the past 10 years, and an additional 10% were undecided on changes in uncertainty. Of the approximately 60% who believed uncertainty has been reduced, only 8.3% felt that it had been significantly reduced. With so few climate scientist expressing confidence that the amount of scientific uncertainty has declined during the past decade, it seems implausible that the debate is nearing an end. In fact, many involved in the global warming debate warn that the more we learn about the climate, the less confident we can be in our ability to understand or predict our climate's future.

While this survey was done over a year ago, there seems to be ever more support for the conclusion that the debate must not be terminated. **To me it is clear that now is not the time for politicians and policy analysts to begin a dramatic overhaul of our economy, society and culture. It would be based on speculation at best!**

Not the IPCC!! and That's GOOD!

In March 2008 and 2009, there was a highly publicized (NOT!) conference in New York City that each brought together over 500!! scientists and other environmentalists that are commonly labeled as "global warming skeptics". This was referred to as the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC). Related to this overall debate, I encourage you to find and read the ongoing debate between two internationally recognized individuals – Fred Singer vs. James Hansen. It's really interesting – just Google and read.

In April 2008, scientists and researchers in climate and related fields, economists, policymakers, and business leaders, assembled at Times Square in New York soon after the above mentioned conference on climate change. Their pointed declaration of rejection of the Gore/IPCC movement included dozens of scientists and other experts

from 16 industrialized countries. They signed a very definitive declaration. You can check out the statement and those signing it on the internet.

Where From Here?

One of my favorite commentator/climate experts Bjorn Lomborg reacted logically to the issue: “We need to cool our conversation, rein in the exaggerations, and start focusing where we can do the most good.” But while doing this, we need to keep studying climate change in general and let the science develop – let the debate continue. I am confident in this approach because I agree with Mr. Lomborg that the alarmists are way out of line in their predictions of the extent and impact of global warming, and the improvements available from the recommended policies. If we don’t spend money foolishly (e.g. Kyoto and Bali conference recommendations), we will have more available to spend on R&D for renewable and non-carbon energy sources, including nuclear. By the way, Mr. Lomborg believes warming is caused by humans, but is not an alarmist.

OK, that’s good advice, but time is getting very short to avoid Obama’s initiatives. Congress is now having hearings and weighing far reaching legislation. And the EPA is “puttin’ the pressure on”! The EPA recently said that rising sea levels, increased flooding and more intense heat waves and storms that come with climate change are a threat to public health and safety. The administration has signaled a willingness to use decades-old clean air laws to impose tough new regulations for motor vehicles and industrial plants to limit their release of climate-changing pollution – without new legislation! Everyone agrees that the door is open to regulate almost everything. Even cow flatulence has been proclaimed as a concern of the EPA. And the supreme court gave them the power to regulate pollution and greenhouse gases. That includes CO₂. THEY DON’T EVEN NEED NEW LEGISLATION! Uff Da! Essentially the administration and the majority in Congress are telling our senators and representatives to “vote our way, or we’ll render voting meaningless” (quote from Jonah Goldberg).

Bait and Switch, or I Mean, “Cap and Trade”

Now, how about the proposed cap-and-trade legislation. UNCCC data show that the European emissions rate, under a policy of cap-and-trade, increased by 3 to 5% from 2000 to 2006, while U.S. emissions increased by only 0.7%. And in 2008, U.S. CO₂ emissions actually went down. Why should we expect different results here if we institute cap-and-trade? We’re already doing a better job than they are! The Marshall Institute released a study in March entitled “The Cost of Climate Regulation for American Households”. The study documents the economic burdens a cap-and-trade program to control greenhouse gas emissions will impose on American households. They report that the constraints posed by the Lieberman-Warner cap-and-trade approach is equivalent to a constant consumption decrease of about 1% each year, continuing to 2050. Put another way, this approach is the equivalent of a permanent tax increase for the average American household ranging up to almost \$3,000. The study shows that the estimates of job losses attributable to this approach range in the hundreds of thousands.

And the study showed that the price for energy paid by the American consumer also will rise dramatically.

Here's something really "cute". I found it on the New York Times web site. Obama's cohorts are being advised to calm the controversy by simply changing the language of the debate. A "marketing and messaging" firm in Washington says that instead of talking about global warming, they should talk about "our deteriorating atmosphere". Don't discuss CO2, rather talk about "dirty fuels". Cap-and-trade should be revised to "cap and cash back" or "pollution reduction refund". They are being told to "reframe the issue". For example, rather than talking about energy efficiency, which makes people think of shivering in the dark, they are told it is more effective to speak of "saving money for a more prosperous future". They also have been told to drop the term "environment", in favor of "the air we breath, the water our children drink". Have you noticed the move from the term "global warming" in favor of "climate change"? This has been reinforced by the fact that warming actually hasn't occurred for almost a decade.

IT AIN'T OVER 'TIL THE FAT LADY SINGS AND SHE AIN'T EVEN STOOD UP YET!!

Pass this along to your friends and family! Feel free to use my name – Fred Famous.

Sources of Information

This is not intended to be a bibliography or list of notes and references which would be necessary for publication or other wide use of this report. I don't always give quotes and statistics specific attribution. Therefore, this report isn't in a form which is publishable. These lists are my main sources of information on this topic. In addition, there are dozens of writers and websites (expert and otherwise) that I follow regularly to monitor this issue. This information is intended to relay the nature, extent, and seriousness of my effort to become personally more knowledgeable. I hope it lends some credibility to the project and my conclusions. The items below are listed in no particular order.

Books

An Inconvenient Truth by Al Gore (book and movie versions)
Myths, Lies, and Downright Stupidity by John Stossel
Under a Green Sky by Peter Douglas Ward (excerpts)
Taken by Storm: The Troubled Science, Policy and Politics of Global Warming
by Christopher Essex and Ross McKittrick (summary and review)
The Weather Makers: How Man Is Changing the Climate
and what It Means for Life on Earth by Tim Flannery (summary and review)
Field Notes from a Catastrophe: Man, Nature and Climate Change
by Elizabeth Kolbert (summary and review)
The No-Nonsense Guide to Climate Change by Dinyar Godrej (excerpts)

The Complete Idiot's Guide to Global Warming by Michael Tennesen, (excerpts)
 Cool It by Bjorn Lomborg
 Unstoppable Global Warming, Every 1500 Years by S. Fred Singer and Dennis T. Avery
 Eco-Freaks by John Berlau
 The Politically Incorrect Guide to Global Warming by Christopher C. Horner
 Heaven and Earth by Ian Plimer (excerpts)
 Climate Confusion by Roy Spencer, PhD – (excerpts)
 The Really Inconvenient Truths: Seven Environmental Catastrophes Liberals Don't Want
 You to Know About – Because They Helped Cause Them – (Excerpts)
 The Deniers – Scientists Who Deny Global Warming: Kooks or Crooks in the Pay of Big
 Oil, or Courageous Crusaders for the Truth by Lawrence Solomon (Excerpts)
 Red Hot Lies: How Global Warming Alarmists Use Threats, Fraud, and Deception to
 Keep You Misinformed by Christopher Horner

Papers, Pamphlets, Testimony and Court Records

A Global Warming Primer – National Center for Policy Analysis
 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)
 – Summaries for Policymakers – (2007)
 IPCC Report – Summary for Policymakers – (2001)
 The Myth of Dangerous Human-Caused Climate Change
 by Professor R. M. Carter (Australia)
 Climate Momentum Shifting: Prominent Scientists Reverse Belief in Man-made Global
 Warming – Now Skeptics, by Marc Morano
 Approved Judgment, October 2007 by Mr. Justice Burton re: British Public
 Schools Use of “Inconvenient Truth” Without Presentation of Alternate Theory
 Climate Change Impacts on the United States, the Potential Consequences of Climate
 Variability and Change, by the National Assessment Synthesis Team (2000)
 35 Inconvenient Truths – The Errors in Al Gore's Movie
 by Christopher Monckton of Brenchley, Science & Public Policy Institute (SPPI)
 Climate Change Science: An Analysis of Some Key Questions
 – Executive Summary (2001), National Academy of Sciences
 Skeptics Guide to Debunking Global Warming Alarmism
 Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus
 by Professor S. Lindzen
 Uncertainty in Climate Model Projections of Arctic Sea Ice Decline:
 An Evaluation Relevant to Polar Bears, by Eric DeWeaver/USGS
 Testimony of Roy W. Spencer Before the Senate Environmental and Public Works
 Committee – (July 22, 2008)
 Global Warming and Nature's Thermostat by Roy W. Spencer, PHD
 Global Warming: Experts' Opinions versus Scientific Forecasts by Kesten C. Green
 (Monash University) and J. Scott Armstrong (The Wharton School) (February
 2008)
 Index of Leading Environmental Indicators by Steven F. Hayward, Pacific Research
 Insitute and American Enterprise Institute (April 2008)

Scientific Consensus on Global Warming – Results of and International Survey of Climate Scientists by Joseph Bast and James M. Taylor, The Heartland Institute (2007)

Gore’s 10 Errors Old and New – Scientific Mistakes and Exaggerations – and Interview in India Today (March 17, 2008)

Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate by S. Fred Singer, The Heartland Institute (April 2008)

Climate Skeptics Reveal ‘Horror Stories’ of Scientific Suppression – NYC Climate Conference Further Debunks ‘Consensus’ Claims – U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works (March 6, 2008)

Unequivocal Consensus on Global Warming by Christopher Monckton (May 22, 2009)

An Independent Analysis of Global Warming by Heinz Lycklama, PhD in Nuclear Physics (May 4, 2009)

The Cost of Climate Regulation for American Households by Bryan Buckley and Dr. Sergey Mithakov, The Marshall Institute (March 2, 2009)

The Incidence of a U.S. Carbon Tax: A lifetime and Regional Analysis by Kevin A. Hassett and Aparna Mathur of American Enterprise Institute and Gilbert E. Metcalf of Tufts University (January 31, 2008)

U.S. Senate Report Debunks Polar Bear Extinction Fears – U.S. Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee (January 30 2008)

Inhofe Says Listing of Polar Bear Based on Politics, Not Science – U.S. Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee, Minority Page (May 14, 2008)

Media Hype on ‘Melting’ Antarctic Ignores Record Ice Growth - U.S. Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee, Minority Page (March 27, 2008)

The Wilkins Ice Shelf Con Job by John McLean (April 2, 2008)

U.S. Senate Minority Report: More than 650 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims – Scientists Continue to Debunk “Consensus” in 2008 (December 11, 2008)

2008 International Conference on Climate Change – Opening Remarks by Joseph Bast, President, The Heartland Institute (March 2 2008)

Reports (various) from the Global Warming Conference in New York City by Joseph L. Bast, President, The Heartland Institute (March 2008)

Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate – Summary for Policymakers of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (Heartland Institute) by Fred Singer (March 2, 2008)

Is the Earth Getting Warmer, or Cooler? By Steven Goddard (May 2 2008)

More comments will follow on important topics and personal thoughts as our President battles through tough territory. I want to join other conservatives in recognizing and respecting our new President – and supporting him when we should. When we oppose our President’s policies, we should act in accordance with values of decency – but that doesn’t preclude a healthy dose of sarcasm and satire, which are valuable tools for political commentary.

I extend thanks, as always, to the many writers, commentators, researchers, and others, from both political extremes, whose hard work helps me greatly. They gather details and individually present much information. About all I do is gather, organize, summarize, and then attempt to fill in with additional comments – commonly referred to as my frequent “RANTS”.