

Who Watches the Watchmen?

As Global Warming theory collapses, the ignorant news media resort to censorship and name-calling

By Steven J. Allen and Julia A. Seymour

Summary: *The news media have fostered panic and junk science regarding earth's climate for longer than you realize. As far back as 1895, the New York Times was repeating dire warnings of climate disaster from scientists. Every few decades, however, the apocalypse that supposedly threatens us shifts: first, global cooling was the danger, then warming, then cooling, and in recent decades the scare is once again warming. Now the problem is also what the media refuse to report, as censorship silences all who keep an open mind on the science involved, rather than mouthing the "consensus."*

They can't win a fair fight. So they don't fight fair.

Global Warming theory is collapsing around us. When Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth* won the Oscar for Best Documentary in 2007, the current Global Warming pause (some call it a "lull" or "hiatus") was already nine years old. Even if Warming resumes (or, to put it another way, even if the Ice Age continues to be over), proponents of Warming theory have been discredited, their computer models—the only "proof" of their theories—having crashed and burned.

With so much at stake—wealth for perpetrators of "green energy" like wind and solar; tenure for "green" professors; power for "green" politicians and bureaucrats; credibility for "green" journalists—you might expect them to become desperate, and you would be right. Nowhere is that desperation more obvious than in the news media, which are turning increas-



Scared yet? The news media warn us about Global Warming and its various purported effects such as floods, droughts, and extreme cold.

ingly to name-calling and to simply ignoring the facts that disprove their claims of an approaching, man-made environmental apocalypse.

In this article, we examine three critical elements of news media bias on the Global Warming issue:

- The current wave of censorship, which attempts to keep legitimate scientific views out of the debate
- The media's long record of sensationalism and of promoting junk science, and
- Their often-hilarious use of doomsday predictions in an attempt to create panic over Warming.

Censorship: Deniers must be banned!

According to a Media Research Center study released on March 6, 2014, that day marked 1,383 days since the Global Warming views of a skeptical scientist had been included in a news report on ABC, and 1,391 days since such views had been included in a news report on CBS. NBC had not included a skeptical

August 2014

Who Watches the Watchmen?
Page 1

Green Notes
Page 8

scientist in the previous 298 days.

The study covered 2010-2014 and indicated that the situation had actually worsened since the publication of an earlier MRC analysis in 2007, which found a 13-to-1 ratio of Global Warming alarmists to skeptics on the major broadcast news networks (including a 38-to-1 ratio on CBS). CBS News anchor Scott Pelley was blunt about the reason for the imbalance. Asked why he refused to include skeptics, Pelley referred to Elie Weisel, an author famed for his work to expose the Holocaust. "If I do an interview with Elie Weisel," Pelley asked, "am I required as a journalist to find a Holocaust denier?"

Recently, some media outlets have taken the next step. Rather than simply leaving skeptical views out of stories, they now exclude those views overtly. They even brag about it.

► Last October, the *Los Angeles Times* was (as CNS News reported) "among mainstream media sources that quietly stopped giving a voice to climate-change deniers." The newspaper's letters editor, Paul Thornton, declared that letters to the editor from those "deniers" would no longer appear in the pages of the *Times*. Thornton wrote:

As for letters on climate change, we do get plenty from those who deny global warming. And to say they "deny" it might be an understatement.

Editor: Steven J. Allen

Publisher: Terrence Scanlon

Address: 1513 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1480

Phone: (202) 483-6900

E-mail: sallen@CapitalResearch.org

Website: CapitalResearch.org

Green Watch is published by Capital Research Center, a non-partisan education and research organization classified by the IRS as a 501(c)(3) public charity. Reprints are available for \$2.50 prepaid to Capital Research Center.

ment: Many say climate change is a hoax, a scheme by liberals to curtail personal freedom.

Before going into some detail about why these letters don't make it into our pages, I'll concede that, aside from my easily passing the Advanced Placement biology exam in high school, my science credentials are lacking. I'm no expert when it comes to our planet's complex climate processes or any scientific field. Consequently, when deciding which letters should run among hundreds on such weighty matters as climate change, I must rely on the experts—in other words, those scientists with advanced degrees who undertake tedious research and rigorous peer review.

And those scientists have provided ample evidence that human activity is indeed linked to climate change. Just last month, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC]—a body made up of the world's top climate scientists—said it was 95% certain that we fossil-fuel-burning humans are driving global warming. The debate right now isn't whether this evidence exists (clearly, it does) but what this evidence means for us.

Thus, Thornton admitted that he relies on "experts" rather than his own independent examination of the evidence (presumably because science is just too hard); he admitted that he simply assumes the IPCC has the evidence to back up its claims; and he seemed not to understand one of the basic principles in science: that, even if the IPCC were an objective, nonpolitical body, and even if its claims were backed up by the evidence, a 95 percent level of certainty wouldn't mean "settled science" or "case closed." It would mean that the matter is open to scientific debate.

► Beth Buczynski, a leading environmentalist writer, wrote in October

2013 about the ethical dilemma facing journalists:

Two weeks ago I attended a conference for environmental journalists. Throughout the week, a topic kept surfacing, both during official sessions and casual conversation: In environmental journalism is objectivity—that old notion that you have to present two, equal sides to every issue—an outdated and perhaps dangerous practice?

Opinions varied widely, and those with a background in traditional print journalism seemed to have the hardest time with the idea. After all, a reporter's job isn't to cloud the issue with opinion, but to simply deliver the facts. How can you do that if you don't cover both sides?

I understand this instinct; it was drilled into us in journalism classes. However, like many others, I feel that its time has [passed] when dealing with stories about environmental destruction at the hands of corporate polluters and especially climate change.

... Since the *LA Times* took its stand on climate change, a grassroots campaign has been launched, targeting other major newspapers. Led by Forecast the Facts, the campaign asks editors of the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, *USA Today*, and the *Wall Street Journal* to adopt similar policies.

"Newspapers like the *Times* and the *Post* wouldn't print letters from people who deny links between smoking and cancer," said Forecast the Facts campaign director Daniel Souweine. "It's high time they start applying the same standard to the human role in causing climate change, which has the exact same level of scientific certainty."

The campaign gathered over 22,000 supporters in the first 24 hours, according to a press release.

Forecast the Facts, by the way, is a project of the Citizen Engagement Laboratory, whose founders helped develop MoveOn.org and the Van Jones organization Color Of Change. It is part of a network of organizations that seeks to silence political opponents by organizing boycotts against them and by smearing them as racists and destroyers of the planet.

► Recently, the website reddit [*sic*][—]a news aggregator that calls itself “the front page of the Internet”—announced that its science forum had effectively banned comments by Global Warming skeptics. Nathan Allen, a professional chemist who volunteers as forum moderator, wrote on the website *Grist* (part of the George Soros-funded Media Consortium): “The science forum is a small part of reddit, but it nonetheless enjoys over 4 million subscribers. By comparison, that’s roughly twice the circulation of *The New York Times*. . . .

“When 97 percent of climate scientists agree that man is changing the climate, we would hope the comments would at least acknowledge if not reflect such widespread consensus.” That’s a reference to the bogus “97 percent” statistic often cited by environmentalists.

Allen complained of the tone of incivility created by the people he called “deniers,” a term that likens them to Holocaust deniers (people who claim that the Nazi genocide of the Jews did not occur or who seek to mitigate the Nazis’ guilt). He said that, after the new rule was imposed, things improved, and there was little complaint.

About a year ago, we moderators became increasingly stringent with deniers. When a potentially controversial submission was posted, a warning would be issued stating the rules for comments (most importantly that your comment isn’t a conspiracy theory) and advising that further violations of the rules could result in the commenter being banned from the forum.

As expected, several users reacted strongly to this. As a site, reddit is passionately dedicated to free speech, so we expected considerable blowback. But the widespread outrage we feared never materialized, and the atmosphere greatly improved.

Allen argued that keeping skeptical comments off the site was the responsible, moral thing to do, and he encouraged newspapers to follow suit. “As moderators responsible for what millions of people see, we felt that to allow a handful of commenters to so purposefully mislead our audience was simply immoral,” he wrote. “So if a half-dozen volunteers can keep a page with more than 4 million users from being a microphone for the antiscientific, is it too much to ask for newspapers to police their own editorial pages as proficiently?”*

► The *Sydney Morning Herald*, Australia’s oldest continuously published newspaper, adopted a similar policy. At a program hosted by Global Warming activist David Suzuki, editor-in-chief Darren Goodsir told the audience that “The *Herald* believes unequivocally in human-induced climate change. It is an established fact. What we are much more interested in is not the sideshow over whether this phenomenon exists or not,

but on how it should be tackled.”

An editorial note in the *Morning Herald* stated: “We do not ban writers whose views suggest they are climate change deniers or sceptics. We consider their letters and arguments. But we believe the argument over whether climate change is happening and whether it is man-made has been thrashed out extensively by leading scientists and on our pages and that the main debate now is about its effects, severity, and what society does about it.”

► Brian Stelter, host of the CNN program “Reliable Sources,” which covers journalism, said on February 23 that “Some stories don’t have two sides. Some stories are simply true. There’s no necessity to give equal time to the quote-unquote ‘other side.’ One of these is climate change.”

► Whenever *Popular Science* ran articles promoting Global Warming theory, the magazine used to receive harshly critical comments posted on its website by readers. Not anymore. As reported by the environmentalist website *EcoWatch*:

The website’s online content director, Suzanne LaBarre, said that comments like “Gullible Warming. What a crock!” were “undermining scientifically sound” information.

* **Editor’s note:** Given that one of the favorite tactics of Warmers is to attack skeptics as tools of big corporations, it is interesting that Allen’s regular job is reportedly as a chemist for Dow Chemical—the chemical company most closely linked to bureaucrats at the Environmental Protection Agency.

There was a time when the Left hated Dow. The manufacturer of napalm used by the U.S. in the Vietnam War, Dow was the target of hundreds of student protests, one of which, at the University of Wisconsin in February 1967, was the first anti-Vietnam War protest on a college campus to turn violent. Today, Dow is praised for its environmentalist efforts.

In December, the EPA presented Dow the U.S. Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Award. According to a Dow press release, “This win marks the ninth time that Dow and its affiliates have received this recognition, more than double any other company since the award’s inception in 1996.” The award was for the development of a polymer for use in paint to replace a white pigment, titanium dioxide. According to Dow, the polymer “reduced the paint’s carbon footprint by more than 22 percent.”

Of course, no media outlet suggests that Dow has a vested interest in Global Warming theory, an interest that would lead it to promote a belief in the idea. As everyone knows, when evil corporations “go green,” they cease to be evil—right? —SJA

Without the means to moderate the comments effectively, they felt the best move was to disable commenting on the site altogether.

Like any good scientific publication, the decision was based in research, as well. In a study, test subjects read an article about a pretend piece of technology. Fake reader comments were attached to the end of the article either supporting or berating the technology. The study found that those who read the positive comments reported favorable feelings about the technology, while those who read negative comments were opposed to the technology. Since even non-factual comments can influence readers' perceptions, *Popular Science* saw fit to remove that unhelpful factor.*

When you consider your readers a bunch of idiots, what else can you do?

► A July 9 Rasmussen poll suggested that most Americans oppose censorship on Global Warming. The Rasmussen firm noted that some news organizations are banning comments from those who “deny global warming,” but

60% of voters oppose the decision by some news organizations to ban global warming skeptics. Only 19% favor such a ban, while slightly more (21%) are undecided.

But then 42% believe the media already makes global warming appear to be worse than it really is. Twenty percent (20%) say the media makes global warming appear better than it really is, while 22% say they present

an accurate picture. Sixteen percent (16%) are not sure. . . .

Even among those voters [37% of the total] who consider global warming a Very Serious problem, 57% say the debate is not yet over. These voters by a 49% to 34% margin also oppose the decision by some news organizations to ban global warming skeptics. . . .

Most voters across all demographic categories say the debate is not over. Most also oppose the decision by some media outlets to ban global warming critics.

► The BBC has been a powerful advocate for Global Warming ideas. For example, it reported in 2007 that Warming would leave the Arctic Ocean ice-free by 2013. (In 2013, the amount of Arctic sea ice increased by 60 percent from the year before.)

Now a British government report has criticized the organization for taking an excessively scientific approach. The report was issued by the BBC Trust, a panel that oversees the taxpayer-funded BBC. The report claimed that the BBC remains prone to “over-rigid application of editorial guidelines on impartiality” that resulted in the news service giving “undue attention to marginal opinion.”

Since the review began in 2010, *nearly 200 BBC senior staff have been sent to indoctrination workshops* to learn how to cover science “impartially” (i.e., in a government-approved manner). The workshops were revealed in the BBC Trust report, written by Steve Jones, Emeritus Professor of Genetics

at University College London. In the report, Jones asserted: “The key point the workshops tried to impart is that impartiality in science coverage does not simply lie in reflecting a wide range of views, which may result in a ‘false balance.’ More crucially it depends on the varying degree of prominence such views should be given. In this respect, editorial decisions should be guided by where the scientific consensus might be found on any given topic, if it can in fact be determined.”

Given that, over the past several hundred years, the “scientific consensus” has proven wrong on virtually every matter of political debate into which it has injected itself, you might think that a science journalist’s job is to *challenge* the scientific consensus. But the BBC Trust doesn’t see things that way.

The Trust cautioned that avoiding “false balance” does not mean critical opinion should be excluded. Rather, contrary ideas should be ridiculed and otherwise denigrated. “The BBC has a duty to reflect the weight of scientific agreement but it should also reflect the existence of critical views appropriately. Audiences should be able to understand from the context and clarity of the BBC’s output what weight to give to critical voices.”

Censorship advocates such as the *Huffington Post* praised the report, noting in a headline: “The BBC is Fighting Its Addiction to False Climate Balance.”

More and more each day, their argument amounts to *Shut up! Shut up! Just shut the hell up!*

Past predictions: Global Cooling is on the way! No, warming! No, cooling! No, warming!

Here’s the opening of a *New York Times* article: “The question is again being discussed whether recent and long-continued observations do not point to the advent of a second glacial period, when the countries now basking in the

* **Editor’s note:** *Popular Science*’s founder, Edward Youmans, was a science writer and a leading supporter of Prohibition, which was ultimately one of history’s greatest public policy disasters. Youmans argued that a government ban on alcoholic beverages was justified on the grounds that, as proven by science, alcohol is worse than any other intoxicant—that “Alcoholic Liquors, when drunk, . . . disturb the mind, pervert the conduct, and invade the responsibility; that their properties in these respects are *so peculiar and remarkable as to separate them widely from all other substances* in nature and art, and confer upon government a right of control over them which is necessary, fundamental, and absolute.” (Emphasis added.) —*SJA*

fostering warmth of a tropical sun will ultimately give way to the perennial frost and snow of the polar regions.” The date: February 24, 1895. A subhead on the article noted: “Geologists Think the World May Be Frozen Up Again.”

By the 1930s, the concern had shifted. “NEXT GREAT DELUGE FORECAST BY SCIENCE / Melting Polar Ice Caps to Raise the Level of Seas and Flood the Continents,” proclaimed the *New York Times* on May 15, 1932.

By the 1970s, we were back to Global Cooling. “Get a grip on your long johns, cold weather haters—the worst may be yet to come. That’s the long-range weather forecast being given out by ‘climatologists,’ the people who study very long-term world weather trends.” So reported the *Washington Post* in a January 11, 1970 article entitled, “Colder Winters Held [sic] Dawn of New Ice Age / Scientists See Ice Age In the Future.” The article continued:

Some of them [climatologists] say the world is in a ‘cold snap’ that started in 1950 and which could last hundreds of years, even bringing on the start of another Ice Age.

In the meantime, it could mean more snow, and more arctic freezes like the one Washington is now shivering through.

Ice floes will continue to close in around Iceland; glaciers in the Pacific northwest will grow; there will be major changes in farming patterns—and colder late season football games.

On May 21, 1975, the *New York Times* published an article entitled “Scientists Ask Why World Climate Is Changing; Major Cooling May Be Ahead.” According to the article, “Sooner or later a major cooling of the climate is widely considered inevitable. Hints that it may already have begun are evident. The drop in mean temperatures since 1950 in the Northern Hemisphere has been suf-

ficient, for example, to shorten Britain’s growing season for crops by two weeks. . . . The first half of this century has apparently been the warmest period since the ‘hot spell’ between 5,000 and 7,000 years ago immediately following the last ice age.” (That warm period in the first half of the century would have been *before* the time when human-caused Greenhouse Gas emissions are supposed to have warmed up the climate.)

In the 1970s, the news media seized on Global Cooling as an existential threat. [See the box below.]

The approaching Ice Age was often cited as a reason for taking away people’s rights and expanding the power of government. It was argued that such action was necessary to save civilization. An example appeared January 26, 1970 in the Owosso, Michigan *Argus-Press*, the

WORLD TO FREEZE! *Scientists warn of coming Ice Age*

Throughout the 1970s, the news media, citing the reports of scientists, warned us that we were headed into a new Ice Age. A small sampling of the headlines, taken from a longer list compiled by *Popular Technology*:

Is Mankind Manufacturing a New Ice Age for Itself? (*L.A. Times*, January 15, 1970) • Scientist predicts a new ice age by 21st century (*Boston Globe*, April 16, 1970) • U.S. Scientist Sees New Ice Age Coming (*Washington Post*, July 9, 1971) • Ice Age Around the Corner (*Chicago Tribune*, July 10, 1971) • New Ice Age Coming - It’s Already Getting Colder (*L.A. Times*, October 24, 1971) • British Expert on Climate Change Says New Ice Age Creeping Over Northern Hemisphere (*Lewiston Evening Journal*, September 11, 1972) • Science: Another Ice Age? (*Time*, November 13, 1972) • Ice Age On Its Way, Scientist Says (*Toledo Blade*, December 13, 1972) • ‘Man-made Ice Age’ Worries Scientists (*The Free Lance-Star*, June 22, 1973) • Weather-watchers think another ice age may be on the way (*Christian Science Monitor*, December 11, 1973) • Ominous Changes in the World’s Weather (*Fortune*, February 1974) • Another Ice Age? (*Time*, June 24, 1974) • 2 Scientists Think ‘Little’ Ice Age Near (*Hartford Courant*, August 11, 1974) • Ice Age, worse food crisis seen (*Chicago Tribune*, October 30, 1974) • Pollution Could Spur Ice Age, NASA Says (*Beaver Country Times*, December 4, 1974) • Climate Change: Chilling Possibilities (*Science News*, March 1, 1975) • B-r-r-r-r: New Ice Age on way soon? (*Chicago Tribune*, March 2, 1975) • Is Another Ice Age Due? Arctic Ice Expands In Last Decade (*Youngstown Vindicator*, March 2, 1975) • The Cooling World (*Newsweek*, April 28, 1975) • Oil Spill Could Cause New Ice Age (*Milwaukee Journal*, December 11, 1975) • Worrisome CIA Report; Even U.S. Farms May be Hit by Cooling Trend (*U.S. News & World Report*, May 31, 1976) • The Ice Age Cometh... (*New York Magazine*, January 31, 1977) • The Big Freeze (*Time*, January 31, 1977) • Space Mirrors Proposed To Prevent Crop Freezes (*Bangor Daily News*, February 7, 1977) • We Will Freeze in the Dark (Capital Cities Communications Documentary, Host: Nancy Dickerson, April 12, 1977) • Little Ice Age: Severe winters and cool summers ahead (*Calgary Herald*, January 10, 1978) • Geologist Says Winters Getting Colder (*Middleboro Daily News*, January 16, 1978) • Large Glacial Buildup Could Mean Ice Age (*Spokane Daily Chronicle*, June 5, 1979) • New ice age almost upon us? (*Christian Science Monitor*, November 14, 1979)

south of the Sahara) was blamed on the inhabitants. Dramatic declines in rainfall were attributed to mistreatment of the region's vegetation. . . . [But in fact] 'This was not caused by people cutting trees or overgrazing,' says Columbia University's Alessandra Giannini, who led one of the analyses. The roots of the drying of Darfur, she and her colleagues had found, lay in changes to the global climate."

► "Climate change poses a global security threat as competition over energy and other resources heralds 'significant potential conflicts' in Africa, the Middle East and between the European Union and Russia," declared the London *Telegraph* in a 2008 story, citing a "stark report" by "two senior EU officials." The headline was even worse: "Climate change 'will spark global conflict.'"

► According to the news media, Global Warming is, will be, or could be responsible for cow infertility (*Science* 2.0), the spread of AIDS (Australia's *The Age*), cougar attacks in Alberta (*National Post*), increased danger in climbing Mount Everest (AP), the rise of the terrorist group Boko Haram and the sinking of the *Titanic* (*The Guardian*), bumpy airplane rides and the death of a 16-year-old polar bear in Svalbard, Norway (NBC News), hikes in the prices of corn flakes (*Los Angeles Times*) and coffee (*Bloomberg/BusinessWeek*), as well as the future extinction of coffee and the 1993 takeover of Somalia by warlords (ABC News), and the higher pitched croak of the coqui frog of Puerto Rico (*Science Daily*).

► On "Good Morning America," weather reporter Sam Champion introduced a segment: "And now to our series, 'Global Warming: Global Warning.' Could global warming one day force us into space to live?"

► In June, Reuters reported that climate change will bring "life-altering results" in cities from Miami to Seattle, so that less than an hour's activity in the shade

will give a fit person heat stroke. That will happen even though, according to *Rolling Stone*, Miami will be under water by the end of the century, possibly by 2030.

► In July, as part of a *Wall Street Journal* series looking at the future, supermodel Tyra Banks made 10 predictions, one of which dealt with the environment: "3. Global warming will threaten our crops so natural food will be scarce. Hourglass, curvy bodies will be the aspirational beauty standard, representing that those women have access to bounties of fulfilling yet healthy food, which means they are affluent."

► The *Christian Science Monitor* in 2012 blamed Global Warming for the following: the future evacuation of the Republic of Kiribati; the exposure of World War I explosives in the Alps; the growth (!) of glaciers in the Alps; tiger attacks in India; the building of elaborate cocoons by Pakistani spiders; the powering-down of a nuclear power plant in Connecticut because its cooling water was too hot; a genetic change causing salmon to spawn early; a plane getting stuck at Reagan National Airport because the tarmac was soft; a popcorn shortage; a future decline in production of maple syrup and baseball bats; interference with Wi-Fi; the organizing of "snowless ski races;" an increase in ant-control calls to Orkin; the shrinking of fish, amphibians, and reptiles; increases in violent crime and rates for homeowners' insurance; changes in the timing of the National Cherry Blossom Festival; the abandonment of cars during a Chicago blizzard; and the fact that "polar bears are learning (!) a new skill out of necessity: long-distance swimming."

► Last year, when CNN anchor Deborah Feyerick interviewed Bill "The Science Guy" Nye about a snowstorm that some blamed on Global Warming, she shifted the conversation: "Talk about something else that's falling from the sky, and that is an asteroid. What's coming our way? Is this an effect of, perhaps, of Global

Warming, or is this just some meteoric occasion?"

► "Whether alien activity or natural phenomena, reports of UFOs have flooded in this summer from across [Britain]," reported the London *Telegraph*. ". . . Malcolm Robinson, who studies the phenomenon, said . . . 'Some experts believe it could be linked to Global Warming and craft from outer space are appearing because they are concerned about what man is doing to the planet.'"

In the 16th and 17th Centuries, European experts sometimes linked crop failures to witchcraft, and those convicted of witchcraft were executed. We now know that some of those crop failures were the result of climate change—*natural* climate change, before industrial times. Today, Global Warming theorists blame witches—SUV drivers, coal miners, the Koch Brothers, and their ilk—for everything from African terrorism to the sinking of the *Titanic*. No matter what the century is, there's never a shortage of witches, or of things to blame on them.

Dr. Steven J. Allen (JD, PhD) is editor of Green Watch. Julia A. Seymour is the assistant managing editor for the Media Research Center's Business and Media Institute.

GW

Please consider contributing now to the Capital Research Center.

CRC is a watchdog over politicians, bureaucrats, and special interests in Washington, D.C., and in all 50 states.

Given the current economic climate, every dollar counts... and we need your help to continue our important research.

Your contribution to advance our work is deeply appreciated.

**Many thanks,
Terrence Scanlon
President**

GreenNotes

Global Warming regulations kill. Last month's *Green Watch* reported deaths in **Great Britain** due to "energy poverty"—people not being able to pay for heating, thanks to "green" restrictions that drive up energy prices. Sen. **Joe Manchin** (D-W.V.) recently pointed out that the **Obama** administration's **War on Coal** could have similar consequences for America's poor. "If our reliability had failed during [last winter's] Polar Vortex . . . there's no question people would have died," Manchin said. "During that time, coal provided 92 percent of the increase in energy needed to survive the disaster."

Last August, we reported on efforts by wealthy Republicans and others to trick conservatives into supporting a carbon tax. Now, former Treasury Secretary **Hank Paulson** has joined two billionaires—former New York Mayor **Michael Bloomberg** and hedge fund operator **Tom Steyer**—along with former **Clinton** Treasury Secretary **Robert Rubin** and former **Nixon** Treasury Secretary **George Shultz**, to call for such a tax. Paulson is most famous for assuring the public that government-sponsored mortgage giants **Fannie Mae** and **Freddie Mac** were fine, right up until the 2008 financial crisis; he then became one of the principal engineers of the **Wall Street** bailout that helped bring Barack Obama to power.

Even as Washington officials seek to reduce military spending by cutting military pay, healthcare, and housing, the government continues the military's commitment to "green" ideology and cronyism. According to the **Government Accountability Office**, the **Defense Department** spent up to \$150 a gallon for 315,000 gallons of jet fuel from algae, compared to \$3 a gallon for traditional jet fuel. To power a carrier strike group off Hawaii's coast in 2012, the Navy spent almost \$27 a gallon for 450,000 gallons of biofuel, compared to the usual \$2.50 for petroleum. Such purchases, according to *Russia Today*, "are helping to subsidize an industry that has become one of President Barack Obama's pet projects." But the blame is bipartisan: the "green" Energy Policy Act that pushes the military to use ridiculously expensive fuels passed in 2005 with a Republican Congress and President.

TheBlaze reported that the Defense Department has 680 so-called renewable energy projects in the works for all branches of the armed forces. That includes 357 solar projects, 29 wind projects, and 289 thermal energy projects. *Reuters* reported in 2012 that the **Air Force** purchased 11,000 gallons of alcohol-based jet fuel for \$59 a gallon from a company backed by high-dollar Democratic donor **Vinod Khoosla**, who has invested in several companies that receive subsidies from the Obama administration.

Sen. **Tom Coburn** (R-Okla.), who monitors wasteful spending, points to **NASA's** \$390,000 effort to develop the **Green Ninja**, a **Smokey Bear**-type character designed to propagandize children about Global Warming. (Meanwhile, the spaceflight agency has shut down manned spaceflight, making the U.S. reliant on others, particularly **Russia**, if it needs to put an astronaut into space.)

Doug Badow of the **Cato Institute** reports the Obama administration is treating antique collectors, dealers, and auctioneers across America as criminals for dealing in ivory. Technically, ivory objects imported before 1976 can be sold, but the administration has shifted the burden of proof on the importation date from the government to the seller. That effectively bans the sale of almost all ivory objects, even those acquired legally decades ago, with no positive impact on the conservation of elephants. **Greg Campbell** of the *Daily Caller* wrote, "The order from the **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service** is meant to crack down on the illegal sale of **African** elephant ivory, but it has also made it nearly impossible for orchestras, symphonies, and individual [musical] performers to travel with the tools of their trade." One musician said his bassoon was built in 1954, but he bought it in 1979, so it doesn't qualify for the pre-1976 exemption.

Speaking of alternative energy: At **Townhall.com**, **Katie Pavlich** reported that an incinerator in **Oregon** was ordered to stop burning medical waste to power homes—"waste" that included aborted babies from **Canada**. Earlier in the year, it was discovered that a dozen hospitals in the **United Kingdom** were burning aborted babies along with trash in order to generate heat for the facilities.

CRC's Henry Haller interns Marc Connuck, Maria Girard, and J.T. Mekjian contributed to this report.