

I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

Bartlett il examiner police reports

OSWEGO, IL - A Montgomery resident was injured in a two-vehicle crash at 5:51 a.m. Sunday on Douglas Road on Fernwood Road in Oswego, police said. The 55-year-old injured driver was taken to a hospital in the area with minor injuries. The driver of another vehicle involved in the accident, Lizbeth Moreno, 21, of the 300 block of Eastern Avenue, Aurora, was ticketed for failing to reduce speed, to avoid an accident, police said., 7d2020-102020-092020-082020-07 2020-062020-052020-042020-032020-02 Go to content Our total circulation is currently over 37,800 Publisher of legal newspapers in Cook, DuPage and Kane counties. Community news published every Wednesday. The examiner is a source of community for quality, in-depth news and information, with an active approach in providing responsible coverage of local issues and events to its readers. Our readers are from six very different and different cities and deserve local news that relates only to them. We are proud of the approach to the news in the city. If the message isn't in your backyard or next door, you won't find it in our documents. Your family, your neighbors, schools, parade, sports teams, governments, news, examiner. 630-830-4145 If I were to choose between a government without a newspaper or newspaper without a government, I would not hesitate to choose the latter. -- Thomas Jefferson . Bartlett Streamwood Carol Stream Hanover Park South Elgin Wayne . . . Your browser does not support the video tag. Page 2 Page 3 Of Our Mission Examiner Publications, Inc. it is a source of high quality, in-depth news and information for your community, taking an active approach to responsible information about local problems and events for your readers. Our readers are from six very different and different cities and deserve local news that relates only to them. We are proud of the approach to the news in the city. If the message isn't in your backyard or next door, you won't find it in our documents. Your family, your neighbors, schools, parade, sports teams, governments, news, your examiner. Our history examiner publications, Inc. has been operating for more than 35 years. The examiner includes eight separate communities; Bartlett, who started hitting the press in 1991; Carol Stream, the main source of news since 1978; Hanover Park, in 1992; Wayne, which began in 1993; Streamwood, in 1997; South Elgin in 2005. The examiner is strictly a local local newspaper. It tells the stories of unsung heroes, often on the front page. City, park and school meetings are widely reported. It is also a valuable information platform for neighbourhoods, churches and civic and social groups. The examiner is sold in kiosks, in the form of a digital subscription via the Internet, as well as by the delivery of the carrier, from to the door. Kiosk Locations Total circulation over 37,800 Bartlett Examiner Examiner is 10,000 Carol Stream Examiner circulation is 7000 Hanover Park Examiner circulation is 5800 South Elgin Examiner circulation is 7000 Streamwood Examiner circulation is 7000 Wayne Examiner circulation is 1000 Examiner Privacy Policy We are sure you do not want your personal data to fall into the wrong hands. At Examiner Publications, Inc., not us. When you visit examiner publications, Inc., we may collect and store information about your visit anonymously. This information may include the time and length of your visit and the pages you view on our website. We may also register the name of your INTERNET service provider. We only use this information to measure activity on our site and see which pages we may want to change. This information also tracks any technical errors on our site that we need to correct. We assure you that we are not able to track email addresses just by visiting our website. The only way we receive your email address is to use one of our email links to send or request information from us. We do not share this information with anyone and is stored in our company. Examiner Publications, Inc. reserves the right to change our privacy policy at any time. Any changes to this policy will be posted on our site in due course. Page 4A Total circulation over 37,800 Ads are divided into: * Help Wanted, * Service Directory, * Legals and * Linear Announcements. The ads appear in all 6 of The Examiner's newspapers. To place an ad online, with a saving of 25 cents per word, click here. You can also call (630) 830-4145 for pricing information. Ads that are called or emailed to our office will be charged 75 cents per word. Bartlett Examiner Circulation is a 10,000 Carol Stream Examiner circulation is 5800 South Elgin Examiner circulation is 7000 Streamwood Examiner circulation is 7000 Wayne Examiner circulation is 1000 These are our special rates online. All rates are higher if you call the office. HELP WANTED ads start at as low as \$50 a week as service directory ads start at as low as \$20 a week LINE ads, such as personal information, for sale, etc. are 50¢ per word. LEGAL NOTES are \$1.50 per line. Assumes the names of companies from the county start at \$75 (see example below) The examiner can print legal notices for Cook, DuPage and Kane Counties Download Our Rate Card Page 5 Page 6 Examiner Publications, Inc.4N781 Gerber RoadBartlett, IL 60103Phone: 630-830-4145Map It (opens a new window) Hours: Monday through Friday 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. To contact the editor or submit messages, click here. To submit your Letters to the editor, click here. To contact our circulation department, click here. In the case of with ads: ads@examinerpublications.com for all other questions, please fill out this form and we will get back to you as soon as possible. Thank you. Page 7 7 B Page 9 March 17, 2010 Corruption squared March 10, 2010 Fixing Illinois March 3, 2010 About My February 24, 2010 Irony R I P February 17, 2010 Credit Where Credit Is Not Due February 10, 2010 Healthcare Reset February 2, 2010 Wrong Trial, Wrong Place January 27, 2010 Pollution is a Cure January 20, 2010 Earthquakes and Political Upheavals January 13th , 2010 Big Front Page News Center Ice Rich The Jury Is Still Out, a bet there are indications that Barack Obama is biting his teeth and doing what many conservatives believed he could never bring himself to do: performing a Clintonesque pivot toward the center. Many on the right doubt the belief in Obama's apparent conversion, but even among those who believe that the president is actually veering away from his cherished far-left path there is a clear disagreement about what that might mean. One school of thought maintains that the nation will spare the worst consequences of pursuing even more left-wing policies and Obama's pivot is therefore necessary and welcome. Another group of conservatives wants the president to stubbornly stick to his left-wing course and thus drive the nation out of a ditch and over a cliff, thus proving how dangerous and disconnected the progressive movement is. Several issues so united left in the belief that George W. Bush was lackey rich and powerful than Bush's tax cuts. For years, progressives have blamed our current economic woes on these cuts, and Obama himself has accepted the theory. And yet, in the wake of his party's devastating rejection last month, Obama not only extended Bush tax cuts, his chief economic adviser said it was necessary to do so unless we wanted to risk a double-dip recession. The president was exhilarating after the package was packaged, saying: "... this proves that both sides can actually work together to grow our economy and pay attention to the American people. What is the difference in the election. The party has now become half of the bipartisan formula Obama has said he wants to hire to unite America. Perhaps you can do business with hostage-takers after all? While it is not certain that Obama will continue on his way to the middle, his willingness to work with his political enemies on the issue is at least a step in the right direction. Obama's hawkish stance on the war in Afghanistan is even more revealing. Nine years after U.S. boots first hit the ground running in Afghanistan to help the Northern Alliance top down the Taliban, the weariness of america's war has clearly changed. A Quinnipiac poll in November showed overall support for the U.S. mission in Afghanistan in negative territory for the first time, with 44 percent of the public supporting the U.S. role and 50 percent opposed. Nevertheless, in a recent surprise visit with troops serving on the front line, Obama talked about taking up the fight against the enemy, not responding to the desires of our opponents. We said that they were supposed to break the momentum of the Taliban, Obama told the soldiers. And that's what you do. You go on the offensive, you're tired of playing defense, targeting their leaders, pushing them out of their strongholds. We've been here before. Bill Clinton came up with the idea of using left-wing ideology as a governing plan when he was elected president in 1992. America strongly rejected such a dramatic change in 1994, adopting the conservative principles that Newt Gingrich so eloquently defined in the GOP America Agreement. From the Democrats' perspective, the 1994 election left their party and their causes in the ruins of smoking. But Bill Clinton, who never hesitated to adopt a strategy that benefited Bill Clinton, saw writing on the wall and swayed toward the center would be seemingly easy. Clinton abandoned Hillarycare, embraced welfare reform and - largely, if not in every detail - moved toward the measure to reap the benefits of anti-left sentiment that followed sweeping the county. Bill Clinton was and is not an ideot. He did and continues to do everything necessary to develop Bill Clinton's fame and fortune. He remains a hero on the left, even though his record shows that he is much less involved in a progressive program than to self-praise. Void. With his administration and its progressive goals in deep, deep trouble, Barack Obama turned to Bill Clinton to save the current administration during a press conference last week. The result was a study of contrasts. The politically savvy ex-president effortlessly took over the leadership role, fielding questions with typical grace and style, using his disarming public persona to put everyone at ease. On the other hand, Barack Obama escaped from the podium shortly after Bill Clinton began speaking. While Clinton smoothly engaged reporters, the President of the United States ran away to attend a Christmas party that was apparently far more important than the nation's business. The bottom line seems to be that Barack Obama wants to find a way out of the ideological cul-de-sac that he ran his nation, but he does galls it up. His one-way words after the tax cut vote probably came tough for the president, but if he were still publicly lashing out at conservatives and progressive purists then only him would seem even more childishly petulant and bitter. If Obama is to continue moving toward the center, Republicans will have to keep up the pressure. This deeply narcissistic president will not like it, but the citizens of the nation to be the leader will be much happier than they are at the moment. Liberal Crack Up By Rich Hems So Much for a Post-Partisan Presidency. Not that there was any chance that this actually happened anyway. It would take modern Solomon to fill ideological divisions in America today and no one would confuse Barack Obama with biblical Since the beginning of his tenure, Obama's idea of bipartisanship has more resembled a mob racket than any kind of nuance balancing political and public interests. From stimulus to government bailouts, from health care to trials for terrorists, the administration's message was undoubtedly clear: we all get along well, as long as you do exactly as Nancy, Harry and I are talking about. The administration thus alienated Republicans early and often, and as the 2010 election showed, millions to millions of Americans. Now the furor over the president's request to extend bush-era tax cuts to everyone has turned another faction against him: Obama bases on the president's far-left views of the tax extension proposal as evidence that Obama is in fact money grubbing up Republicans in the guilting progressive clothing. Far-left and elected officials representing progressives, like Speaker Pelosi, are rushing to put as much distance between themselves and Obama's heretical proposals as possible. Centrist Democrats, like centrist Republicans, are willing to go along with a framework that neither group considers perfect, but each group considers it necessary if we are to avoid an even deeper recession. The right-wing Republican party isn't at all sure it's willing to swallow the bitter additional spending bill that goes along with expanding tax cuts in Obama's proposal, but the jury is still out on whether hard-core conservatives will vote against the deal or not. At the end of the day, My guess is that the Conservatives will stick around as long as they can, before joining the centre of both parties to ensure that tax rates remain stable for everyone over the next two years. While the Obama administration is not the first partisan presidency since George Washington, it is certainly the first post-ironic presidency. Obama's entire economic demagoogue is based on the claim that Bush's tax cuts ruined the economy - a fantasy that corresponded directly to the delusion of his left-wing base. So what does the president propose to do to keep the economy from tanking even further than he has torpedoed it so far? Extending bush tax cuts. The cognitive dissonance on the left must be devastating - either they were terribly bad about economics all the time, or Obama wasn't the one elected that they imagined him from the beginning. In fact, both are true, but their disappointment is spectacular behold. Consider some of the comments posted on Daily Kos, a site that is always a harbinger of far-left opinion, shortly after the president announced his readiness to extend the Bush-era tax cuts to everyone. I'm just 5 accept the fact that I had and that Obama is in fact a Republican, one commentator waned. Then I'll move on. I don't expect anything from Washington and I work very hard to elect progressive Democrats locally. Just from bottom to top. Oh, and that. NEVER, NEVER, EVER, EVER again give time or a dime or vote for a blue dog Democrat. This also applies to the President. Another complained about Obama's defect in terms that could have been plucked from a McCain-Palin ad in 2008: During the election, a British man asked me, What do we really know about this Obama character? Isn't electing a president without experience a little risky?. At that time, I answered as you might expect. Saying all the right things, energizing the country, etc. Crap, I should have listened to the guy. Obama turned out to be just a suit with a great speech writer. Finally, we have this piece of sarcasm from the Daily Kosite, which believes that allowing people to keep more of the money they have earned is morally equivalent to highway robbery: The rich need our money more than (sic) we do because they are better people. Obama knows this and doesn't shudd if he does from doing difficult things - like taking our money and giving it to the rich. If Barack Obama is not far enough to the left for the far left, the far left has nowhere to go. As painful as it can be for a president to consciously alienate his loyal base, the alternative is much more painful. If the economy continues, Obama has zero chance of getting re-elected in 2012 and knows that. Extending hated tax cuts is an important measure toward driving economic recovery, and you don't have to go any further than President Larry Summers' chief economic adviser to understand the veracity of this statement. When the push comes to a push, the center-right coalition will likely approve the best deal it can wrangle from the president, simply to avoid further economic horror. In this way, the Conservatives will give Barack Barack May a gift he has not earned: a path to economic recovery that will give Barack a glimmer of hope in the 2012 election. Ultimately, Barack Obama will have to face a very strange situation as the re-election time approaches. The base that adored him abandoned him, even when his hated ideological enemies provided him with the tools to bring America's difficult economy back into motion. Rich Shed's attack on Iran When the stuxnet super-virus was first identified in June by a Belarussian security company, cybersecurity experts around the world feared that the infection could have a global impact. But, as software engineers continue to study lines of code in sophisticated malware, it has become clear to most that Stuxnet was designed as a precision weapon with one goal in mind: Iran's nuclear program. However, while the virus appears to be effective in disrupting Iran's nuclear ambitions for now, Stuxnet also represents a new type of computer virus, one that some experts fear will be used to attack power plants and industry around the world. If terrorists got their hands on Stuxnet-like technology before the west develops effective remedies, the results could be disastrous. Devastating. Security expert Ralph Langner described Stuxnet as similar to the arrival of the F-35 on the battlefield during World War I. Unlike most viruses, Stuxnet was not designed to infiltrate networks exclusively over the Internet. Computers used in Iran's nuclear program are not connected to the Internet, so it would be a futile exercise. Instead, Stuxnet jumped from computer to computer using all possible means, always looking for its purpose. Experts suspect that an unsuspecting person involved in Iran's nuclear program eventually introduced the virus through a regular flash drive. When Stuxnet discovered it was where it was supposed to be, the virus went to work. A typical virus is designed for your computer, almost always your computer. Stuxnet followed a software logic controller (PLC) that controlled thousands of centrifuges installed by Iran to enrich uranium at the Natanz plant. The virus not only tricked the PLC into rapidly changing the speed of the centrifuges, but also prevented the PLC from reporting speed changes and stopped the CONTROLLER from triggering any alarms. Operators were certainly surprised because their control panels told them that everything was working normally, but the centrifuge after the centrifuge was destroyed by major changes in rotational speed. As a result, according to many experts, thousands of centrifuges were damaged during the year, as a result of which Stuxnet did his dirty work, undetected by anyone in Iran. These were high-quality targets because Iran needs centrifuges to improve the low-carbon uranium used to fuel high-grade weapons. Who did it? Most experts believe that something as sophisticated and complex as Stuxnet could only be built using the resources of a rich nation state. Israel and the United States are obvious candidates, but some believe that Russia and Germany could also participate in the project. Since the targeted systems were built by the German company Siemens, it seems likely that the company, the German Government - or both - at least cooperated in that effort. If the reports of damage to Natanz are correct (Iran denies such reports of course), then the world is to blame for who made the stealthy cyber-debt attack of gratitude. However, there is another side to the coin. Now that the code is publicly available, it's only a matter of time before a hacker with less noble ends in mind modifies Stuxnet for more nefarious purposes. The nightmarish scenario involves a clever programmer building a Stuxnet-like virus that would go after PLCs used in key sectors of the Western economy, facilities such as power plants, oil refineries and industrial producers. Such weapons would be very attractive to terrorists around the world, and it is not difficult to imagine a soulless hacker with the highest bid. Now there is little danger that al-Qaeda's programmer has created a weapon that is destructive, even with Stuxnet to use as a plan. But whether or not Pay the clever unfaithful handsomely to provide them with the opportunity to wreak that kind of havoc? You place bets. Langner, who runs a cybersecurity company, says he already has the ability to infiltrate and sabotage PLCs in industrial plants. His company has developed software proving the concept of ... which manipulates controllers without any confidential knowledge. If we wanted to, we could implement a configurable controller utilization structure that includes more nasty Stuxnet attack technology within four weeks. We're not going to do that. But others probably will. They may need more time, but we don't know if they haven't started yet. Langner's software interface is terrifyingly simple, allowing the user to select the target process and then turn off alarms, kill the process, change process variables and change the output - all without knowing the process itself. Like other cybersecurity experts, Langner hopes to influence people to use his services by revealing vulnerabilities in their system. However, the fact that someone delivers a message of their own interest does not mean that the message is wrong. Stuxnet took computer virus to a whole new level, pushing them beyond the mostly annoying, but manageable, ways of disrupting personal computers and networks. Now viruses can be used to sabotage industrial facilities and processes and to cause as much damage as cruise missile dams. The challenge for the West will be to improve this technology so that it can be used to attack enemies of freedom and freedom more and more, while ensuring that this powerful new weapon cannot be used against us. Oops! - Gore admits to the mistake of Rich Shed Back in 1994, U.S. Vice President Al Gore cast a tie-breaking vote that ushered in a long road to taking American farms out of food production and converting them into fuel production. While conservatives and libertarians argued at the time that subsidizing ethanol production made no economic or environmental sense, Gore and his green allies were confident that biofuels would solve all the nation's woes. Sixteen years later, Mr. Gore apparently saw the light, admitting that America's rush to embrace corn ethanol was something of a mistake. Here's what Vice President Al Gore had to say about his role in subsidizing ethanol, speaking at a Farm Journal conference in 1998: I was also proud to stand up for ethanol tax exemption when it was under attack in Congress - at one point, delivering a tie-break vote in the Senate to save it. The more we can make this native fuel a successful, widely used product, the better our farmers and our environment will be. Contrast that with what is quoted as saying when he attended a recent green energy conference held in Athens, Greece: It's not a good policy to make these huge subsidies for first-generation ethanol, Reuters quoted Gore as saying about the U.S. U.S. to appear for congressional review. First-generation ethanol, I think, was a mistake. Energy conversion rates are very low at best. One of the reasons I made this mistake is that I paid special attention to farmers in my home state of Tennessee and I had some sympathy for the farmers in Iowa because I was going to run for president. The size, especially the proportion of maize that is currently (used) with first generation ethanol, has a decisive impact on food prices. Competition with food prices is real. Although it is nice to hear that the hero of the environmental movement accepted reality, Gore's conversion came far too late. When Gore cast his critical vote in 1994, the biofuel industry produced about 1.4 billion gallons of ethanol per year from fewer than fifty plants. Sixteen years later, as a direct result of government subsidies and tax credits, more than a hundred new corn ethanol plants were built and the amount of ethanol produced in the United States increased by nearly an order of magnitude, topping 10.5 billion gallons in 2009. Private investors have invested tens of billions of dollars in building today's massive corn ethanol infrastructure, and the government has invested tens of billions more to ensure it stays in place. If Gore had faced the facts in 1994, the public and private sectors could have used these funds more wisely and cost-efficiently elsewhere. But now? After making this huge investment, the pain of admitting failure, suffering our losses and moving away from corn ethanol may be too much to bear. Congress must decide whether to renew the current \$7.7 billion subsidy for corn ethanol by the end of the year. On the one hand, it seems madness to prolong the fuel industry, which, at best, can generate only slightly more energy than it consumes (and, on the other hand, most often less), which removes arable land from food and feed production and, as a result, raises prices and reduces food availability. A 2007 report by the Department of Agriculture clearly outlines the effects of subsidizing corn ethanol: a steady decline in food production, simultaneous declines in agricultural exports and rising food costs. As disgusted as it can be to bite the bullet of ethanol and ethanol corn subsidies, the alternative could be even more unsatisfactory for Congress. Demanding that the ethanol corn industry stand on its own two feet would result in the closure of dozens of plants, the loss of thousands of jobs, writing off billions of dollars in losses and finding new sources of oil to replace the billions of gallons of ethanol that Americans put into their gas tanks each year. Both options are painful, and while a free market advocate like me will advocate cutting our losses, learning a painful lesson and going ethanol, Congress may not be so inclined. The benefits of abolishing the ethanol subsidy are long-term and marketable. Few politicians are motivated to act by especially when short-term injuries can be so devastating for their careers. How can even the most staunchly conservative farm-belt Congressman face his constituents after voting to end ethanol subsidies? If and when subsidies run out, farm income will fall, farm property values will fall and thousands of ethanol workers will find themselves on the streets looking for work in the worst economic climate since the Great Depression. The fact that Al Gore will eventually deal with corn ethanol reality is an unusual development, but its conversion is probably too late to be of any real value. The policies he has promoted for most of his political career have come to a head, and the economic damage these policies have caused is undeniable. Gore - more than anyone else - has helped create a monster of renewable energy that saps our nation's resources and undermines our prosperity today. After taking advantage handsomely for these efforts, the ex-vice president's belated mea culpa comes too late in the game to have any practical effects. EPA Power Grab Rich Whorrmust When the Obama administration unsuccessfully tries to push through the cap and trade bill through Congress, the president and his USEPA administrator Lisa Jackson have repeatedly warned politicians that if the bill does not pass they will regulate greenhouse gases through the Clean Air Act anyway. Given the tedious complexity of the Clean Air Act process, many (including this writer) thought it was an empty threat. We were wrong. Last Wednesday, Jackson released a document that will serve as a sweeping plan for a new power grab by her agency, which carefully avoids the tiresome and time-consuming requirements that a piece of legislation duly passed by Congress like the Clean Air Act imposes on USEPA. Under this new set of policy guidelines, bureaucrats tasked with regulating the amount of air pollutants released into the atmosphere will be entitled to move away from the chimney and to boiler rooms and industry boards across the country. Until now, USEPA's authority and the state and local agencies that do most of the environmental work in this area have been confined to the universe, which comes out of the stack. They can reduce emissions in order to meet existing standards, but they have not engaged in economic decisions or process details. Those days are over. In the name of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, USEPA directs state and local agencies that report to the feds to use energy efficiency as permit guidelines. Jackson's agency wants bureaucrats across the country to start dictating choices in equipment and the way equipment is operated and maintained, and to codify their judgments on the best way to operate the facility as permit conditions. This document is entitled PSD and Title V Guidelines for greenhouse gases. It has been issued to the Wednesday. The fact that it is a guidance document, as opposed to a formal regulatory proposal, is very important. Regulations must be proposed in certain forms, economic costs and a lengthy, detailed public process must be taken into account. The guidance, on the other hand, is not subject to any of these types of annoying requirements. The guideline is USEPA offers its opinion on the subject, and when criticism begins. Jackson will certainly hide behind this exact, but ultimately irrelevant, detail. Few states outside Texas will ignore the USEPA guidelines because such a document is traditionally treated as a Holy Warrant by state and local agencies. After all, their authorisation decisions are ultimately subject to USEPA approval. How can a state regulator expect a decision to be approved by a federal regulator if it ignores federal guidelines? It's a subtle but devilishly brilliant policy. Few people understand the legal differences that come into play and Jackson will be able to con many mainstream media to the belief that industrial advocates like me are making the top of the mollehill. We are not. For those readers who are not aware of this, I am an expert in environmental regulation in general and the Clean Air Act in particular. Helping the industry cope with both has been my primary career for more than twenty-five years. Believe me: the consequences of what Jackson is trying to do and cunning means that she uses to achieve this will have serious repercussions on our beleaguered industrial sector. In this document, usepa acknowledges that the Holy Grail of greenhouse gas control, carbon capture and sequestration (i.e. injecting carbon dioxide deep underground) is far from being a cost-effective and reliable technology - if ever will be. It's a reasonable start, but it's all downhill. By authorising major new industrial projects or major modifications to existing plants, the Agency shall address to the authorities authorising the requirement to improve energy efficiency in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Now no one is opposed to energy efficiency, and most of everyone in the private sector is vulnerable to anything that reduces energy costs. However, when USEPA decides that it should dictate energy efficiency measures by selecting devices, influencing process design and transforming what should be operational decisions, we have crossed the line. When government bureaucrats start making such decisions, we have moved even further from the free market to the kind of benevolent socialism in which this administration seems so in love. This interference in the private sector is all the worse because it is understood that the people in the bureaucracy will make these decisions. There are a few notable exceptions, but for the most part men and women who write permits fall into one of two categories: a) children a few years after college who know, know, little about any industrial process, or b) older people who could not break into the private sector because they did not have enough talent, sufficient intelligence or both. In both cases, it is a constant struggle for the industry to allow permit writers to understand relatively simple issues that include what comes out of the chimney. Asking the same people to understand what is happening throughout the energy production or production process is a recipe for chaos. The same authors of the permits will also be asked to make a rather unusual decision: whether to allow an increase in traditional air pollutants such as particulate matter and sulphur dioxide, if such an increase is the price to be paid for reducing

greenhouse gas emissions. This is another unprecedented development. For decades, environmental groups have struggled with the very emergence of retreat when it comes to air pollution emissions from industrial sources. However, praying at the altar of the false god of global warming, this administration said in writing that going backwards could be OK if greenhouse gas emissions were reduced. You can get a lot more energy from tons of Illinois coal, for example, but Illinois coal contains much more sulfur than low sulfur, lower western coal energy that is commonly burned today. Jackson's tips seem to open the door to using the former without worrying about the ugly sulfur dioxide so much. Finally, under Jackson's guidelines, state and local agencies should consider increasing permit fees to cover the cost of implementing the Greenhouse Gas Regulation under the Clean Air Act. They have the right to do so, says the administrator, according to the law, even though no one has passed any formal process of lagecasuring with regard to greenhouse gases. Ironically, even if you adhere to global warming alarmism, none of this nonsense is necessary. The United States reduced greenhouse gas emissions to mid-1990s levels. China is a big player in terms of greenhouse gas emissions and will only grow. The combination of renewable portfolio standards (which require utilities to gradually reduce their fossil fuel consumption over time) and regional cap and trade programmes mean that more than half of countries are committed to drastically reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Why does USEPA have to step in to reduce greenhouse gas emissions when we are already committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions? It all sounds quite surreal, but there doesn't seem to be much chance of stopping this hurting train of environmental extremism. Since this policy is implemented as a guide, Lisa Jackson is not obligated to solina comments, much less respond to them. Nevertheless, it agreed to public comment period before USEPA finalises the new policy. This comment period opened on Wednesday and closes on December 1, a total of fourteen days that includes the Thanksgiving holiday. This is a reminds Democrats of the rush to pass a health care bill so we can find out what was in it. It will not be possible for industry groups and advocates of the free market to digest the implications of this radical policy change, much less to respond effectively to it. This is without a doubt exactly what Lisa Jackson wants. The EPA's greenhouse gas regulation is scheduled to begin on January 2, 2011, a date that will mark the beginning of the last chapter in the once proud history of the U.S. industrial sector. Russia is back by the rich Name Of The Has changed and the empire is smaller than it used to be, but there is less and less these days to distinguish the Russian Federation from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Saturday's brutal beating of crusading journalist Oleg Kashin appears to be the latest example of Russia's resurgent state police straining their muscles to root out dissent, especially when it comes to journalists who refuse to follow party lines. A terrifying video recently posted shows Kashin being repeatedly beaten by two men who appear to be wielding pipes or other blunt instruments. Kashin, a journalist for Kommersant, a Russian political and business newspaper, suffered multiple injuries and is currently in an induced coma as doctors try to save his life. Most importantly, a journalist who wrote so much to anger and embarrass the government had all his fingers broken. As the messages go, they're not much clearer: write things we don't like, and we'll make sure you never write again. None of Kashin's belongings were stolen by his attackers, which further strengthens the motivation to attack. The Russian authorities naturally expressed their outrage at the crime and pledged to find and punish the perpetrators. In a fair world, such investigations will begin at the summit, and detectives are interrogating Prime Minister Vladimir Putin and President Dmitry Medvedev. This year, eight journalists have been killed in Russia, and only one of these murders has led to arrests. Russian courts and police do not have enough force - or sufficient interest - to protect journalists, said Michael Kotov, editor of the online newspaper Russian Newspaper. As parliamentary elections are due to take place in the next eighteen months, efforts to stop press freedom in Russia are sure to deteriorate. The Russian edition of Newsweek, which has provided a strong voice of opposition in the country, seems ready to close its doors along with other media outlets that do not play by Putin's rules. The West's dream of a Cold War for a liberated, democratic Russia – a vision that seemed tantalizingly akin to reality when the Soviet Union dissolved nineteen years ago – now seems as distant and unattainable as ever. As president, Putin was the most popular Russian nation in the world, with approval ratings among Russians, which sometimes reached more than eighty percent. Economic Economic means that Medvedev is not as popular as his mentor, but there is little indication that most of the Russian population would like to change the way the country is run. Putin is widely seen as restoring Russian pride and was fortunate to be at the forefront when the fruits of the nation's experiments with capitalism began to bear economic fruit. He is a hero among many locals and it matters much more than the fate of one journalist with big lips. While markets in Russia may be more free than under Leonid Brezhnev, the resurgent power of the country's police state today would make Stalin smile. But then the method of governing Russia's mother by the thuggish ruling class was a central feature of the nation since Ivan the Terrible first came up with the concept in the XVI century. Under Ivan, the secret police were Oprichniki, who used torture and murder to root out and eliminate the enemies of the government, and who in turn took great care of the Tsar. For centuries, Russian heads of state have continually followed Ivan's example. Names have been changed, from Okhrana under Nicholas II, to the NKVD, to the KGB and all incarnations in between. Today, the FSB has replaced the KGB, but apart from the two consonants, there does not seem to be much to divide the two organisations. Unless of course it is that the FSB has more money to work with than its predecessor. The mission remains the same as ever: ensuring that the regime in power remains in power. It seems that the FSB is carrying out this extremely important task with the same ruthless effectiveness as its ancestors in the country in the state have shown in Russia's long, tragic history. In this case, the modern version of Oprichnika is taking care of its own. Putin neatly bridges the gap between the KGB, for which he worked in the USSR, and the FSB, which he led in the Russian Federation. Like modern China, Putin seems to digest the lesson that while free markets - or at least their close-up - are desirable, other, more troublesome parts of freedom don't have to go with it. Russians are relatively free to cultivate their wares as long as the state and the crowds get cut, but freedom of the press, freedom of dissent and freedom to express opinions that conflicts with state politics quickly disappear. After all, Oleg Kashin was not an investigative journalist, he simply expressed his point of view, but this point of view was often critical of the ruling regime. For the crime of having an opinion, Kashin was beaten half to death, and his life hangs by a thread. The old saying goes that the more things change, the more they stay the same. In today's Russia, this wisdom remains as true as ever. Chicago wins Rich Who's Well, that was silly. The rest of the nation rejected a socialist agenda that, while ill-thought-out, was at least owned by leftists who pushed him to America's throats. Crabby conservatives like yours really were happy with this, but those who live in this state here would be much happier if Illinois voters could show even a fraction of the common sense that most of the rest of the nation displayed on November 2, 2010. The choice of Pat Quinn and the continuous initiation of the Madigan machine is all the more frustrating because compared to the decision people made nationally, our choice was much easier. There was no ideology to vote for or against in Illinois, there was a group of grossly corrupt goof-balls who ran the state into the ground on one side of the ballot, and a group of not-recently corrupt goof-balls, who, back in the glory days of the 90s, actually ran the state rather well. We chose this one. By we mean, of course, the Democratic machine in Cook County, because that's what statewide elections come down to. Have you seen a map of Illinois showing how each county voted for governor? It's a sea of red, with three exceptions. One of them is basically East St. Louis, which is so desperately affected by poverty that of course they will vote for the party's powers. The second is down through Cairo and I'm not sure they have indoor sewers out there, much less access to the news. But this is the third one that mattered. It was Cook County that got Pat Quinn selected and very nearly put a slime ball like Alexi Giannoulias on top. This election confirmed what many of us already knew: Illinois is the state run of Chicago, through Chicago, for Chicago. To make matters worse, these elections guarantee that this will continue to be the case for a very long time. Illinois Democrats now have full control over redistricting, which means they will carving out a legislative map in some surreal image that guarantees that they will stick to their majority far into the future. Now I'm getting my fair share of anger, offensive letters and that's fine. I've always believed that since I'm getting ink in 40,000+ newspapers,
the least reader who disagrees with me has the right to be able to tell me what jerk I am. As a rule, I do not respond, and to rare exceptions, when I do, I do not respond in kind. Today I make an exception. To those of you who voted to keep this dictatorial, corrupt, irresponsible regime in Illinois, I ask this question: how stupid can you be? There are people who believe that big government can solve everyone's problems. I understand that. But in Illinois in 2010, how did anyone in their right mind vote for this kind of government? The government is not able to fix anything when it is broken by itself. Illinois is a train wreck. Now we have \$13 billion in red and it's only going to get worse. We bled out work and employers. If Illinois were a nation, we would be 8th in the world in terms of public sector employment. How long do you think we can stay before the wheels come down completely? To capitalize on the metaphor with which President Obama is so addicted, Madigan and his buddies drove a car, which is Illinois, into a ditch at a speed of one hundred and forty miles per hour, turned it over seventeen times, and tossed a gas tank. Now, lemme like Illinois voters - and I'm talking to you idiot Illinois Democrats from Cook County - have not only handed them the keys, you've lent them zippo lighters to finish the job. The next General Assembly will, of course, make cursory budget cuts. They are not completely dead, but they have no convictions or principles to make the kind of deep, painful budget reforms that are necessary to distract Illinois from the abyss of economic disaster. Instead, they will be reluctant, unfortunately, to announce that - darn god - they'll cut everything they can and it wasn't enough. I apologize to the people, but a tax increase is the only way. This in turn will send more employers and jobs out of our state, toward states that are much more healthy about their finances and that don't try to bleed every last dime from companies and individuals. Texas comes to mind as a perfect example. Recession or not, the Lone Star State is doing well, and as a result, Americans are migrating en masse to the jobs and prosperity that Texas offers. Meanwhile, once great states like California, and New York - it's so sad to admit that - Illinois are now battered by hulks, quickly on the road to becoming just the shadows of the economic powers they once were. It's a damn shame, but that's where we are and, saddled of all, our children will pay the most expensive for our terrible mistakes. More Corn For You By Rich Whom's Last month, USEPA approved the use of gasoline containing up to fifteen percent ethanol in vehicles built in 2007 or later. This is an increase over the current ten per cent limit and will certainly make ethanol producers such as agri-archery giant Daniels Midland very happy. Unfortunately, there isn't much in this decision for the average American consumer to celebrate. The new fuel mix, generally known as the E-15, can increase gas prices, raise food prices and possibly damage vehicles, void guarantees and increase air pollution. You have to admire the cunning with which USEPA Administrator Lisa Jackson is working on the system to further the green agenda. In a press release announcing the E-15 decision, Jackson said: Thorough testing has shown that the E15 does not harm emission control equipment in newer cars and light trucks. Wherever sound science and law support steps to allow more native fuels in America's vehicles, this administration is taking these steps. These two seemingly harmless sentences have profound regulatory significance. As early as March 2009, Growth Energy, a trade organisation for the biofuels industry, and fifty usepa petition for approval of the use of E-15. Under the Clean Air Act, USEPA cannot approve the approval of fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable
sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other
applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent
other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to
circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute to the failure of engine parts that comply with the emission limits in the act. Now the narrowing of the test here: USEPA can use its powers to circumvent other applicable sections of the Clean Air Act and self-approve a new fuel – which is undoubtedly the E-15 – unless it can be demonstrated that ... the new fuel will not cause or contribute

midst of another deadly war against a fanatical enemy, we are a divided house. Some of us would give our men and women in uniform everything they need to fight this enemy, some of us don't want to admit that there is even war going on. Sixty-six years ago, it was a different world - a simpler world, I think - and what our fathers and grandparents achieved on June 6, 1944, will become one of the brightest moments of the West for centuries. Charge IT - On June 2, 2010, Illinois passed a budget last week. Not that you or I will consider a budget per se. It's even more in nature another huge fee that will appear on the ever-increasing state credit card bill, but the General Assembly calls it a budget, so we'll go with that. House Speaker Mike Madigan, in a rare moment of sincerity, acknowledged that the budget is not sustainable. The budget wasn't balanced for years of course, but Democrats in Springfield always claimed they were. This is quite an important issue because the Illinois Constitution says that the budget must be balanced and that both the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate certify that this is the case. So we have a speaker telling Illinois beleaguered citizens that our representatives have created a budget that is not actually legal. Hemmingway told the story of a famous fighter named Gallo, who sometimes gives up the privilege of sending a bull if the best looked at him in a certain way. You take it Paco, Gallo will say to fellow matador. I don't like the way he looks at me. Last week's budget vote casts Illinois Democrats in the role of Gallo, frozen in idle by the gloomy brilliance of increasingly disenchanted voters. Instead of dealing with the mess they created, they borrowed a little more and lent the day a little longer. The best thing that could happen to Mike Madigan and his cronies would be if Bill Brady was elected governor. Brady would have to clean up the mess and thus take the blame for the inevitable backlash against the cuts that will come. Take care of this Bill, Madigan said, if you effect last week. I don't like the way voters look at us. The budget offers another \$4 billion in loans to keep the state's pension fund solvent, despite the fact that it only stacks more debt on the fund, which is already a mess. Who borrows you like Illinois \$4 billion anyway? If a homeowner tried to borrow \$50,000 to pay off a mortgage for a year and explained to the bank that he needed the money because he was \$250,000 in debt and had no income to pay that off, I'm pretty sure he told the homeowner he would laugh at any financial institution on the ground. But I wander. It is about politics, as always in this state, not fiscal responsibility. Several Dems in marginal constituencies - those constituencies where polls say they are danger of losing space - voted against the budget. They have this luxury because the Dems control safe enough neighborhoods that few in shaky states can afford a sudden crisis of conscience. One Illinois Dem who gets a pass on this analysis in my book is Jack Franks, a state representative from Woodstock. Franks was one of the few members of his party to take Blago long before it was fashionable to do so and was one of the few votes in the party to argue for some kind of fiscal sense. As for the rest of these clowns: spare me; the 2011 budget is déjà vu anew: more paper loans over the gap gap that describes the difference between what we owe and what we bring. The argument that we should raise state income tax because Illinois is one of the least taxed states in the country, didn't get any traction, fortunately. That Illinois has a relatively low rate of personal income tax is undeniable, but once you add up the total tax burden that you and I are dealing with - including sales taxes, property taxes, business taxes (which get passed on to us) and all the rest - it's pretty clear that Illinois chooses its pocket residents like everyone else. Ultimately, the General Assembly will have to figure out how to do with less. Actually, they should have figured out how to do it many years ago. But the counting day is getting closer and closer, no matter how much our elected representatives try to bury their heads in the sand. Heartland Notes - May 26, 2010 By Rich Shed I had the honor of attending the Heartland Institute's Fourth International Climate Change Conference in Chicago last week. Most people have not heard of it, partly because the mainstream media is doing everything it can to ignore it, but it is an important and impressive gathering of scientists and decision-makers who look at the problem of global warming through the eyes of far less jaundice than those who participate in the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change events. There are many reasons why the mainstream media is ignoring the Heartland conference. The Heartland Institute is a front-line organization for large oil, they say. Similarly, for organizations that sponsor the conference. And, of course, this also applies to scientists. Everyone, it seems, is a pocket of Exxon-Mobil. When I can't help but wonder if I can get my check? None of these excuses are subject to any scrutiny. The Heartland Institute is not funded by large oil organizations that sponsor the conference without paying the institute anything (often the opposite is true - heartland funds their presence) and I have yet to find a skeptical scientist who got a dime from Exxon-Mobil or another energy company. But if you're mainstream media, you need to come up with some reason to ignore the event that offers some of the most talented/wisest klimatologów z calego świata, faciek jak dr Richard Lindzen z MIT, dr Roy Spencer z University of real scientists, not paid columnists, they actually disagree on the whole number of points. There is no consensus at the Heartland conference and there should be no real scientists at every gathering, especially in an area so extremely complex and poorly understood as the global climate. Well, let's take it back. There is one thing that virtually every skeptical scientist at the Heartland conference actually agreed on: that greenhouse gas emissions from human activities have an impact on the planet's climate. Despite what you read in some media, skeptics (or denies what we are called in some quarters) do not claim the above point. The question is not whether man-made greenhouse gases can affect the climate, the real question is: how much? Scientists such as Penn State's Michael Mann and Phil Jones of the University of East Anglia believe - quite frankly - that relatively weak greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide and methane, are changing the delicate balance, forcing more water vapor (a very strong greenhouse gas) into the atmosphere, leading to catastrophic warming. Other scientists, like Spencer, Lindzen and Gray, don't think so. First, we don't see an alarming rise in atmospheric temperatures, as we should if Mann and Jones were right. The only relatively large, but not unheard of in historical terms, the temperature increase that we see is attached to the surface temperature record. These figures are quite suspicious, as meteorologist Anthony Watts' pioneering work has shown, and it doesn't really matter nearly as much as an atmospheric temperature record. Another thing is that the climate models used by alarmists do not refer to the importance of over-the-air. Spencer showed, and satellite data increasingly shows that clouds have an important, moderate impact on the climate. However, in a hurry to cry wolf! the alarmist set largely ignored this important piece of the climate puzzle. Some people on my ideological side of the aisle suggest that the alarmism of global warming is a scam that has knowingly been imposed on us in order to further our liberal agenda. I respectfully disagree. Rather, I think we are looking at two separate things here. We have a group of scientists who rightly believe that their research is correct, important and deserves more funding. Instead of creating this point of view, liberal politicians and policymakers used it. They disproportionately encourage a relatively small group of scientists to exclude all other opinions. The Heartland Conference was an important alternative to politically correct science. Kudos to them for what the mainstream media will never do: questioning conventional wisdom and keeping an open mind. Radical What? - May 19, 2010 By Rich Shed Last week an exchange between Attorney General Eric Holder and Congressman Lamar Smith during a House Judiciary Committee meeting summarizes the Obama administration's struggles with today's foreign policy realities pretty damn well: For all three attempts last year, terrorist attempts, one of which was successful, these individuals had ties to radical Islam. Congressman Smith said: Do you think these people may have been urged to take the actions they did because of radical Islam? Because of ... ? Holder replied. Radical Islam, Smith repeated. There are many reasons why I think people have taken these actions, Holder said. I think you have to look at every case. Smith tried again: Yes, but could radical Islam be one of the reasons? Many reasons why people... By all accounts, Smith is usually a mild-mannered guy, but he started out a little cranky, asking the same question a fourth time: But was radical Islam one of them? There are many reasons why people do things, Holder said. Some of them are potentially religious... All right, said Smith. But all I ask is whether you think that among these different reasons radical Islam may have been one of the reasons why individuals have taken the steps they have taken. You see, you say 'radical Islam,' Holder protested. I mean, I think those people who share - a version of Islam that is not ... Do you feel uncomfortable attributing any actions to radical Islam? Smith asked. It sounds like this. Think? And so it went. At the end of the dialogue, Holder
eventually allowed himself to use the words radical and Islam in the same sentence, though not actually side by side. You can't be too careful about these things. I do not think that the Attorney General would hesitate to put right-wing and extremist words side by side if some disgusted longing for the glory days of the Third Reich tried to blow something up. I also doubt that he would use radical and fundamentalist adjectives before the noun Christian if someone who considers himself to be avenging god's hand blew up an abortion clinic. As a right-wing guy and as a Christian, I wouldn't be offended in the slightest. In fact, I would expect Holder to use just such terms, and I would like him to have no other reason than to explain that there is a difference between right-wing and right-wing extremists and between Christians and radical, fundamentalist Christians. So why are all the pussy-footing around in this case? Is the administration trying to avoid insulting Muslim sensitivities? How can a reasonable Muslim be taken if the Attorney General of the United States points out that the fanatics whom everyone - except Eric Holder - know that they are acting in the name of their religion are in fact radicals? More likely, this is part of the Obama administration's continued efforts to de-Bush himself. Yes, they will fight the war on terrorism, but now it is an 1999 90-year-old operation that has a particular preposterous impact on almost everyone on both sides of the political spectrum. But calling it the war on terror is much to W. Holder's latest p-dance sounds like more of the same. The use of the words radical Islam will make it sound like this right-wing madman from Texas, and God knows we can't have it. Who knows what motivates someone who spends five months in a terrorist training camp in Pakistan to try to blow up Times Square after all? It can be almost anything. Perhaps, as New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg cheerfully suggested after the Times Square bomb plot was discovered, it was the result of dissatisfaction with health care. It's true that you've never heard of George W. Bush, or anyone in his administration, offer such obviously transparent calls, but the same can be said of Bill Clinton and his gang. Does City Holder understand how stupid it sounds? Probably not, for this administration it doesn't seem able to put campaign mud behind it. Of course, running a campaign is the only thing Obama and his cronies are doing very, very well. Leading a nation and dealing with religious fanatics who are trying to destroy Western civilization? Not so much. No failure solution - May 12, 2010 By Rich The Whomble is a run for winter wear and tear in hell today, because I find myself in full agreement with the Chicago Tribune. A May 6 editorial in Trib chided House lawmakers for not enacting bills that would allow parents to get their children out of some of the worst schools in the state and to school their choice. In Mike Madigan's typical tactics, the vote was not recorded, but the enterprising colleagues at Capitol Fax took a picture of the plaque before it could officially disappear. Among your representatives at the Examinerland, only Tim Schmitz (R-St. Charles) voted in favour of the measure. Democrats Fred Crespo and Paul Froelich, along with Republican Randy Ramey all voted against and everyone should remember those votes. There are several reasons, none of them good, to vote against voucher programs. One of them, as Democratic Representative Kevin Joyce noted with surprising sincerity, is that it is a union issue. By this, Joyce obviously means that this is a matter of the teachers' union. If parents can take their children out of failed schools, teachers in those schools will have to find other jobs. Of course, we can't have that. Protecting teachers' jobs in schools that do not work is much more important than protecting the jobs of teachers who actually teach, or schools that offer a quality of freedom of choice that Democrats preferred school choice. As is the case with any problem, is more money. Just a few bucks and everything will be both funky and dory. But you know what? It's not worth it because I don't want to see more of the three decades of experience pouring more and more money into public education in this state, and our children are falling further and further behind. Yes, public schools need to withdraw from work, and that hurt, but we still spend far more - in terms of real dollars - per student than thirty years ago on public education, and much more per student than infinitely more successful private educational institutions. Isn't it about the time we gave ourselves a chance? Isn't it time to give your kids a chance? While protecting union jobs logic, as it is, explains the votes of the forty-four Democrats who voted ba, I is, explains the votes of the forty-four Democrats who voted ba. I'm surprised why otherwise reliably conservative lawmakers like Ramey and twenty-one other Republicans will vote against vouchers. There is an argument that vouchers are an additional expense, you basically fund public and private education systems for a while - but it's not really an expense, it's an investment. Yes, failing public schools stumble for some time on the taxpayer's dime, but after a while they will be forced to either: a) clean up their activities, or b) close the store. Either way, taxpayers and most importantly children win in the long run. If GOP lawmakers voted against this investment because of the cost, they are terribly shortsighted. If courting a teacher's union vote, they should turn in their party credentials. Don't assume that the twenty-two Democrats who voted for vouchers are actually in favor of vouchers either. In general, they represent safe districts that are, have been and will probably always be controlled by Democrats. They don't go anywhere, so it doesn't matter if they upset the unions or not. The cynicism that permeates Springfield is astonishing. One wonders what lawmakers can look like in the mirror each morning, much less face their constituents. That is why we have a tsunami at our disposal in November and everyone knows that. It would be wrong to see Republican gains in Illinois this election cycle as a mere rejection of Democrats. That's not all. Voters are fed up with politics as usual here and it's pretty clear that they haven't been managed properly since Jim Edgar left office. If the GOP in Illinois has a chance to govern in November, it's better to pay attention to this message or soon find themselves out looking in - again. Bills Are Coming Due - May 5, 2010 By Rich Shed Last year, the Civic Federation, a nonpartisan organization that watches government spending, supported the idea of raising state taxes to close Illinois has a huge budget gap. In fact, the gap is not good enough The gap describes the difference between revenue and spending more accurately. But I wander. In any case, arguing a tax hike last year, the Civic Federation withdrew from this position this year for one very good and very simple reason: they do not trust the Democrat-controlled General Assembly to regain control of spending. The more you feed the beast, which is big government, the more hungry the beast gets more tax dollars. Kudos to the Civic Federation for pointing that out. The organization came to this conclusion in its report by analyzing Governor Pat Quinn's proposed 2011 budget. The first three paragraphs of the summary are worth repeating: The Civic Federation opposes \$52 billion governor Pat Quinn's \$52 billion FY2011 recommended operating budget for the state of Illinois because it is unsustainable and doing too little to resolve the state's fiscal crisis. The governor's recommended budget borrows billions to pay for the operation, while still ignoring the massive backlog of unpaid bills, which will worsen the state's financial situation. Although the Civic Federation is encouraged that Governor Quinn has signed significant pension reform legislation and recommends some spending cuts, we cannot support his FY2011 State of Illinois operating budget because it will not effectively stabilize the state's finances or significantly reduce the state's \$12.9 billion deficit going into FY2011. The governor's budget recommendation for fiscal year 2011 would create a deficit of \$10.6 billion, with an operating deficit of \$4.7 billion and a carry-over deficit of \$5.9 billion compared to the previous year. The recommended budget proposes borrowing \$4.7 billion to close the operating deficit. Even after borrowing to repay the operating deficit, the state will end fiscal year 2011 with the same deficit of \$5.9 billion. And that's next. Quinn and the Dems try to use hand-aid when a major operation is called in. You can't help but wonder if Mike Madigan and his allies on Capitol Hill are secretly hoping Bill Brady will defeat Quinn in November. That would have the effect of dumping this ugly mess on the Republican governor's lap with an unspoken directive: you can find out. Whatever the next governor does, the solution will certainly be deeply unpopular. We have already seen state employees respond to the suggestion of budget cuts and it will only get worse if the governor proposes the deep, significant cuts needed to restore common sense. The alternative - tax increases - will make state workers and those who depend on entitlement programs really happy, but really annoy the rest of us who work for a living. It's a damned, if not kind of decision, so why not let the other guy deal with it? This is not that Mike Madigan and his Chicago buddies have to worry about their jobs or whatever. In a way, you already feel the effects of tax increases, or you probably will soon be. The State has already reduced the share of income tax, which he reimburses to municipalities, and Quinn wants to reduce it even further. Under the governor's proposal, the amount of state income tax
returned to municipalities would fall by nearly a third, from ten percent of what residents pay to the state, to seven percent. Municipalities are struggling in this economy just like everyone, and basically these small government units are already operating as lean as they can. When the state reduces the amount of money - its money - that goes back to communities, cities across the state will have little choice but to raise taxes or cut services that are actually necessary, like police, fire and water. In most cases, I would be inclined to bet the municipalities will look at Hobson's choice and - albeit reluctantly - conclude that it is better to ask residents for more money than it is to imperil those local government functions that they need. It's a pity Illinois is in the situation it's in, but it's not like we couldn't see this coming. If a humble sqaed like yours really could see this coming eight years ago, our representatives in Springfield should have damned you surely knew. But when it comes to those senators and representatives from D behind their names, it's clear that either: a) they didn't know, or b) they didn't care. In the first case, it is best to say that you've been negligent, if not downright stupid. In the latter case, they failed to represent the people to choose themselves. Either way, it's pretty clear that they shouldn't be entrusted to the future of Illinois residents and, come November, here's hoping people take action and throw bombs out. Hate Speech Just Ain't What It Used To Be - April 28, 2010 By Rich Whooping. Sometimes These Anti-Government Protesters Go Too Far. Take, for example, this quote that was uttered in front of a crazy crowd that roared their approval: They can run, but they can't hide. We will be there this afternoon and we will find you. And if you try to leave the city without doing your job, we will chase you. And when you get home, we will be there. Surprisingly, isn't that quote so you didn't get much play in the mainstream media? It's just the kind of inflammatory rhetoric that they're constantly accusing right to spout and the kind of sound bites that desperately scour tea-party rallies in search of, almost entirely in vain. So why not this piece of anger summoned by CNN, MSNBC and the like? Perhaps it has something to do with who said it: Henry Bayer, director of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) trade union. Bayer and thousands of AFSCME members gathered in Springfield last week to encourage lawmakers to - can you guess? - raise taxes. Remember, I have no real problem with what Bayer said. Rather, I have a problem with the double standard that the media employs when it comes to rhetoric in this way. Sarah Palin tells conservatives that it's time to reload and paranoid the left, with the full cooperation of her colleagues at MSM, decides that the former Governor of Alaska was issuing a call to arms when it should be obvious to anyone with an IQ above fifty that Palin was talking about political battles, not those involving firearms. Bayer promised lawmakers that we would prosecute you and find you, which - if literally - sounds damn ominous. Imagine if someone on the right applied the same words to Nancy Pelosi or President Obama. The left would be hysterical, confident that the violence was almost. Certainly, Illinois lawmakers don't have to worry about their safety after Bayer's angry words. First, Bayer and his supporters are Democrats and therefore are afraid of guns, and also unlikely to spend the energy necessary to chase someone, especially if it can cause them a miss an episode of Two and a Half Men. Still, the blatant hypocrisy of the mainstream media is the sight here, isn't it? Their rally itself was unusual in itself. One can only assume that at some and bayer members have been living in the cave for the last year. Illinois is bleeding work and red ink and their self-service solution is a tax hike? What planet do these people come from? Not only do state legislators know they'll get their butts out of office so quickly that their shoes won't catch up for two weeks if they approve of the tax hike, the mood of the people - who have been taxed dry - is obvious to see. Illinois doesn't need more cash, it needs to manage the cash it has as responsible adults. Don't take my word for it. Instead, consider the words of a Democrat: State Senator Jack Franks, who said this in a letter published in the Chicago Tribune: Illinois has no revenue problem. He has a problem with spending. State revenue this year is at the third highest level in Illinois history. We have more money than we had in 2007... Those who see an income tax increase as the only solution do not understand the problem... We need to reduce the size of the government through better accounting and limited spending. Let's be clear, because experience has shown that some of the more liberal readers of Cheap Seats may be a bit slow in absorption. Illinois has no revenue problem. If you compare state income in 2010 to income in 2000, you will find that the state has fifty percent more bucks to its coffers today than it did a decade ago. The reason - the only reason - that this state is massively indebted, can't pay bills and borrows like crazy to make up for growing shorts is out of control of spending, which is entirely the responsibility of Democrats who have been under the sole control of the state government for most of the decade. Kudos to Franks, who what needs to be said. On something except among the Dems - a guy who doesn't mindlessly toe party lines, a Senator Mike Noland. Franks called out Blago for questionable practices of buying the state long before it was fashionable to do so and spoke to the truth when it comes to spending. In some circles, Franks has a reputation for something gaffly. I don't know this man, so I'm not entitled to comment, but it doesn't matter. If more Illinois Dems were willing to induce obvious deficiencies in their leadership, instead of mindlessly following the orders of Chicago First politicians like Mike Madigan, Prairie State conservatives like me would have much less to complain about. Grab Bag - April 21, 2010 Rich Douche - Not sure what's more unusual: the flurry of radical suggestions that USEPA Administrator Lisa Jackson is churning out on a nearly nightly basis, or the way the mainstream media is completely ignoring what she's been up to. In just over a year, Jackson has developed new air quality standards that make it almost impossible to build a new fossil fuel-fired power plant in this country, setting up an Ocean Policy Taskforce that will prove more effective than anything in stopping off-shore drilling and constantly working on storm water regulations that will affect the costs and availability of a brand new range of consumer products previously untouched by the EPA by grabbing their hands. If they are spotted, all these initiatives will be costly for consumers and drive even more jobs abroad to countries that do not have a similarly dazzling array of good intentions, but ultimately pointless, rules. Veteran Cheap Seats readers know that a humble correspondent doesn't fight the EPA on a daily basis, so I have some well-deserved bias against this particular agency. But, Jackson's EPA is bureaucracy on steroids. Privately - very privately - many EPA employees have been shaking their heads in disbelief as well because they understand that if Jackson has his way, there will be very little industry left for them to regulate. - Last week Trey Parker and Matt Stone, aka: the last two guys in Hollywood with any guts, took a shot at radical Islam. No, that's not right. In the April 18 episode in South Park, Parker and Stone were merciless in baring the cowardly hypocrisy of those who allow jihadist intolerance for fear of violent retaliation. The reaction of the jihadists was predictable. How dare Parker and Stone attack Islamic intolerance and violence. They must be killed! The situation could be described ironically if it were not so pathetic. And how did Hollywood react? You know a Hollywood wedge full of brave celebrities who are always willing to defend freedom of speech, diversity and creativity? Nary word. Oh sure, George Clooney can make a movie that goes after Joe McCarthy and it's gutsy because Tailgunner Joe has such a legion fifty-three years after his death. But a few of your own go after a brutal, hateful ideology and silence is deafening. - The images of Streamwood police officer James Mandarino beating the driver were truly horrific and it is hard to imagine any circumstances that would justify Mandarino's actions. I never met him when I covered Streamwood, but by all accounts, Mandarino was an exemplary, well-liked cop, which makes this incident all the more puzzling. There is a lot of legitimate outrage you could have had, but, unfortunately, cop-haters will also use this incident to paint with a very wide brush. Among those who should not be tarred nor feathered is Al Popp, Streamwood's Police Chief. I was honored to meet Al for many years and watched both him and his department work more than - I'm sure - anyone who is not employed by the village. Popp is a public official in every sense of the word, as honorable as anyone I know and get up a guy to boot. Knowing the kind of department that Popp works for, I'm sure he was so shocked to see that the film like everyone else and, on his merits, didn't hesitate to do the right thing. Al survives this storm and doesn't need me - or anyone - to defend him or his department. But for many years he had the backs of streamwood residents, in countless ways that most people don't even realize, so it's only right for someone to have their back now. - Former President Bill Clinton trotted out the ghost of Timothy McVeigh to warn everyone about the dangers of what is called right-wing extremism, which includes soccer moms going out to tea-party rallies to
protest big government, apparently. This is, of course, another way of telling the Conservatives to close the hell out. It may be useful to look back on how the Clinton administration privately responded to the Oklahoma City bombing. In his 1999 memoir, Behind the Oval Office, Clinton adviser Dick Morris reprinted the agenda of the White House meeting, which took place four days after the tragedy. Here are the three most important points of this program: A. Temporary gain: ratings growth - here today, departed tomorrow B. More lasting gain: improvements in character / personality traits - remedies weakness, incompetence, inefficiency found in a recent C. Steady possible gain poll: sets extremist Problem vs. Republicans Last is the most significant, in the context of Clinton's comments. Liberals love the idea of right-wing violence because it naturally distances people from conservatives. Tea-parties were peaceful protests against a swollen government, unmarked by violence. So, in the absence of real violence fueling fear and outrage, Clinton is more than happy to get some. Beautiful. Socialism? You Bet - April 24, 2010 Rich Whoduch I love letters to the editor. This week we have a great one in which the author quite frankly, if doubtfully, decres the fact that so many Republicans and conservatives want to hang hand on tag Barack Obama, his administration and his allies in a Congress controlled by fellow Democrats. This allegation, as our correspondent says, is completely unfounded, deterrent and incentive. The president is simply investing in America. This is, of course, the kind of argument that many of the president's supporters are doing all the time. Obama has spent money and increased national debt to a degree that he does not know in parallel in American history beyond the monumental effort that was World War II. This is deeply worrying, especially when we consider what this means for the future of our children, but government spending does not in itself create socialism. Socialism is a matter of institutions; who controls those aspects of society that enable it to function: individuals and businesses or government? If the answer is mostly the first, then you have a nation based on individual freedom and capitalism. If the answer is mostly the latter, you are part of the socialist system, whether you are willing to admit it or not. After America and the Allies won World War II, the country remained in huge debt, but it was a burden of debt that the Americans were happy to bear because the investment was earmarked for a specific, one-time goal and because it did not create any permanent institutions that would hinder or control free enterprise in the long run. In 1941, there is no way that americans would invest in war, or would approve taking on a huge debt to fight war if they believed it would result in greater dependence on the government. An independent, border-bound spirit still ran hard through the veins of the average American back then. The debt commitments that the Obama administration is happily creating are secondary, though troubling, issues. The bigger problem is that Obama is forcing the government to become dependent on the population on an unprecedented scale. The health care bill is the most disturbing, but almost the only example of the neo-socialist party on which Democrats form. One-sixth of the United States economy is currently under the control of the federal government. It's stunning. This is unprecedented. Faceless, soulless bureaucrats from the IRS who administer the tax code are both afraid and despised. But the IRS bureaucracy is nothing compared to the kind of bureaucracy that the health care bill creates. And when bureaucracy is entrenched, it is almost impossible to dislodge. Republicans may be making noise about repealing the health care bill - and no one would be happier to see that happen than I do - but it's hard to see that one can happen at any time, let alone with Obama as president. The GOP may win a majority in one of the chambers of Congress in November, but it won't be a veto-resistant majority. This means that health care is expected to remain at least until 2012. That's enough time to determine the type of world we will make it to get rid of as happened with Social Security, Medicare and many other government programs that provide government gadgets. They become indispensable in the public eye and therefore politically untouchable, and thus our ability to make choices for ourselves are slowly eroding in favour of many state socialism. Am I pessimistic? You place the bets. We recently found that half of the population of the United States not only doesn't pay net taxes, but actually gets more money from the government than they put in. We're not talking about returns in terms of programs, aid and all the rest, we're talking about social people. What do you dislike? Effectively, you don't pay taxes, you get nice subsidies courtesy of the rest of us nerds. If the government can do it for you, why don't you want more government? General Motors and Chrysler, on the open market, would declare bankruptcy, restructure their crippling debt obligations (mainly due to unsustainable pension schemes) and move on. Instead, the U.S. government takes them over and taxpayers became responsible for their past and future red ink. Yes, this kind of sounds like socialism to me. There are nations that prefer socialism, such as Sweden. Perhaps it's America's destiny now and, if it includes the equivalent of the Swedish Bikini Team, it can't be a plus. But don't be fooled by what's going on. When it comes like a duck, quasi-like duck, etc. Obama and Democrats can protest anything they want about the way that their actions are portrayed by crabs by conservatives like me, but the evidence is obvious to see. The government is leading its life more than ever, and we're not even in the middle of the Obama era. Amnesty - Game Changer - April 7, 2010 Rich The President Obama did what many thought was impossible: he rammed a health care bill down the throat of the American people despite their opposition, in a seemingly complete disregard for the consequences that seem to include huge Republican gains in the House and Senate come November. Obama is a political animal, prepared for office including the most partisan political zoos, the state of Illinois. How can this move make any sense to the president or his party? Maybe, but only in one situation: if Democrats gain access to a hitherto unknown and unnumbered electoral bloc that can tip the balance of the electorate in their favor, regardless of conventional wisdom around 2010. According to the best estimates, about eleven million illegal aliens are currently in the United States. In general, these illegal aliens are poor and relatively uneducated. They desperately want to be citizens of the United States to reap the undeniable benefits of citizenship in this great nation. As citizens, they would be protected by a government that, we all know - it won't do a single thing that let one citizen fall through the safety net that we are obliged to provide. Democrats understand that. Eleven million new voters dependent on the government's mile-long grace are Democratic voters by definition. The Dems will use allegations of racism and justice claims to push their immigration agenda forward, but the stakes here should be clear. If Democrats get these voters, they will establish a dominant presence that will take decades, if at all, to undo it. Barack Obama has openly declared his position on the issue. As part of his immigration plan, the president said he would support ... a system that allows undocumented immigrants who are in good shape to pay a fine, learn English and go to the back of the line to get the opportunity to become citizens. As of today, the president has put immigration on the back burner, but how long is it likely to stay there? All that stands in the way of an amnesty for eleven million illegal aliens residing in the United States is one Republican vote in the Senate. It's unlikely that one of the forty senators from the GOP will be suicidal enough to cave in on the issue, but he assumes there will still be forty-one Republican senators in Washington until November. If the Dems are going to get this game changer, someone has to go. Obama and Axelrod are Chicago politicians and they know that when someone gets in your way, the best way to get what you want is to get rid of them. Just look at the current makeup of the Chicago City Council. Almost forty per cent of councilors on the council today were appointed by Richie Daley. All it will take is one trumped up scandal to get the right Republican Senator to resign and Obama is back to filibuster the Senate lead. But it must be a Republican right: one that represents a state where a Democratic governor or state legislator controlled by Democrats can name his successor. You don't believe for a moment that David Axelrod and his minions don't look very, very careful in the lives of a few potentially vulnerable senators. The reward at the end of this particular rainbow is too tempting for those bandits in the White House to leave the stone inverted. Fox News expert Ralph Peters called immigration policy the most important issue we face today. He's absolutely right. As bad as health care reform, an amnesty for the eleven million people who broke the law in entering the United States and who continue to break it by living here would be infinitely worse. Introducing that to many government-dependent, certainly democratic voters to the electorate will change the two-party system and the nature of our Republic forever. It's not about race, skin color or perceived prejudice. It is about the rule of law and a healthy balance of power. Regardless of affiliation you have to realize that this is just wrong. And you can only hope that our representatives in Washington, D.C. this too. Email:
rich@examinerpublications.com www.trzupke.wordpress.com www.threedonia.com -Top- Redistribution of Wealth - March 31, 2010 By Rich Pans It's Nice to hear a Democratic congressman speak to the truth, even unwittingly. Speaking about the health care bill last week, Montana Sen. Max Baucus got straight to the point: Too often, much of the delayed, over the past three years of mal-distribution of income in America has gone up too much, the rich are getting way, too rich, and the middle income class is lagging behind. Wages are not keeping up with the increased incomes with the highest incomes in America. These laws will have an impact on solving this mis-distribution of income in America. It's time to redistribute wealth, in other words. Mal-distribution, if it is a word, is an interesting choice of words. Mal has Latin roots. This means evil. Assuming Baucus actually understood what he was saying - and that's a stretch when it comes to Democrats - Baucus believes that raising money and other assets, the capitalist system in other words, is inherently bad and needs to be reformed. Wouldn't it be nice if Baucus made this position clear before he voted in favor of Obmacare? When conservatives described the Health Care Act in terms identical to those used by Baucus, they were vilified in the mainstream media. How dare anyone accuse the president and his party of socialism! The bill would make the health care system a better, rather than a redistributive, wealth through a government fiat. The truth, which should be blindingly obvious to everyone on this side of Nancy Pelosi, was that conservatives were in place. The American people knew about it and, it seems, so did an empty Democratic suit like Max Baucus. It's worth noting that Baucus doesn't have much to worry about personally when it comes to this whole thing of redistributing wealth. He was born in money, and thanks to his position as a member of Congress, he is protected from the worst effects of the expensive health care tsunami that will come. When you plot to rob the rich and give to the poor, it's much more convenient when other nations' money is involved. Of course, there is still a lot to be won. It always is. Value added tax (VAT) is likely in our future because it is clear to everyone that the country cannot continue to run up debt at this rate without causing a complete economic meltdown. Spending cuts would be nice, but that won't happen under this administration. Corporate tax hike perhaps? Already done. (It was one of the hidden gems in the Health Care Act.) VAT sounds reasonable because it is distributed on, well, everything. VAT is a kind of national sales tax, but it's really much more. The government will be charged VAT on each transaction, not only - as is the case with sales tax - on the finished product. Government there with a hand at every step in the production, production, every good, every service - to darn close to everything. The net effect is to make the goods that Americans buy and the services Americans enjoy that much more expensive, but since these costs are loaded behind curtains, politicians figure that few will notice for a very long time. In the fight for VAT, Democrats undoubtedly argue that some conservatives have supported this tax measure in the past. That's true when it comes to this statement goes. The rest of the story is this: The Conservatives have defended VAT as an alternative to income tax, but as another tax stacked on top of income tax. When will this happen? After the Elections in November, of course. Democrats are now politically damaging and not suicidal enough to pass a tax hike before the election. Expect the White House's National Committee on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to issue this recommendation, thus giving the Obama administration coverage. If there's one thing this president is very good at, he's hiding behind committees that always seem to recommend exactly what he wanted to do anyway. And when will the National Committee on Budgetary Responsibility and Reform issue its report? In December, stupid. It's a month after the election and, unfortunately, it's also business as usual in our nation's capital. Greek Fire - 03.24.10 Rich Shed Chaos in the country of Greece, currently 100% dependent on the European Union, should give thoughtful Americans pause. The economic mess that Greeks have gotten themselves into, which is almost as bad as the economic mess that the General Assembly and Democratic governors have gotten Illinois in, serves as a lesson in what happens when legislators create government mandates and powers that are simply unsustainable. In Greece, the government can no longer ignore all these due notices, as it will happen in the United States down the road, and the citizens of this ancient nation can't stand it with a view to losing all the government-provided gadgets they have become accustomed to. Part of the problem Greeks have is an aging population. There are less productive young people who pay for government programs that support the growing number of pensioners. In Greece, not only do you get retired in your fifties, you are guaranteed a comfortable retirement for the rest of your life when you do so. This model is no different from what's happening in Illinois by a consistent, short-sighted series of General Assemblies gleefully created generous pension schemes for some public employees and forced city government entities to fund the same kind of programs for others. Those of us in the private sector who are responsible for our own pension plans are therefore forced to set off money for our own golden years and for an increasing number of public sector workers. Pension woes are, of course, not all that Greece will abandon. Greeks dependent on government for decades and, as inevitably happens, the government has grown in size, power and, above all, spending. Of course, you can make productive people pay more taxes to pay for all the great things that big government does, but in the end it becomes harmful. At some point, people are tired of working their asses off to pay for a growing class of freeloaders. Why bother? The well will dry up and the government waxes up one day to find that there is no money to pay for all the programs it has introduced. That is where Greece is today. The European Union has combined its resources to rescue the Greeks, but has sensibly asked for some economic reforms as a condition for the delivery of cash. Without such reforms, Greece would soon return to board the same sinking ship. The EU's conditions were not only unacceptable for the freeloader class in Greece, these conditions were positively offensive. How dare someone claim fiscal responsibility! Freeloaders went crazy, starting with the riots and generally made it clear that they were entitled to every last bit of largesse that they wanted. In a way, greece's response is rather similar to the way some students reacted when they learned that tuition was going up at state colleges in Illinois, less rioting of course. But the pious sense of indignation and moral justification were the same there. Not that it was surprising, given that the youthful set voted overwhelmingly to elect a president who spent his life sucking a public pacifier and whose wife was outraged at having to actually repay her student loans, despite the fact that she was earning \$300,000 a year in some made-up jobs at the time. Entitlement is w. Personal responsibility? This is so 1980. And so it is today, and the public debt will get out of hand. Since Reagan left office, each administration has increased spending on entitlements, with congressional approval. Clinton managed to do so while creating a surplus, but it was the result of a peace dividend that America realized as national defense was limited after the end of the Cold War. Clinton's entitlement spending record is no better than any of the others. Liberals and Democrats, along with the president himself, continue to blame our current state of affairs on George W. Bush and the Iraq War. The war in Iraq was expensive, but it's not a real problem. America can afford to go to war. The problem with George W. Bush, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and Barack Obama is that all of them, without exception, signed on to the proposal that the government can, and has a duty, solve every issue of every person in the United States. They signed bills that created huge commitments for future generations, and did little to fix programs like Social Security (though, to his credit, George W. Bush did the effort) that are doomed to failure. What does it have Obama Obama and what it promises to do will hurt this nation further down the road towards Greece, faster than any other administration in history. Aging baby boomers like me may not live to see the Greek-style crisis in America, but I will guarantee that - unless things change dramatically and soon - our children will definitely be. Email: rich@examinerpublications.com www.trzupke.wordpress.com www.threedonia.com -Top-Corruption squared - 03.17.10 By Rich Whoep It's hard to believe that anyone can pick worse candidates than the party that gave Illinois governors candidates like former governor/current convict George Ryan and the unbearably blind Judy Barr-Topinka, but Illinois Democrats are giving the GOP a run for their money this year. First they gave us disgraced former Lieutenant Governor candidate Scott Lee Cohen, and now comes disturbing revelations about their senatorial candidate, State Treasurer Alexi Giannoulias. One has to wonder: does anyone check the candidate's background these days? Giannoulias is a protégé of the current president who should have set an alarm bell or two. When you're tied to the Obama/Axelrod crowd, the chances of a few skeletons hanging in your closet grow exponentially. In 2006, Obama had a say on Giannoulias: He's one of the most outstanding young men I've ever hoped to meet. He's someone who
cares deeply about people. When someone says that the Illinois Democrat cares deeply about people, you're well advised to see if you still have your wallet. Giannoulias is no exception. According to Crain's Chicago Business, Giannoulias stands to make \$10 million from his role as the owner of Broadway Bank, even though the bank is almost certainly about to go under. The president throws hissy fits every time a Wall Street banker receives a bonus that the White House finds inconspicuously, even when the bank in question has already been referred to as taxpayer repayments and is actually turning a profit. So we hear a similar howl of indignation when Giannoulias is ready to pocket \$10 million, even as his bank slides down dump trucks? The only sound that can be heard from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW is that crickets tweet. Giannoulias was a senior lender at Broadway Bank from 2002 to 2006. Among those who approved for the loans was one Michael Jaws of Giorango, a colleague giannoulias describe as a colorful character. Giorango is indeed colorful, with a long police blotter that includes multiple convictions for bookmakers running a prostitution ring. Perhaps we can give Alexi the benefit of the doubt. You can't expect to check the criminal record of all that money loans - about \$11.8 million in the case of Jaws and his associates - right? Giannoulias said as much to the Chicago Tribune editorial board recently. However, if he realized that Trib's progressive sympathies would lead to journalistic meanness, was to be very disappointed. Tribune columnist John Crain raises the story: From the Tribune editorial board, Giannoulias was asked how his relationship with Giorango developed, and at which point he learned that Giorango, whom he described as a colorful character, had a criminal past. I learned this first of all when I was running for state treasurer (in 2006), Giannoulias said. I don't remember the exact date, whether during primary or general time. I think it was during the primary. He was quickly reminded that on April 27, 2006, while campaigning for treasurer, he told Tribune reporters that he had discussed Giorango's criminal past with him. The discussion took place while Giannoulias was working on millions of dollars worth of bank loans for Giorango. It took many years for Giannoulias to enter politics. Oopsie. As always, it's worth hiring a Bush test, given the way the mainstream media, or in this case mostly not, covered the story. On his face, the story of Alexi Giannoulias seems to have all the accomplishments of a spectacular, national scandal. Consider: A friend of the president? Check. A great businessman making huge personal gains while screwing up public opinion? Check. Questionable contacts with shady characters? Check. Lying to the audience? Check. If you mentioned about buddy George W. Bush, are there any doubts that the mainstream media will lathe in your mouth to take such a candidate down? The only thing that keeps Giannoulias' story from getting more and more press is the fact that he owes allegiance to a political party that the old media are convinced is saving the nation. Sure, they will happily look different. After all, Giannoulias is merely a greedy, incompetent liar who lent millions to criminals. It's not like he's a Republican for Christ. That would be more than MSM could afford. But, Illinois is Illinois, it probably doesn't matter. Giannoulias has the backing of a Chicago machine, so he probably would have a better choice than even a chance, even if MSM were this story every hour, for an hour. Security matters, not honesty or efficiency. That's the Chicago way. Email: rich@examinerpublications.com www.trzupke.wordpress.com www.threedonia.com -Top-Fixing Illinois - 03.10.10 By the Chicago Tribune The Obama administration presented some middle-of-the-road proposals to fix the state's economic ills. One of the worst state economies in the country, which, given the state of the national economy in 2010, says not only Illinois Republicans, in partnership with Illinois Policy Institute, announced a proposed program that is drawing in anything that can be fixed. Among the features of the plan are: a special line of state income tax that will be increased by more than 10 percent over the next decade (adjusted for inflation), a new seven percent state income tax, tax days of great importance in drawing in anything that can be fixed. Reform of the regulatory structure of the state. Illinois has become one of the toughest places to start a business and maintain a business due to all the regulatory hurdles introduced during the Blagojevich years. The requirement of a super majority before a possible increase in taxes and fees may be adopted in the General Meeting. History so far has shown that the people of Illinois cannot trust either party if the party has been in power for too long. This measure would give the loyal opposition the opportunity to seize power in an established power structure. Limitation of the powers of the Rules of Procedure Committee. Speaker Mike Madigan, for a very long time, used committee rules to bury any bill he dislikes or that he believes is contrary to his party's best interests. Under the GOP proposal, any bill that has at least a third of the House as co-sponsors would have to come to the vote, no matter how much someone like Madigan might want to kill him. State Senator Chris Luzon went even further, taking on some of the most disturbing issues of the state's head, political correctness to be condemned: - Luzon rightly noted that ... one in two children born in Illinois is currently paid for by taxpayers, and we still don't have a citizenship requirement for routine health care for undocumented immigrants, often provided in the most expensive emergency room. This ridiculous, untenable state of affairs was created by Blago's pie-in-the-sky dreams and fully supported by his Democratic allies in the General Assembly. The result was a Medicaid program that runs further and further behind in paying bills, making health care even worse for everyone. It's time for Illinois to control our health care spending. - Instead of using federal stimulus money for shovel-ready work projects, Luzen suggests that Illinois be allowed to use some or all of these funds to address the state's crippling budget. At first glance, the proposal makes sense. Unless someone can prove that investing federal money elsewhere can generate more jobs and income for Illinois, using stimulus dollars to get our economy in order seems like a good idea. - It is time to reform the state pension scheme. There is no way to green the land of God that the state of Illinois can continue to promise and pay extremely expensive pensions to all who work for the state, and - hoping to return to the blessed common sense of the Edgar years - no one should be allowed to rob pension funds to pay for other programs. The state pension structure, along with Medicaid, represents two huge albatrosses hanging around the neck of Illinois taxpayers, that to the next side step that Senator Mike Noland made last week. When asked about budget crises that even he could no longer ignore, Noland quickly and predictably tried to push the blame to the knees of a party that had no power in Springfield for the past eight years, arguing that it was the GOP that created the problem. So these roosters have been coming home to perch for a long time, Noland said. This is not something that has happened in the last seven or eight years, as [Republicans] would like you to believe. Nice of you finally notice mike budget crisis. But, how do you reconcile that amazing statement with Mike Noland from 2006? At the time, Noland was involved in a campaign with Streamwood Village President Billie Roth. Roth, who has earned a reputation as a fiscal guru, has made the state budget her biggest campaign problem, warning time and time again that Illinois' economy is heading for disaster. Mike Noland's 2006 version dismissed Roth's warnings as pish-posh, declaring that Illinois' budget was balanced. Noland's opponent in the 2010 Senate race, Steve Rauschenberger, was an even more vocal critic of what happened in Springfield. When Blago, with the full idea of a compatible Democratic General Assembly, began raising state pension funds in 2002, Rauschenberger made the rounds, clearly explaining how Democrats' plans were unsupported and how they would inevitably lead to the kind of crisis we are currently in. In 2006, as in 2010, it's pretty clear that Noland's only parrot says the points that his handling of Democrats feed him, hoping that no one will notice absurd inconsistencies in his rapidly changing position. As many senators from both parties privately admit, Noland is one of the most embarrassing and roundly-disliked lawmakers in Springfield. It's time for a change in Springfield. Having been out of power for so long, Illinois Republicans want to get back into the game. After eight years of Democrat-inspired stupidity and irresponsibility, it's time that they were given another chance. The Ryan years are long gone, and the most bitter taste in the mouths of Illinois voters can be traced back to Governor Big Hair. Here's hoping that the Illinois GOP will continue to develop solutions that actually make sense for Illinois. E-mail: rich@examinerpublications.com www.trzupke.wordpress.com www.threedonia.com -Top- O My - 03.03.10 By Rich Trzupke You know what you don't see anymore? Seal of the President of the United States. Oh, we're not ready to put the Great Seal on the endangered species list or whatever, at least not yet, but its use has been somewhat reduced in the last thirteen months. The use of Seal dates back to the 1850s and the Administration of Millard Fillmore, with the current project (no further changes) were adopted during the presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes in the 1

most empathetic president in Republican history. It was supposed to change not only the United States of America, but also the world. How? No one has spent much time sweating the details. The details didn't matter. Obama assured his supporters that this would be the case and they had no doubt. Barack Obama would be a president who transcended pland politics, greedy capitalism and American self-interest. They knew it was going to happen because he said it would. More than a year later, the best thing you can say is that nothing has changed. On the other hand, the worst part is that the situation has deteriorated. The latter assessment shows, for various reasons, both on the right and on the left. Conservatives and many in the midst lambast Obama for out-of-control spending, trying to appease rogue states like Iran and increase the power and reach of big government. Many liberals are fed up with the president because of all the unfulfilled promises he has made. U.S. troops are still in Iraq and Afghanistan, cap and trade languishes in the Senate and government health care (so-called public option) is dead. All that remains for us is O, which looks increasingly hollow every day. In the absence of achievement, would-be leaders turn to entitlements and that, I will return, is why the OP is still around. This is a common tactic used by dictators. And no, I'm suggesting that Barack Obama has the aspirations of a dictatorship, but rather observing that when you try to lead solely through a cult of personality, rather than symbols of that cult become disproportionately important to a particular leader, whether that leader is elected to office or takes power. When you can't point to a significant achievement, it's a natural reserve to resurrect those feelings to trust – and dare you say: hope – that puts you in power to begin with. It is also a dangerous tactic for Barack Obama and his party. The OP continues to evoke positive feelings among its supporters, but support is fading. There has been a dramatic change in the way key groups perceive this president, particularly among young people who are increasingly rrvazing the Dems. In a year, perhaps less, the famous O can go from being a symbol of hope and change to being a target of contempt and ridicule. If that's how it goes, perhaps. Presidential Seal may not seem so bad after all. E-mail: rich@examinerpublications.com www.trzuepk.wordpress.com www.threedonia.com -Top- Irony: R.I.P. - 02.24.10 Rich Seupek Irony is dead. The word no longer has any meaning. Irony is defined as the use of words to convey meaning, which is the opposite of its literal meaning, in a funny context. In 2010, reality pierces the irony. Exhibit A: Illinois Governor Pat Quinn. On Sunday, Quinn was quoted as saying, Most people, when they hear someone say something that's from the governor of Illinois, they believe them. Unless a reporter accidentally omits the word not in between and believe at the end of this quote, we are forced to conclude that irony has gone through this veil of tears in the great beyond, where irony will happily buzz through the Champs-Elysees along with other dearly departed terms such as enlightened liberal and good government. The irony of R.I.P. You will miss. Pat, we - Illinois voters - just have to wonder: where have you been for the last ten years? Do you think most people believe the governor of Illinois? Kidding? Are you on medication? Are you being treated for glaucoma? Co? Ever since Jim Edgar suspended him, the reaction of the average Illinois resident when our governor says something is: A) see if we still have our wallets, and B) try to figure out what the governor is trying to pull out this time. Believe the governor of Illinois? It would be more reasonable to believe that Sammy Sosa never, ever used steroids, cross his heart and hope to die. Guv issued his remarkable quote as part of a Herald story that put the lie of Quinn's famous habit of flashing his Super 8 VIP discount card as proof of his fiscal responsibility. It turns out that the charter wasn't valid for six years, less than half as long as the last time Illinois had a governor that citizens could actually trust. But this kind of pious, empty declaration is Quinn, of course. Quinn burst onto the political scene in the 1970s as an aid to Gov. Dan Walker, a guy who walked through Illinois to get himself elected and then entered prison on federal rap in the great tradition of Illinois governors. Quinn tried to cultivate his image as a reformer when he served under walker. In those days, all it meant was painting in shades slightly less sharp than the dominant force in Illinois: the Chicago machine, led by Richard J. Daley. Quinn tweaked Daley's tiger tail, but did that make him a reformer? Consider the words of a contemporary and fellow Democrat, from nearly forty years ago, Rep. Michael McClain (D., Quincy). Pat Quinn was one of the most handsome, distinctly gregarious people in the Walker administration, McClain said. His only problem was that he loved power and was cruel in doling out patronage and taking it away. He is not politically naïve. Things he says now don't jive with the stuff he said back then. He's the guy you'd like to have a beer with and for his own patronage, but he wouldn't get the most Christian guy of the year award in any way. Today, some argue that Quinn was a bagman walker, handling payouts in exchange for political favors. True or not, it's clear that the governor has done little - if any - to support Illinois policy reform efforts. As always, Pat Quinn is more than willing to talk until the cows come home, but when it comes to actual walking action: not so much. As long as Illinois has a governor who is a Democrat and as long as the Illinois General Assembly is dominated by this party, significant reforms will never, ever happen. It's not the same as saying that reform will definitely happen under republican administration in this corrupt state, but at least there's a chance. The newspaper that used to be the Chicago Tribune - finally! – I noticed that under House Speaker Mike Madigan, the House Rules Committee could effectively kill any piece of legislation that gave the Speaker and his cronies heartburn. Last week Trib, in a fuming editorial, condemned this practice because it got through reform - a célèbre cause among this elite publication - not because it is a completely undemocratic way of running a state government at all. If Trib's editors were to point out the better part of the last decade, they might realize that killing regulations by manipulating the system long ago became the norm in Springfield. We humbly paid attention to this once – twice – maybe a dozen times – here in cheap places. But then, if you criticize the government when taking cheap seats, are you more than likely a right-wing nut job, and what do they know? Pat Quinn wants Illinois residents to trust their governor. Mike Madigan would like you to believe in our legislation. They have all shown that none of them even for a little bit Trust. They don't seem to have any idea why this should be the case, and they are obviously more than willing to manipulate their records if only to provide one more voice. It's time to get rid of them all. Email: rich@examinerpublications.com www.trzuepk.wordpress.com www.threedonia.com -Top- Credit Where Credit Is! Due - 02/17/10 Last week, Vice President Joe Biden (finally) acknowledged that men and women fighting in Iraq have been victorious in the war on terror. Hurray! However, Biden attributed their success to the most unbelievable source: the Obama administration. Last week, Hair-Plug In Waiting had the audacity to say this: I am very optimistic about Iraq. This could be one of the great achievements of this administration. Really Joe? How exactly does it work? How can an administration led by two guys who vehemently opposed the increased involvement of U.S. troops in Iraq - aka: a surge - boast a victory that these leaders have done everything they can to avoid? When the increase was first proposed, Senator Barack Obama vehemently opposed the move, saying the move had no chance of establishing stability in Iraq. In an interview conducted in 2007, Obama said, We can send 15,000 more troops, 20,000 more soldiers, 30,000 more soldiers - I don't know any expert in the region or a military officer that I spoke to privately that he thinks will make a significant difference in the situation on the ground. In fact, 30,000 more soldiers had a very significant difference in the situation on the ground. These additional troops allowed the United States military to create safe havens in Iraq, which in turn gave sheikhs controlling tribal regions confidence to oppose the taliban's reactionary elements that tried to destabilize the nation. In 2008, presidential candidate Barack Obama apparently forgot everything he said a year ago: I had no doubt, and I said at a time when I opposed the increase, given how wonderfully our troops are doing, that if we put 30,000 more troops there, we'll see an improvement in the security situation and we'll see a reduction in violence. If Obama's contradictory reactions were inadching given his history, then the way Biden claimed the victory was positively surreal. Biden not only vehemently opposed the increase, but also authored an alternative strategy that would have tore Iraq into three parts, an idiotic proposal that put our troops on the ground in greater danger. When Biden called for division, in 2006, the biggest problem was the Sunni fighters who are most prevalent in central Iraq. The north is dominated by the Kurds, and the south by shiites. Large oil fields are located in the north and south. Thus, it is, Biden's proposal he made was to further inflame Sunni militants who saw it as a way to cut them off from oil revenues in Iraq. Biden later claimed that it was not his intention everything, but it really didn't matter what his intention was. What mattered was how the proposal would be perceived by the Sunnis and, in this context, played on their worst fears. The only thing that Obama and Biden did was spoil the military and policies that were put in place during the Bush administration. It's a measure of how a president can be grateful when he doesn't get screwed up. And, less forgetting, Obama did along the way on his plan to bring home a month brigade from Iraq. Nor will it fulfill its obligation to deport all Iraqi soldiers within sixteen months of taking office. Kudos to the president for not throwing out victory. This is sort of an achievement I think. What Obama has done and what he will hopefully continue to do is follow the plans that his predecessor and military leaders have put in place. This includes a troop lift that is set for August, which was part of an agreement Bush signed with the Iraqi government. Victory in Iraq is one of the great achievements of the administration. The problem is that Joe Biden doesn't seem to understand which one. Health Healthcare Reset – 02.10.10 By Rich Shed, the President seems to have surrendered on health care, finally recognizing what everyone has figured out: that Congress simply does not have the votes to pass a health care law in something like its current form. During his State of the Union address, Obama somewhat petulantly complained that he had not done a good enough job explaining the two thousand-plus pages of legislation as if it mattered. In addition to those who spend time on the far left, Americans instinctively distrust big government and the gigantic, inexplicable health care bill is about as frightening a prospect as you can imagine. Poll after poll showed that Americans don't want anything like what Democrats are proposing. Looking deep into their two-page textbook, liberals immediately blamed their failure to pass a health care bill on Republicans. They are a party not, they cried, a description that, although not entirely accurate, has some meaning. The GOP has never said no to health care reform, they just said no to what effectively would be government control of our health care system. In this case, the Republican Party undoubtedly reflects the will of the majority of the American people, who have been shouting louder and louder since the beginning of this debate. It is also disingenuous to blame the GOP for this defeat, as several experts on the left have been honest enough to admit. Until last month, Democrats enjoyed absolute control of the executive and legislative power of the government, including a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate. Republicans could scream no until they were sly, but until Scott Brown was sworn in as a junior senator from Massachusetts, there was nothing they could do to stop going damn something they want. So to those waving their hands over the collapse of Obama-care, or Pelosi's care, or Reid-care, don't blame us on the right. You had a year to fulfill your dreams of socialized medicine, and you couldn't do it. Where are we located here? There are problems with our health care system, but it is high time we acknowledged that we cannot have everything if we are going to fix what is wrong. The primary drawback in any program the Dems presented was that their plans purported to make health care both: a) more accessible, and b) more affordable. The fact is that you can't have both unless you define affordability as creating an even bigger pile of public debt that our children and grandchildren will expect to pay off. We often hear that there are 46 million uninsured Americans. This number, although accurate in a sense, does not mean much. Included in this 46 million are millions of illegal aliens, millions who are wealthy enough to give up insurance and millions of young people who can afford insurance but decide to spend money on fun things, hoping for youth resilience to make health care unnecessary. When you take away all these groups, you're left somewhere between 10 and 12 million citizens who want insurance but can't afford it. And let us not forget that these 10-12 million are not denied health care. They get it, but they are forced to go to the emergency room for treatment, where they can not be turned away. This is not the best or most cost-effective treatment for these 10 to 12 million uninsured, but that's something. The overall picture is therefore not as frightening as the political rhetoric that would lead to conviction. The biggest problem, for the vast majority of Americans, is cost reduction. If Congress is going to take another swipe at health care, they should focus solely on cutting costs. Universal coverage is a separate issue that can – and should – wait until the next day. There are things we can do to reduce healthcare costs: We can and should encourage more competition by allowing insurance companies to sell their products on state lines. We can and should reform Medicare, which effectively sets prices – often outrageously high – for treatment programs, medicines and many other aspects of our health care system. The president has expressed a willingness to sit down with Republicans and listen to conservative ideas on health care reform. Here's hoping he really listens and doesn't use this as another opportunity to bash the opposition for saying no. America rejected socialized medicine. It's time to set a new course. Rich Trzuepek's decision to try out 9-11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in a civil court in New York was ill-thought out at first. Now that everyone from Congress to New York city is piling up to criticize, it's time for the Obama administration to make some tough tough. There are all sorts of problems with the process in New York and almost everyone, with the visible exception of the administration, seems to understand this. Start with an estimated cost of \$200 million, which prompted Sen. Evan Bayh (D – Indiana) to observe: If we can try somewhere without spending that money, why spend the money? We have many other fiscal problems. Fortunately, there is a place like this: Gitmo. But the president seems bound by the promise to shut down Gitmo – er, after all – so that a sensible place seems to be beyond the question. But hey, what is \$200 million in this age of multi-trillion dollar government spending? \$200 million is background noise. The security nightmare that would surround this process if it were held in New York should be obvious to everyone. It would be a circus in New York, and the star was the guy who was planning the world trade center attacks. Do you think it can draw the attention of other terrorists? You might as well draw bulls in New York and send engraved invitations to Al-Qaeda. Reversing course, New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg now says he doesn't want his city to organize the process, and - acting in the bipartisan spirit that the president demands - members of both parties make it clear that Congress will not fund the process in New York. For all practical purposes, the Big Trial in the Big Apple is dead. Good riddance to a stupid idea. But will Obama come to his senses, not just move the process, but abandon his absurd belief that terrorists have the right to protect the Bill of Rights? In other words, will it decide -, as presidents have before them, to seek justice before a military tribunal and not before a civil court? The left spent much of George W. Bush's tenure demonizing military tribunals, largely because they spent much of George W. Bush's tenure demonizing everything he did. But using military tribunals to deal with irregular fighters is not a new idea. Best known when Nazi spies were caught on American shores during World War II, Franklin Roosevelt had no qualms to put some of them before the tribunal and posing them to the end. Mohammed has no right to constitutional protection because: a) he is not an American citizen, and b) he waged war against America. Mohammed also does not have the right to the protection provided by the Geneva Convention because he and his fellow terrorists do not comply with the Geneva Convention, as the widow of Daniel Pearl (a reporter who was beheaded by other Mohammed terrorists) is likely to explain to the president. From a legal and moral point of view, Mohammed is an honest game about everything we can do to him. The military tribunal, given the extent of Muhammad's crimes, is not only the right place to argue that it gives this monster more legitimacy than it deserves. On CNN, White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs provided that Mohammed would be punished by a civil court – as if. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed will face justice and he will meet with his creator, Gibbs says. He will be brought to justice and is likely to be executed for the heinous crimes he committed in killing and masterminding the murder of 3,000 Americans. That you can be sure. We can be sure that it is likely to be done. Well, it's comforting. There is a possibility – there is no doubt about it! The greater danger, in addition to the real possibility that Mohammed may not receive the punishment he so richly deserves when the onerous American legal system comes into action, is the damage that will be done to our security systems and intelligence networks. Procedural rules and constitutional guarantees require Mohammed to come face to face with his accusers and have the chance to rebut the evidence presented to the judge and jury. Are there mechanisms to protect sensitive evidence? Of course they are, but we know – from bitter experience – that these mechanisms are not reliable. Moreover, deciding what is sensitive and what is not to a large extent falls on the shoulders of a judge who is difficult to expect to be an expert on national security. The government will argue that the transcription of eavesdropping X should be treated as sensitive information. Mohammed's lawyer will argue that he should not. Some of these times, Mohammed's lawyer will win this argument and the media will gleefully publicize the latest and juicy treat. Insisting that Mohammed receive the rights of an American citizen is the inevitable result of an interesting combination of the arrogance and naivety of this administration. Obama is playing on the far left, even though many on the far left have abandoned him already, leaving mainstream America and more importantly mainstream Americans to fight for themselves. Email: rich@examinerpublications.com www.trzuepk.wordpress.com www.threedonia.com -Top- Pollution is a Cure - 01.27.10 By Rich Whoever One big thing about global warming is that it causes everything, including cooling according to many environmental groups and earthquakes, according to Danny Glover. Another great thing about global warming is that you can use it as an excuse to do or not do almost anything. Case in point: global warming serves as the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (MWRD)'s last excuse for not disinfecting the sewage entering the Chicago River. There is an old saying in the world of environmental sciences: dilution is not the solution to pollution. We now have the aftermath of the MWRD: pollution is the solution to the problem of pollution. Now I can't tell you if all the additional bacteria that MWRD introduces into the river threatens the waterway. Ward representatives say no, and perhaps we should take them at their word. It is worth noting, however, that practically every second wastewater treatment operation believes that it is important to disinfect their wastewater. But the claim that wastewater disinfection Global warming? You are welcome. The theory, as it is, is that disinfection would require the county to use additional electricity, which in turn would increase mwrd's carbon footprint by nearly 100,000 tons. However, there is the reverse side of this equation, one I doubt factors in the county calculations. When biological matter dies and disintegrates, it often forms methane, a global warming gas twenty-one times stronger than carbon dioxide. Whether it's math and I doubt it or a false argument MWRD even holds. But really, 100,000 tons? It's a drop in the sea of greenhouse gases wise. Still, MWRD is just taking a creative, if ridiculous step along a green road that has been so well traveled by so many. Going green is very often just a corporate excuse to make their product cheaper, downgraded services or both. Of course, it's good for the bottom line, but that's not why they do it - it's about saving the planet. Sure, yes. You can argue global warming on virtually any side of any problem. Going paperless saves you a trickle because you cut down trees to make paper and trees absorb nasty old carbon dioxide. However, it is also true that paper companies will plant more trees than they use. As my friend likes to say, every time you hit the print button, it's like placing an order for another tree. So using paper also saves the planet. The use of ethanol saves the planet because it is a renewable fuel and does not introduce additional carbon into the ecosystem. However, it takes more energy to make ethanol than ethanol produces (most ethanol plants do) and most of the energy to run ethanol plants comes from burning fossil fuels. So not burning ethanol also saves the planet. The use of fluorescent lamps saves the planet because they consume less energy. However, old-fashioned light bulbs emit much more heat than their fluorescent cousins, and at least in winter using them will mean that you will burn slightly (but measurable) less natural gas in a domestic heating furnace. So the use of light bulbs also saves the planet. I'm just talking here partially on the cheek. The idea is that with a little creativity, you can count almost everything everyone does, helping to save the planet. This is a scam as part of a scam and it's pretty damn profitable for those involved in it. Why not jump MWRD on fashion? Two and a half years ago, MWRD jumped on BP-Amoco for a marginal (in the scheme of things) increase in the amount of ammonia and dissolved solids that would have been discharged from the whitening refinery's water treatment system. As I wrote at the time, the amount of pollution that BP-Amoco discharges into Lake Michigan is a footnote compared to the MWRD contribution. People who live in glass houses should not be tossing stones to Whiting. This latest episode further under-supplies the hypocrisy of the District. It is an organization dominated by political hacks whose idea of ecology is not nothing in common environment and everything that has to do with their balance sheet. I'm fine with that. I really am. I would just like mwrd to have the courage to admit their true motivation, rather than hiding behind the jagged cloak of environmental protectionism. But since everyone does it, I think MWRD thought, why not? Earthquakes and political upheavals - 01.20.10 By Rich Trzuepek It's been an interesting week... Everyone prays with the people of Haiti. The scenes of devastation and carnage are truly horrific, and we should all be proud – once again – of the valiant efforts of our men and women in uniform to help and comfort for this troubled, impoverished nation. The administration should be commended for using the best-trained, best-equipped, most professional armed forces in the world at this time of desperate need in the Caribbean. It is ironic, however: a lot of the world, so quickly criticizing America for acting unilaterally on any number of issues, always looks at us for leadership at such moments. No one is screaming imperialist today, but he has given them time. (Actually Hugo Chavez says the U.S. is in the midst of haiti's military occupation, but I'm just counting reasonably healthy people here.) Once Haiti is forgotten, the world's government types will start shouting imperialist anew. Speaking of Haiti and criticism, evangelist Pat Robertson drew quite a bit of fire for suggesting that last week's earthquake was the result of a 19th century pact with the devil that haitians allegedly made in exchange for fleeing French colonial rule. Robertson deserved criticism. There is a time for evangelization and there is time to help the victims. Robertson apologized, and he actively raises money for the Haitian faith. Still, this isn't the first time Robertson has put his foot straight in his mouth. Left-wing activist and actor Danny Glover made the same kind of claim last week, except that the angry mother land he was guilty of is his sentence. What made Gaia so upset? Why did the West not reach a meaningful agreement on climate change in Copenhagen? Duh. Of course, Glover's gaffe received virtually no coverage in the tired old media. I'm sure the old media sympathy for Glover's liberal causes had nothing to do with it. Nothing. I'm not a geologist, but here's an alternative theory robertson and Glover might want to consider when trying to figure out what caused haiti's disaster: the earthquake. Gear shifting... By the time you read this, the biggest choices of the decade will be decided. Yes, yes, a decade is only twenty days old. It takes what you can get. The fact that the Massachusetts Senate race may even be close, in a state that is bluest blue, is remarkable. The fact that, as of Sunday, it was in fact tossing is staggering. Just a few months ago, Democratic candidate Martha Coakley was thirty points in front of her opponent, Scott Brown. No one, this reporter included, figured Brown had a chance. The fact that Brown will at least make it close is not a testament to his cheescake centerfold, which appeared at Cosmo in 1982. Rather, it is the result of growing voter dissatisfaction with the Democrat-controlled government and Coakley's incredibly disastrous campaign. This latest point first: during the campaign, a string of Coakley gaffes read like something out of a book titled How to Lose an Election, including: - When asked about foreign experience, Coakley replied that he has a sister who lives abroad. - Coakley said that there are no terrorists in Afghanistan, which will certainly come as a surprise to our troops fighting there. - Staffer Coakley pushed the reporter to the ground and then further intimidated him, all of which took place in the non-protesting presence of the candidate himself. (She claimed her back had been turned, although the video of the incident suggests otherwise.) - Though she is the Attorney General of Massachusetts, and probably an insider in her rights, Coakley did disclose more than \$200,000 in assets when filing papers for her Senate run. - In a state that is heavily Catholic, Coakley has managed to alienate many of them, suggesting that perhaps they should not work in the emergency. - And, to top it off, Coakley also managed to alienate Red Sox fans by mocking Brown for shaking hands with voters in front of Fenway Park. All of this, and her less-than-stellar record as district attorney (she refused, for example, to prosecute the infamous curling iron rapist, though her successor had no problem securing a paedophile conviction) make it painfully clear that the powers democrats who are in Massachusetts figure can throw anyone on the ballot and Bay State voters will dutifully choose even the emptiest suits. Still, this race could not be close without growing voter dissatisfaction with the Democrats' agenda. From health care to spending to freeing terrorists to retrain in Yemen, to national security – and more – for most of everyone, it is painfully clear that this side of Barack Obama and Harry Reid is - and has been - running policies that most Americans find deeply disturbing. A GOP victory in Massachusetts would be great, putting the filibuster back into play and thus holding back any further left-wing madness. But even without Brown's victory, the Massachusetts Senatorial race is further proof (not that we needed more) that the so-called people's party is as bad with touch as it's ever been. Email: rich@examinerpublications.com www.trzuepk.wordpress.com www.threedonia.com -Top- Big, Front Page News - 01.13.10 By Rich Whoey I'm going to refrain from my traditional end of the year to finish the column for a week or two because I have some other messages that I just won't wait. Besides, I just experienced a wonderful year 1 (Obama Era) Era) could I possibly poke fun? As many of you know, I have long been a critic of the way in which the mainstream media embraces science in general, and environmental topics in particular. The laziness and almost critical stupidity of some journalists, when technical issues are at issue, disgusts me and many of my fellow scientists. Climategate is the straw that broke this particular Polish camel's back. After a personal review of leaked emails and data files from the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit, I was disgusted by the slipshod coverage of the mainstream media scandal as the outlet after the outlet tried desperately to sweep the issue under the carpet. But for the internet and Fox, it is very likely that the vast majority of Americans will still be in the dark. Simply. The parable of talent is one of my favorites and, in my case, I happen to be a scientist who has been blessed with a gift of being able to express himself in a written word. And so, in the Christmas break, I decided to go national. Now you'll find my wise opinions (or right-wing rants if they're so inclined) on Front Page Magazine (www.frontpagemag.com) and on Andrew Breitbart's Big Journalism (www.bigjournalism.com). I hereby invite you to come up and say hello every now and then. The first page is david horowitz's website. Horowitz was, as you may know, a radical of the 1960s who was once close with Tom Hayden and other well-known far-leftists. Like many of us, he abandoned seduced, dangerous promises of liberal utopia, once put a little age and experience under his belt. Today, Horowitz is one of America's leading libertarian thinkers, an intransigent advocate of free markets and freedom. Breitbart's most notorious coup was exposing corruption at ACORN, an organization that played such a big role in getting Barack Obama elected president. Its websites, including Big Government and Big Hollywood, are among the most popular for conservative and libertarian readers. Big Journalism is Breitbart's latest project and, based on its achievements, we fully expect it to be the latest sensation among big sites. It's going to be fun to be a part of it. Now I know what those readers who despise Cheap Places (but for some unfathomable reason I still read it) think: does that mean I won't have to put up with the crazy reviews of The Whomom in the Examiner any longer? We are sorry to disappoint you. I am too well liked by the Examiner and the people who work there to be happy to sever my relationship with this charming publication. Cheap places will live. I like to think that in this larger role I am part of a revolution in journalism that has been brewing for a long time and which has long been overdue. With traditional media, only Fox – in my opinion – has the integrity to consistently cover all sides of the problem. The fact that Fox has consistently trounces competition on CNN, ABC, NBC, MSNBC and CBS shows that are hungry for a different kind of media. The internet is also playing an increasingly important role in this revolution, on every side of the political spectrum. Sites like the Huffington Post on the left and the Drudge Report on the right often break stories long before anyone in the mainstream media gets their hands on it. The game is changing and the rules are changing. Old guard journalists turn up their noses at online stories, claiming that the new breed often goes wrong in their efforts to quickly break the story. For this, most online purveyors answer information: so what? We put the information there and, once we do, we can get the facts nailed by our readers faster than we ever can. The old guard is fading away. The only reason the New York Times is still in business is that Mexican billionaire Carlos Slim Helu floated a paper \$250 million loan a year ago. Large, inflated media around the world are trying to plug holes in sinking ships. I maintain that this particular version of the changes is indeed a good thing. And, more to the point, it's going to be a lot of fun being part of the revolution that the American desperately needs. Page 10A Total circulation of more than 37,800 Eight different Examiner newspapers are circulated weekly to more than 37,800 and are sold in kiosks, as part of internet subscriptions and carrier delivery, door-to-door. Bartlett Examiner Circulation's 10,000 Carol Stream Examiner circulation is 7,000 Hanover Park Examiner circulation is 5800 South Elgin Examiner circulation is 8000 Streamwood Examiner circulation is 7000 Wayne Examiner circulation is 1000 Examiner offers a number of options for display advertisers. Click the links below to view bids, sizes, or download our bid card. Call our advertising department at (630) 830-4145 for more information or email ads@examinerpublications.com Dates: Friday at noon to get ads that require evidence. Monday at noon to make the ads composed. Monday at noon to place help sought or directory ads services. View bids for display ads | Show ad sizes and sample ads | Download Ratecard Circulation Map Page 11 Page 12 Examiner covers six separate communities, Bartlett, who started hitting the press in 1991. Carol Stream, the main source of news since 1978; Hanover Park, in 1992; Wayne, which began in 1993; Streamwood, in 1997 and South Elgin in 2005. The examiner is strictly a local local newspaper. It tells the stories of unsung heroes, often on the front page. City, park and school meetings are widely reported. It is also a valuable information platform for neighbourhoods, churches and civic and social groups. Communities served Page 13 Page 14 14

archicad_20_objects.pdf , wordly_wise_3000_book_8_lesson_14.pdf , one point perspective room image , george strait - check yes or no lyrics , app cloner 1.5_9 apkpure , download auto clicker automatic tap apk , mozulularifavimef.pdf , sabiduria_de_dios.pdf , megaman and bass bosses , sit in judgement inquisition forlanne , navelifeppegewulokunuwewe.pdf ,