



THE O'LEARY REPORT

VOLUME 4 • ISSUE 8

www.OLearyReport.com

NOVEMBER 2009

Only 43% of Voters Would Re-elect Obama Just One Year Later

Washington, D.C. — Just one year after receiving 53 percent of the votes cast for the U.S. Presidency, only 43 percent of voters would re-elect President Obama, including just 37 percent of Independent voters, according to a recent Zogby International/O'Leary Report Poll. The Poll surveyed 2,879 Americans on November 10-12, all of whom voted in the 2008 presidential election, and has a margin of error of plus-or-minus 1.9 percentage points.

Nearly 45 percent of voters say it is time for someone new to be president, 11 percent say that their vote for-or-against President Obama would depend on who is running against him.

Only 37% of Independent voters would re-elect Obama

Among Independent voters, only 37 percent say they would vote to re-elect Obama. Forty-six percent say it is time for someone new, and 17 percent of Independents say it would depend on who is running against Obama.

Obama and Jobs Creation

In addition, a majority of Americans do not trust President Obama to get legislation passed that would create jobs in 2010.

A plurality of voters (42 percent) say they do not trust the Obama White House "at all" in this regard, and an

(Continued on page 2)

Just 19% of Voters in Competitive 2010 Congressional Races "Much More Likely" to Support Pelosi-Democrats Who Voted for Health Care Bill

Washington, D.C. — Senators and congressmen running for re-election next year in races deemed to be competitive by political guru Charlie Cook, may come to regret voting for House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's health care bill, according to a breaking Zogby International/O'Leary Report poll. *(The Poll surveyed 2,879 Americans on November 10-12, all of whom voted in the 2008 presidential election, and has a margin of error of plus-or-minus 1.9 percentage points.)*

Are Senators and Representatives Who Vote for the Pelosi Health Care Bill in Trouble for 2010 Re-election?

Only 19 percent of voters, who reside in competitive congressional districts, say they would be "much more likely" to vote to re-elect their congressman in 2010, and 54 percent would be "much less likely." Just 15 percent of voters in such districts say they would be "somewhat more likely" to support their congressman, and 4 percent would be "somewhat less likely."

Only 25 percent of voters, who reside in states with competitive senate races, say they would be "much more likely" to vote to re-elect their congressman in 2010, and 49 percent would be "much less likely." Just 15 percent of voters in such states say they

(Continued on page 2)

Only 20% of Voters "Strongly Support" Obama Terror Trials

Washington, D.C. — The Obama administration's decision to move the trial of five accused 9-11 terrorists, including confessed 9-11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, to a federal court in New York is decidedly unpopular with American voters, according to a breaking Zogby International/O'Leary Report poll. *(The Poll surveyed 3,616 Americans on November 17-20, all of whom voted in the 2008 presidential election, and has a margin of error of plus-or-minus 1.7 percentage points.)*

Voters Oppose Granting Constitutional Rights to Foreign Enemy Combatants

Only 20 percent of American voters "strongly support" granting American Constitutional rights to foreign enemy combatants, while 53 percent "strongly oppose" it. An additional 11 percent of voters "somewhat support" granting such rights to accused foreign terrorists, and 5 percent say they are "somewhat opposed."

Just 18 percent of Independent voters "strongly support" the Obama administration's move while 53 percent "strongly oppose" it. An additional 11 percent say they "somewhat support" the move, and 9 percent are "somewhat opposed."

Voters Oppose Moving the Terror Trial from a Military Tribunal to a Federal Court

(Continued on page 2)

Only 43% Would Re-elect Obama

(Continued from page 1)

additional 11 percent do not trust Obama much to get job-creating legislation passed. Only 28 percent say they trust the President "very much" to accomplish this task, and an additional 18 percent say they trust the President "somewhat."

"President Obama's popularity with the voting public has been eroding for some time, but these numbers really drive home the point," said Brad

(Continued on page 12)

Only 19% More Likely to Elect Pelosi Dems

(Continued from page 1)

would be "somewhat more likely" to support their congressman, and 5 percent would be "somewhat less likely."

Nationally, just 27 percent of voters said they would be "much more likely" to vote to re-elect their congressman if he or she voted for the Pelosi health care bill, and 47 percent said they would be "much less likely." Just 14 percent of voters nationwide say they would be "somewhat more likely" to support their congressman, and 5 percent would be "somewhat less likely."

Voters in Competitive Senate and House Races Oppose Penalizing Small Businesses That Don't Offer Health Insurance

Small businesses are not one-sided in their support for Republicans or Democrats; rather, they tend to support the incumbent office-holder, regardless of party affiliation. Incumbents' decision to penalize small businesses in their districts for not providing health insurance to their employees is almost universally opposed by voters in their districts. This strong voter disapproval could have a negative effect on fundraising for incumbent congressmen, driving away small business donors.

Only 19 percent of voters in competitive senate races "strongly agree" with such a penalty, and 46 percent "strongly disagree." Just 19 percent "somewhat agree" and 11 percent "somewhat disagree."

Only 16 percent of voters in competitive congressional districts "strongly agree" with such a penalty, and 52 percent "strongly disagree." Just 16 percent "somewhat agree" and 10 percent "somewhat disagree."

Nationally, just 19 percent of voters "strongly agree" with penalizing small businesses, and 45 percent "strongly disagree." Just 20 percent "somewhat agree" and 10 percent "somewhat disagree." ###

Only 20% Support Obama Terror Trials

(Continued from page 1)

Only 25 percent of those who voted in the 2008 Presidential Election strongly support Eric Holder's efforts to try the accused terrorists in a federal court as opposed to a military tribunal, and 50 percent "strongly oppose" his effort. An additional 11 percent "somewhat support" Holder on this, and 6 percent "somewhat oppose" him.

Just 21 percent of Independent voters "strongly support" Holder's decision to move the terror trials to New York, and 52 percent "strongly oppose" the decision. An additional 12 percent "somewhat support" the decision, and 7 percent "somewhat oppose" it.

"These numbers show the White House's decision to grant foreign enemy combatants constitutional rights and try them in federal court is strongly and unambiguously opposed by a majority of voters," said Brad O'Leary, publisher of The O'Leary Report.

New Web Site to Shake up Congress on Terror Trial Issue

A new Web site, sponsored in part by *The O'Leary Report*, promises to take congress by storm on the terror trial issue. At www.911TerrorTrialTest.com visitors can answer 7 critical questions regarding the Obama administration's decision to move the trials of five accused 9/11 terrorists from military tribunals to a civilian court in New York.

After visitors answer the questions, they can simply click to send their answers directly to their congressman and two senators for free.

911TerrorTrialTest.com is a fast, easy and effective way for all Americans to let their congressmen know exactly where they stand on the 9/11 terror trial issue. ###

Inside this issue...

Obama's New York Terror Trial Could Hurt Senators and Guvs.....Page 3

Gov. Barbour Says Obama Re-elect at 42% in Key States.....Page 3

What You May Have Missed...

Rasmussen Health Care Poll Confirms Earlier Zogby/O'Leary Poll.....Page 4

Rasmussen Obama Poll Confirms Earlier Zogby/O'Leary Poll.....Page 4

Rep. Bill Owens (NY-23) Already Flops on Health Care.....Page 4

Obama 1st Amendment Follies.....Page 4

Obama "No Jobs" President.....Page 4

Census to Count Illegals.....Page 5

Obama Loses Public Faith.....Page 5

Majority Say Obama "Liberal".....Page 5

Poll Round-Up:

Governors Races: OH and FL.....Page 5

Senate Races: AR, CT, PA, NV, OH, CA, MO, NY, CO, ND, NH.....Pages 5&12

Anger Over "No Jobs" Obama...Page 6

HealthCareVote.com Revolution.....Page 7

Obama-Pelosi Try to Shut Up and Shut Down Health Insurers.....Page 7

Top Ten Reasons Obama Nobel...Page 8

Ice Age

Global Warming Exposed.....Page 9

Zogby/O'Leary Poll Sparks Nationwide Protest Against Obamacare.....Page 10

The "Good American" Who Was Taught to Hate.....Page 11

Poll Shows that Obama's New York Terror Trial Could Bite Incumbent Senators and Governors in 2010 Elections

(Note: This op-ed by Brad O'Leary originally appeared in The Washington Examiner on November 30, 2009.)

Since Attorney General Eric Holder announced the Obama administration's decision to grant five accused 9-11 terrorists a civilian trial in New York, a search has been underway for any perceivable benefit that could come from this decision. So far, the search for benefits to our nation, our military and the war on terror has turned up nothing. In fact, it's uncovered nothing but potential, and in some cases *probable*, harm to all three.

But are there any possible political benefits to be found in all of this? A breaking new poll shows that incumbent senators and governors facing competitive 2010 re-election battles would do well to oppose Obama and Holder's decision, or face repercussions at the voting booth next year. The Poll, conducted by Zogby International and *The O'Leary Report* newsletter surveyed 3,616 Americans on November 17-20, all of whom voted in the 2008 presidential election, and has a margin-of-error of plus-or-minus 1.7 percentage points. (*The size of the competitive gubernatorial races subsample below is 1,862 and the size of the competitive senate races subsample is 1428. "Competitive races" are as determined by the Charlie Cook Political Report.**)

Voters in Competitive 2010 Senate

and Gubernatorial Races Oppose Granting Constitutional Rights to Foreign Enemy Combatants

The Obama administration's decision to try the accused 9-11 terrorists in a federal court in New York City, as opposed to in a military tribunal, marks the first time foreign enemy combatants have been afforded rights under the U.S. Constitution.

The Zogby/O'Leary Poll asked:

Do you believe your congressman and senators should support or oppose granting American Constitutional rights to foreign enemy combatants accused of being involved in the 9-11 attacks so they can be tried in federal court in New York?

Only 24 percent of voters in competitive 2010 senate races "strongly support" granting American Constitutional rights to foreign enemy combatants, while 51 percent "strongly oppose" it. An additional 10 percent of voters "somewhat support" granting such rights to accused foreign terrorists, and 6 percent say they are "somewhat opposed."

Just 23 percent of voters in competitive 2010 governors races "strongly support" the Obama administration's move, and 55 percent "strongly oppose" it. An additional 10 percent say they "somewhat support"

the move, and 5 percent are "somewhat opposed."

Voters in Competitive 2010 Senate and Gubernatorial Races Oppose Moving the 9-11 Terror Trial to a Federal Court in New York

Many experts fear that moving the 9-11 terror trials away from a military tribunal to a civilian court in New York City could force the revelation of our nation's most sensitive intelligence. This is because in civilian court, the accused 9-11 terrorists can request the U.S. government turn over all its information on them, including how the information was acquired. Should the government fail to disclose such intelligence, it could risk an acquittal or mistrial.

Only 29 percent of voters in competitive senate races "strongly support" Eric Holder's efforts to try the accused terrorists in a federal court as opposed to a military tribunal, while 50 percent "strongly oppose" his effort. An additional 9 percent "somewhat support" Holder on this, and 5 percent "somewhat oppose" him.

Just 27 percent of voters in competitive governors races "strongly support" Holder's decision to move the terror trials to New York, and 53 percent "strongly oppose" the decision. An additional 10 percent "somewhat support" the decision, and 4 percent "somewhat oppose" it. ###

Governor Haley Barbour Says Obama Re-elect at 42% in Key Governors Races

Washington, D.C. — The Republican Governors Association and Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour released the results of a poll today that show only 42 percent of voters in competitive 2010 gubernatorial races would vote to re-elect President Obama. This is roughly the same amount of support each of the candidates who Obama backed in the Virginia and New Jersey gubernatorial

races recently received from voters.

Just 42 percent of Americans who voted in the 2008 presidential election, and who will vote in competitive gubernatorial races next year, would vote to re-elect President Obama. Nearly 45 percent say it is time for someone new in the Oval Office, and 12 percent say it would depend on who

runs against Obama.

Obama and Jobs Creation in States with Competitive 2010 Governors Races

In addition, a majority of Americans do not trust President Obama to get legislation passed that would create

(Continued on page 13)

What You May Have Missed...

Rasmussen Poll Confirms Earlier Zogby/O'Leary Poll on Health Care

A Rasmussen poll conducted November 21-22 of 1,000 likely voters (margin-of-error +/-3%) found that only 21% of Americans “strongly favor” the Obama-Pelosi health care bill, while 43% “strongly oppose” it. According to Rasmussen, 17% “somewhat favor” the bill and 13% “somewhat oppose” it.

A Zogby International/O'Leary Report poll conducted 10 days earlier, and which surveyed 2,879 voters from the 2008 presidential election (margin-of-error of +/- 1.9%), showed nearly identical voter opposition to a specific provision in the health care bill that would penalize small businesses that don't provide health insurance for their employees.

The Zogby/O'Leary poll found that only 19% of American voters strongly favor such a provision, while 45% strongly oppose it. In addition, 20% of voters somewhat favor such a provision, and 10% somewhat oppose it.

Rasmussen Poll Confirms Earlier Zogby/O'Leary Poll on Obama Approval

A Rasmussen poll conducted November 16-22 of 1,500 likely voters (margin-of-error of +/- 3%) found that only 45% of voters say they at least somewhat approve of President Obama's job performance and 54% disapprove.

A Zogby/O'Leary Poll conducted November 10-12 of 2,879 voters (margin-of-error +/-1.9%) found that only 43% would vote to re-elect President Obama if the election were today, and 45% think it is time for someone new in the White House.

Congressman Bill Owens Wastes No Time Breaking Campaign Promises

Democratic Congressman Bill Owens – who was gifted the NY-23 open congressional seat by equal parts incompetency on the part of Republican Party bosses in New York, and skullduggery on the part of their erstwhile candidate Dede Scozzafava – wasted no time bestowing NY-23 voters with a gift for which many politicians are well known: the broken campaign promise. Four such broken promises, in fact...in just his first hour on the job. Might this be some kind of record?

During his campaign, Owen claimed he was opposed to the Pelosi health care bill because he was opposed to: 1) the public option provision; 2) cutting Medicare benefits; 3) taxing health care benefits; and 4) any tax increases on the middle class.

Nevertheless, in his press statement released shortly after his swearing-in ceremony, Owens announced he was now in favor of the Pelosi bill, which, if you're counting, includes: 1) a public option provision; 2) cuts to Medicare benefits; 3) taxes on health care benefits; and 4) tax increases on the middle class.

Owens kept his word the second time, falling in lockstep with his fellow Democrats and voting in favor of the Pelosi bill.

More Obama First Amendment Follies

President Obama, renowned “constitutional scholar” that he is (or, at least, claims to be), continues to enlighten Americans about many new and fun ways to interpret the First Amendment.

It was discovered in early November that Obama's Justice Department sent a grand jury subpoena ordering the Philadelphia-based Indymedia.us, a lefty journalism/activism Web site, to turn over all details regarding all of the visitors the

site had received on a certain day. The subpoena also warned Indymedia.us “not to disclose the existence of this request” unless and until Obama's Justice Department said it was okay.

Linux administrator Kristina Clair was very surprised to receive the subpoena, and not thinking she or Indymedia had done anything wrong, Clair contacted the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) which took her case for free.

After a letter from EFF detailing all the problems with the subpoena, the Justice Department responded with a one-sentence letter saying that the subpoena had been withdrawn.

This more of a pattern than an isolated incident, as the White House is also currently soliciting secret bids from various social media sites for a massive online data mining project.

Apparently the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution is void where prohibited by the Obama administration.

Obama the “No Jobs” President

Even more troubling than the White House claiming to have “created or saved” jobs in congressional districts that don't exist is an *actual* study, completed without the assistance of fabricated numbers, from Rutgers University professors James Hughes and Joseph Seneca. The professors find that even if the American economy began adding 2.15 million jobs a year – as opposed to losing 3 million as it currently is – it would be 2017 before the job market returned to healthy, pre-recession levels. Hughes and Seneca include the annual growth of the American workforce (about 1.3 million) in their calculation.

Nowhere in the professors' report did they account for phantom

(Continued on page 5)

What You May Have Missed...

(Continued from page 4)

congressional districts or other fairy tales.

Senate Democrats Win Census Battle Over Illegal Aliens

Senate Democrats succeeded in blocking a proposal by Senator David Vitter (R-LA) that would have required next year's U.S. census to include a question asking people whether they are a U.S. citizen. Once upon a time, the census was a tool for determining how many *legal* residents were in the U.S.

But since the ruling Democratic Party relies on *illegal* residents to gain congressional representation in certain locales, they'll have none of this nonsense about trying determine whether a person is actually supposed to be here, or in fact, breaking the law.

You see, in addition to not paying taxes, taking American jobs, and soaking up all of the free emergency health care and education services in sight, illegals are particularly adept at voting Democrat. Especially when afforded air-conditioned buses and detailed voting instructions on Election Day.

Gallup Poll Shows Public Faith in Obama Down Just One Year After Election

“Will the Obama administration be able to control federal spending?”

52% said YES on Nov. 7-9, 2008
31% said YES on Oct. 16-19, 2009

Do you have a “favorable or unfavorable” opinion of Barack Obama?

18% said UNFAVORABLE in Jan. 2009

42% said UNFAVORABLE in Oct. 2009

“Generally speaking, do you think

Barack Obama has or has not been keeping the promises he made during his presidential campaign?”

29% said NO on April 20-21, 2009

48% said NO on October 16-19, 2009

Gallup's poll results are based on telephone interviews with 1,521 national adults, aged 18 and older, conducted Oct. 16-19, 2009. Margin-of-error is +/- 3%.

Majority of Americans Now Say Obama's Policies “Mostly Liberal”

“Do you think the policies that Barack Obama has pursued as president have been mostly liberal, mostly moderate, or mostly conservative?”

43% said MOSTLY LIBERAL in November 2008

54% said MOSTLY LIBERAL in October 2009

Gallup's poll results are based on telephone interviews with 1,521 national adults, aged 18 and older, conducted Oct. 16-19, 2009. Margin-of-error is +/- 3%.

Kasich and Strickland Tied in OH Governor Race

Republican challenger John Kasich is in a dead heat with incumbent Ohio Governor Ted Strickland with both attracting 40 percent of voter support, according to a Quinnipiac poll conducted November 5-9 of 1,123 Ohio voters (MoE = +/-2.9%).

McCollum leads Sink in FL Governor Race

Republican Bill McCollum leads Democrat Alex Sink 36 to 32 percent in the race for Florida governor, according to a Quinnipiac poll conducted October 12-18 of 1,078 Florida voters (MoE = +/-3.0%).

Lincoln leads Baker in AR Senate Race

Incumbent Democratic Senator Blanche Lincoln leads Republican challenger Gilbert Baker 41 to 39 percent, according to a Zogby poll conducted November 16-17 of 501 likely voters in Arkansas (MoE = +/-4.5%).

However, the same Zogby poll found that Lincoln would trail her potential Republican challenger 37-49 percent if she votes for the Senate health care bill.

Simmons leads Dodd in CT Senate Race

Senator Chris Dodd (D-CT) trails potential Republican challenger Rep. Rob Simmons in a hypothetical head-to-head matchup 49 to 38 percent, according to a Quinnipiac poll conducted November 3-8 of 1,236 Connecticut registered voters (MoE = +/-2.8%).

Toomey Leads Specter in PA Senate race

Republican challenger Pat Toomey leads incumbent Pennsylvania Democratic Senator Arlen Specter 45 to 40 percent, according to a Rasmussen poll conducted October 13 of 1,000 likely voters in Pennsylvania (MoE = +/-3.0%).

Reid Trails Both Potential Rivals in NV Senate Race

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) trails both his potential Republican rivals for re-election in 2010. Reid trails Sue Lowden 50 to 40 percent, and he trails Danny Tarkanian 50 to 43 percent, according to a Rasmussen poll conducted September 14 of 500 likely voters in Nevada (MoE = +/-4.5%).

(Continued on page 12)

Poll Shows Anger Over “No Jobs” Obama

(Note: This op-ed by Brad O'Leary originally appeared on www.NewsMax.com on November 23, 2009.)

According to the federal government, the U.S. unemployment rate now tops 10 percent — the highest it has been in 26 years. Some economists say that the federal estimate is low, and the actual unemployment rate, which is calculated by accounting for unemployed Americans who are either no longer looking for a job or who have taken part-time work out of desperation, is anywhere between 15 percent and 18 percent.

Yet instead of focusing on job creation, the White House and Democratic leaders are putting all of their energy into job-killers like their healthcare reform and cap-and-trade global warming legislation.

The louder Americans scream about jobs, the less Obama and his counterparts in Congress seem to care.

A recent poll conducted by Zogby International and *The O'Leary Report* shows this growing voter discontent. The Poll surveyed 2,879 Americans on Nov. 10-12, all of whom voted in the 2008 presidential election, and has a margin of error of plus-or-minus 1.9 percentage points.

The Poll asked: “The U.S. House of

Representatives approved a new healthcare bill recently.

“If approved by the Senate as is, companies that do not offer health insurance would be penalized based on payroll costs. This could include small firms with 25 or fewer workers depending on the payroll size.

“Most Democrats support this as a way to encourage businesses to offer healthcare to their employees, while most Republicans disagree with this because they say it discourages increased pay or new hires at small firms. Do you agree or disagree with this portion of the bill?”

A strong plurality of voters (45 percent) “strongly disagree” with penalizing small businesses that don't provide health insurance for their employees. Only 19 percent “strongly agree” with such a penalty. An additional 10 percent of voters “somewhat disagree,” and 20 percent “somewhat agree.”

Among Independent voters, the disagreement with penalizing small businesses is even stronger, as 48 percent “strongly disagree” and just 15 percent “strongly agree.” An additional 12 percent “somewhat disagree” and 20 percent “somewhat agree.”

A sizeable majority of small

business owners (55 percent) “strongly disagree” and only 15 percent “strongly agree.” An additional 11 percent of small business owners “somewhat disagree,” and 16 percent “somewhat agree.”

The Poll also asked voters how much they trust the Obama administration, and House and Senate Democratic leadership to get legislation passed that creates jobs in 2010.

A majority of voters (53 percent) do not trust the Obama administration in this regard, and 59 percent of independent voters don't either. A convincing 62 percent of small business owners also don't trust the White House on this front.

Democratic leaders in the House and Senate fare even worse with voters on jobs creation.

A 62 percent majority of voters do not trust Senate Democratic leadership to get job-creating legislation passed in 2010, and neither do 69 percent of Independent voters and 71 percent of small business owners.

On the House side, 60 percent of voters don't trust Democratic leadership to pass laws that create jobs. A strong 68 percent of both independent voters and small business owners don't trust House leadership either. ###



This cartoon by Sean Delonas originally appeared in the *New York Post* on November 19, 2009.

HealthCareVote.com Taking Capitol Hill by Storm

Brad O'Leary, publisher of the *The O'Leary Report* monthly political insider's newsletter, recently launched a special television program that is currently running on 220 cable and network television stations.

The program promotes two very important messages: 1) Why it's important for everyone to improve personal health and wellness to keep health care costs down, and 2) Why it's important Americans go to www.HealthCareVote.com to tell their Senators and Congressman where they stand in the health care debate.

The TV special is hosted by Bryant Gumbel with a special appearance by actor Dean Cain.

HealthCareVote.com is unlike any other existing web-based campaign tool and it is already impacting the health care debate in the Senate.

Visitors to HealthCareVote.com can answer 14 critical questions on health care reform, and then click to automatically send their answers to their senators and congressman. The questions are balanced and non-partisan, and the service is completely

free for all users. It is a quick, powerful way for Americans to tell their senators and congressman exactly where they stand on various hot-button issues surrounding the health care debate.

So far, over 100,000 people have taken the HealthCareVote.com survey and sent their answers to congress.



HealthCareVote.com will also capture the responses of everyone who takes the survey, and organize them by state and congressional district. This will allow O'Leary to show each individual congressman and senator where his constituents stand on various health care reform issues.

Some of the topics covered on

HealthCareVote.com include:

Should the federal government tax employer-provided health care benefits?

Is a government-run "public" health insurance option needed to create more competition and choice in the health insurance marketplace? Or is the public option too intrusive into the free market and would it eventually drive private health insurers out of business?

Do you want more portability in your health insurance, so that if your job or personal situation changes, you can maintain quality health insurance despite whatever pre-existing condition you may have?

"America is at a critical juncture, not only in the health care debate, but in the path we will take over the coming years," said O'Leary. "I created this Web site and television special so that every American who is concerned about the health care issue can let their elected officials know exactly where they stand before it is too late." ###

Obama-Pelosi to Health Insurers: Shut Up or We'll Shut You Down

(Note: This op-ed by Brad O'Leary originally appeared on www.AmericanThinker.com on November 5, 2009.)

President Obama, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, and their Democratic followers in Congress have a rather draconian message for the private sector: Speak now, and we'll make you forever hold your peace.

Up until a few weeks ago, America's health insurers were sheepishly on board with the Obama-Pelosi health care reform plan. Perhaps the industry feared that voicing any

concern about the plan would unleash the ire of an increasingly rabid Democratic majority on Capitol Hill. As it turns out, the health insurers were right.

No longer able to sit idly by while the President and his chief minion in the House amateurishly try to revamp one-sixth of the U.S. economy, the health insurance industry released a study they commissioned that analyzes the costs of the Obama-Pelosi plan.

The results are quite sobering. The study shows that "between 2010 and 2019 the cumulative increases in the

cost of a typical family policy under this reform proposal will be approximately \$20,700 more than it would be under the current system." (Emphasis mine.)

Rather than challenge the study's results on merit, Obama and Pelosi wasted no time demonizing the health insurance industry with hyperbole and rhetoric. And then Pelosi lowered the boom, expressing "tremendous interest" in revoking the industry's decades-old antitrust exemption.

This proved to be no empty threat,

(Continued on page 8)

Top 10 Reasons Why President Obama Got the Nobel

(Note: This op-ed by Brad O'Leary originally appeared in Investor's Business Daily on October 22, 2009.)

There are a few humorous "top 10 reasons why Barack Obama won the Nobel Peace Prize" lists making the rounds these days. My personal favorite is: "It's his consolation prize for losing the Olympics."

However, let's put intentional humor aside for a moment and examine the top 10 bona fide reasons the president was awarded the highest praise from the Norwegian Nobel Committee. I think you'll find that the unintentional humor in this little episode is off the charts.

First, it's important to understand that this is the same body that saw fit in recent years to give the award to Al Gore and Jimmy Carter — and the same body that seriously considered British Prime Minister and Adolf Hitler appeaser Neville Chamberlain for the top "peace" award.

But if former President Carter's Peace Prize made folks snicker, and former Vice President Gore's made us laugh uncontrollably, you can understand that the Nobel Committee was under immense pressure to top itself.

However, when the Obama announcement came, there were no laughs — just puzzled faces and everyone asking: "Why?" Incredibly, the Nobel Committee finally managed to "jump the shark."

Even Nobel Committee Chairman Thorbjørn Jagland — a man you might think would have a decent answer for "why?" — fumbled around when asked "why?" by the Associated Press. Jagland rambled that while the war in Afghanistan was a concern, the Obama administration, once in power, "immediately started to reassess the strategy."

"That itself is important," he said, "because when something goes wrong,

then you need to ask yourself why is it going wrong."

And there you have it. Millions of Americans who are asking themselves "why?" at this very moment are now candidates for the Nobel Peace Prize, according to Jagland's criteria.

As for any material reasons "why?" Jagland came up blank and offered that the prize was meant to encourage President Obama in his quest to fulfill his many promises — premature and empty as those promises may be.

Lest you question him, Jagland is uniquely qualified in the area of empty promises, he himself having served from 1999-2008 as Vice President of Socialist International. (Yes, the organization's name accurately reflects its mission: Promote the empty promises of socialism worldwide.)

Jagland was also leader of the Norwegian Labor Party for ten years,

(Continued on page 13)

Obama-Pelosi Try to Shut Up Health Insurers

(Continued from page 7)

as the Democrat-run House Judiciary Committee promptly passed a bill to do exactly that.

Now, curtailing the health insurance industry's limited exemption from federal antitrust laws may or may not be good policy. But given the circumstances, this is beside the point.

The real issue is that Obama and Pelosi are using the power of Congress to muzzle the speech of a private sector industry, First Amendment be damned. It couldn't be more blatant. Stay quiet about their disaster of a health plan, and Obama and Pelosi will leave you alone. Point out how their plan will actually make matters worse, and Obama and Pelosi will hit you back with new laws that hurt your business.

To listen to the rhetoric of Obama, Pelosi, and their far-left followers, the First Amendment right to free speech is a sacred cow among sacred cows -- so much so that even dunking a crucifix in urine or smearing animal dung on the Virgin Mary is to be protected, lest we end up on a slippery slope toward Marxist-style censorship.

But when the subject turns from fecal art to a private sector industry conducting an analytical study on the costs of the Democrats' government-run health care plan -- well, that's like yelling "boondoggle!" in a crowded Capitol. That sort of free speech simply can't be tolerated, and certainly can't be protected.

As it turns out, the American public isn't fooled by Obama's and Pelosi's

strong-arm tactics, according to a recent Zogby International/*O'Leary Report* Poll. (The poll surveyed 3,544 voters, was conducted October 23-26, and has a margin of error of 1.7 percentage points.) The poll asked:

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi recently condemned the health insurance industry for releasing an unflattering analysis on the Obama administration's proposal to create a government-run "public option" health insurance plan. Pelosi also threatened to revoke the industry's anti-trust exemption which has been in place since 1945. Do you agree or disagree that Pelosi is using the power of congress to try to limit the free speech of private corporations?

A majority of American voters (53

(Continued on page 12)

ICE AGE

The cold, hard truth about global warming and energy policy...

The Global Warming Hoax Exposed

Just as the “great and powerful Oz” turned out to be a feeble old man hiding behind a few cheap production stunts, so too we learn that much of the “science” propping up global warming alarmism is lies, on top of more lies, on top of cover-ups. Thanks to either a courageous whistleblower or a shrewd computer hacker (as of this writing, it has not been determined who mankind has to thank) we have been given a glimpse behind the curtain of the global warming alarmist machine.

Of course, much of the error-riddled data that alarmists like Al Gore have been using to peddle their fear has already been publicly and thoroughly debunked (i.e. the infamous “hockey stick” graph). The alarmists, once out of excuses for their faulty climate models, would frequently retreat to name-calling (“Flat-earther!”) and declare that the science is settled in their favor.

But not until someone hacked into the computers at Britain’s leading climate research facility, the University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit (a.k.a. Hadley CRU), and released the jaw-dropping communications that were sent to their conspiratorial colleagues around the world, did everyone see the malicious intent behind the alarmists’ faulty “science.” As it turns out, it isn’t so much science as it is intentional fraud masquerading as science.

In a November 20 interview, the director of Hadley CRU, acknowledged that his organization had been hacked, and that the data and emails published all over the Internet appear to be genuine. Senator Jim Inhofe (R-OK) announced that he would call for a congressional investigation into the “Climategate” scandal.

Below is just a sampling of the chicanery from Hadley CRU.

1) Here are the world’s leading global warming alarmists/scientists rigging the data to make it say what they want it to say:

*From: Phil Jones
To: ray bradley ,mann@XXXX,
mhughes@XXXX
Subject: Diagram for WMO Statement
Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 13:31:15
+0000
Cc: k.briffa@XXX.osborn@XXXX*

Dear Ray, Mike and Malcolm,

Once Tim’s got a diagram here we’ll send that either later today or first thing tomorrow.

I’ve just completed Mike’s Nature trick of adding in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years (ie from 1981 onwards) and (sic) from 1961 for Keith’s to hide the decline. Mike’s series got the annual land and marine values while the other two got April-Sept for NH land N of 20N. The latter two are real for 1999, while the estimate for 1999 for NH combined is +0.44C wrt 61-90. The Global estimate for 1999 with data through Oct is +0.35C cf. 0.57 for 1998.

*Thanks for the comments, Ray.
Cheers
Phil*

*Prof. Phil Jones
Climatic Research Unit Telephone
XXXX
School of Environmental Sciences Fax
XXXX
University of East Anglia
Norwich*

2) Here are world’s leading global warming alarmists/scientists getting rid of any damning evidence that would sully the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s latest report:

*From: Phil Jones
To: “Michael E. Mann”
Subject: IPCC & FOI
Date: Thu May 29 11:04:11 2008
Mike,*

Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith re AR4?

Keith will do likewise. He’s not in at the moment – minor family crisis.

Can you also email Gene and get him to do the same? I don’t have his new email address.

We will be getting Caspar to do likewise.

I see that CA claim they discovered the 1945 problem in the Nature paper!!

*Cheers
Phil
Prof. Phil Jones
Climatic Research Unit*

3) Here are the world’s leading global warming alarmists/scientists privately fretting that the Earth’s actual temperatures are not matching their models and predictions:

*From: Kevin Trenberth
To: Michael Mann
Subject: Re: BBC U-turn on climate
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 2009 08:57:37 -0600
Cc: Stephen H Schneider , Myles Allen , peter stott , “Philip D. Jones” , Benjamin Santer , Tom Wigley ,*

(Continued on page 10)

Global Warming Hoax Exposed

(Continued from page 9)

Thomas R Karl , Gavin Schmidt , James Hansen , Michael Oppenheimer
Hi all

Well I have my own article on *where the heck is global warming ? We are asking that here in Boulder where we have broken records the past two days for the coldest days on record. We had 4 inches of snow. The high the last 2 days was below 30F and the normal is 69F, and it smashed the previous records for these days by 10F. The low was about 18F and also a record low, well below the previous record low.*

This is January weather (see the Rockies baseball playoff game was canceled on saturday and then played last night in below freezing weather). Trenberth, K. E., 2009: An imperative for climate change planning: tracking Earth's global energy. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 1, 19-27, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2009.06.001. [1][PDF] (A PDF of the published version can be obtained from the author.)

*The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't. The CERES data published in the August BAMS 09 supplement on 2008 shows there should be even more warming: but the data are surely wrong. Our observing system is inadequate.****

4) Here are the world's leading global warming alarmists/scientists conspiring about how to fudge their numbers to create a warming trend:

From: Tom Wigley [...]
To: Phil Jones [...]
Subject: 1940s
Date: Sun, 27 Sep 2009 23:25:38 -0600
Cc: Ben Santer [...]

Phil,

Here are some speculations on correcting SSTs to partly explain the 1940s warming blip. If you look at the attached plot you will see that the land also shows the 1940s blip (as I'm sure you know).

So, if we could reduce the ocean blip by, say, 0.15 degC, then this would be significant for the global mean – but we'd still have to explain the land blip. I've chosen 0.15 here deliberately. This still leaves an ocean blip, and i think one needs to have some form of ocean

blip to explain the land blip (via either some common forcing, or ocean forcing land, or vice versa, or all of these). When you look at other blips, the land blips are 1.5 to 2 times (roughly) the ocean blips—higher sensitivity plus thermal inertia effects. My 0.15 adjustment leaves things consistent with this, so you can see where I am coming from.

Removing ENSO does not affect this.

It would be good to remove at least part of the 1940s blip, but we are still left with “why the blip”.

Let me go further. If you look at NH vs SH and the aerosol effect (qualitatively or with MAGICC) then with a reduced ocean blip we get continuous warming in the SH, and a cooling in the NH—just as one would expect with mainly NH aerosols.

The other interesting thing is (as Foukal et al. note – from MAGICC) that the 1910-40 warming cannot be solar. The Sun can get at most 10% of this with Wang et al solar, less with Foukal solar. So this may well be NADW, as Sarah and I noted in 1987 (and also Schlesinger later). A reduced SST blip in the 1940s makes the 1910-40 warming larger than the SH (which it currently is not)—but not really enough.

(Continued on page 12)

Zogby/O'Leary Poll Sparks Nationwide Protest Against Obamacare and Taxpayer-Funded Abortions

(Note: This press release was originally issued on October 6, 2009.)

Washington, D.C. — Several pro-life groups, including Operation Rescue and the Christian Defense Coalition, have launched the “I Am 71” project to draw attention to the 71 percent of Americans who are opposed to allowing taxpayer-funded abortions in the current health care reform legislation. The groups recently unfurled a 100-foot “71” banner on the west lawn of the White House. An amendment that would have banned federal funding for abortions in the health care bill failed by a 13-10 vote in

the Senate Finance Committee last week.

The 71 percent number comes from a poll conducted by Zogby International and *The O'Leary Report* in December of last year. The poll surveyed 2,481 American voters and had a margin-of-error of plus-or-minus two percentage points. The poll asked:

President-elect Obama has proposed a bill that would force many employers to provide health insurance to their employees. Do you believe that this bill should also

require insurance plans pay for abortions when the abortions are performed as a method of birth control?

A strong majority of Americans (71 percent) said abortion coverage should not be included in such a bill, while only 20 percent said yes to abortion coverage. Seventy percent of Independent voters said no, as did a majority of Democratic voters (53 percent). Even 53 percent of those who voted for President Obama just one month prior to the poll being conducted said no to abortion coverage. ####

The "Good American" Who Was Taught to Hate

(Note: This op-ed by Brad O'Leary originally appeared on www.AmericanThinker.com on November 11, 2009.)

"You've got to be taught to hate." The line from the famous song in "South Pacific," the Rodgers and Hammerstein play about the military in the Pacific during the Second World War, rings especially true in the instance of Fort Hood mass murderer Nidal Malik Hasan. For those who are unfamiliar, the tune goes:

You've got to be taught to hate and fear;
You've got to be taught from year to year;
It's got to be drummed in your dear little ear;
You've got to be carefully taught.

Hasan was taught to hate. He was taught to hate just as Catholics were taught to hate during the Inquisition. He was taught to hate just as Protestants were taught to hate during the Reformation. Hasan was taught to hate by the Muslim brotherhood, whose network and influence extends to many American mosques, including the one he regularly attended.

Many Muslims and Islamists are teaching Arab-Americans like Hasan to hate. They are stripping these Arab-Americans of their birthright in a blatant attempt to turn them into murderous monsters. Hasan was taught that religious hatred trumps American freedom. The Islamists who taught him to hate are as guilty of his murders as perhaps those U.S. officials who chose the path of political correctness, ignoring the danger he posed to his fellow troops, and choosing to promote him rather than boot him from the military.

His relatives, with spiritual support from politically correct busy bodies, say Hasan is a "good American" -- even "one hundred and ten percent American." And by saying so, they spit on the graves of every Arab-American

who has nobly served in the U.S. military. They defame the approximately 3,500 Arab-Americans who are currently risking life and limb for the United States. Nidal Malik Hasan is American-in-name-only, and barely that.

To cover up the Islamist brand of hatred that Hasan was taught -- the special brand of hatred that compelled him to shout "Allahu akbar!" ("God is great!") before slaughtering twelve innocent and defenseless U.S. soldiers

This coward, who ruined the lives of so many spouses and children, committed a despicable act in the name of a religion that taught him to hate.

(who were preparing for tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan) and wounding 38 others (28 of them seriously) -- is to promote Hasan's hatred as acceptable.

This coward, who ruined the lives of so many spouses and children, committed a despicable act in the name of a religion that taught him to hate. Those who would write off the Fort Hood horror, the worst act of terror on American soil since 9-11, as the result of some poor, misunderstood soul who was picked on by his colleagues denigrate the achievements and sacrifices of Japanese- and German-American soldiers during World War II.

And to those who are convinced that Hasan snapped because of some mistreatment he received by his colleagues: Who cares? Certainly not those true Americans who suffered through real racism and barriers. Certainly not Satchell Paige, who struck out Mickey Mantle with one pitch. Not Jackie Robinson, who had to be smuggled into Major League ballparks. Not Kenny Washington, who broke the National Football League's

color barrier. Not Rosa Parks, who declined to give up her bus seat. And certainly not a young man who joined the army and became a Second Lieutenant: Colin Powell.

Not the 18,000 second-generation Japanese Americans who fought in combat in World War II as members of the all-Japanese 442nd Regiment while their families were imprisoned in internment camps in America. Not U.S. Senator and Medal of Honor recipient Daniel Inouye, who fought as a Second Lieutenant in the 442nd. President

Truman honored members of the 442nd at a 1945 White House ceremony, saying, "You fought not only the enemy, you fought prejudice, and you have won."

Not Asian immigrants, who, despite their sacrifices and the sacrifices of their countrymen during WWII, couldn't legally own property in California until 1952.

Not Irish and Catholic immigrants, who came to this country full of hopes and dreams only to find signs that read "Catholics and Irish Need Not Apply."

Not the German Americans who fought valiantly during World War II, even as nearly 11,000 of their brethren were imprisoned in U.S. internment camps.

Those of us who wish to honor the bravery and sacrifices of so many Americans this Veterans Day must not allow political correctness to conceal the real motives behind Nidal Malik Hasan's hate-filled rampage last week. Doing so dishonors the memory of Americans from other cultures who became U.S. soldiers because they found American freedom worth fighting and dying for. Let us remember their bravery and their sacrifice. And let us remember the hatred and evil that is being taught to monsters like Hasan right here on American soil. ###

Only 43% Would Re-elect Obama

(Continued from page 2)

O'Leary, bestselling author and publisher of *The O'Leary Report*. "Most voters don't trust the President on the number one issue of the day: job creation."

"On top of that, a surprising plurality of voters, and Independent voters in particular, don't side with President Obama on the number one issue to him: whether or not he should be President," said O'Leary.

A Rasmussen poll conducted November 16-22 of 1,500 likely voters (margin-of-error of +/- 3%) confirmed these numbers, finding that only 45% of voters say they at least somewhat approve of President Obama's job performance while 54% of voters disapprove. ###

Obama-Pelosi Shut-Up Health Insurers

(Continued from page 8)

percent) agree that Pelosi is trying to use the power of congress to limit the free speech of private industry. Only 39 percent disagree. Furthermore, 55 percent of Independent voters also agree, while just 39 percent disagree. Majorities of Hispanic voters (52 percent), union members (51 percent), and small business owners (58 percent) agree as well.

Should private corporations have to cower in fear if they exercise their First Amendment rights? Evidently, Obama and Pelosi think so.

In fact, the brazen way in which they smacked down health insurers for speaking out sends a clear message to other private sector industries: Better to cut out your tongue than to risk legislative retribution. ###

Global Warming Hoax Exposed

(Continued from page 10)

So ... why was the SH so cold around 1910? Another SST problem? (SH/NH data also attached.)

This stuff is in a report I am writing for EPRI, so I'd appreciate any comments you (and Ben) might have.

Tom.

The scientific process of testing models and theories is entirely dependent on using accurate data. It also requires an unbiased, unmotivated and open mind.

Thus, it's not exactly clear what the global warming "scientists" are practicing at Hadley CRU. But one thing is certain: It isn't science. ###

What You May Have Missed

(Continued from page 5)

Portman Leads Brunner and Fisher in OH Senate Race

Republican Rob Portman leads Democrat Jennifer Brunner 38 to 34 percent, and Democrat Lee Fisher 39-36 in the race to fill retiring Senator George Voinovich's (R) senate seat, according to a Quinnipiac poll conducted November 5-9 of 1,123 Ohio voters (MoE = +/-2.9%).

Boxer Leads Fiorina in CA Senate Race

Incumbent Democrat Barbara Boxer leads Republican challenger Carly Fiorina 46 to 37 percent, according to a Rasmussen poll conducted November 17 of 500 likely voters in California (MoE = +/-4.5%).

Carnahan and Blunt Deadlocked in MO Senate Race

Democrat Robin Carnahan leads Republican Rep. Roy Blunt 45 to 44 percent in their race to succeed retiring Missouri Senator Kit Bond (R), according to a Public Policy Polling poll conducted November 13-15 of 763 Missouri voters (MoE = +/-3.6%).

Gillibrand Leads Pataki in NY Senate Race

Incumbent Democratic Senator Kirsten Gillibrand barely leads Republican challenger George Pataki 45 to 42 percent in a hypothetical 2010 race for NY Senate, according to a Rasmussen poll conducted November 17 of 500 likely voters in New York (MoE = +/-4.5%).

Norton Leads Bennet in CO Senate Race

Republican challenger Jane Norton

leads incumbent Democratic Senator Michael Bennet 45 to 36 percent, according to a Rasmussen poll conducted September 15 of 500 likely voters in Colorado (MoE = +/-4.5%).

Hoeven Leads Dorgan in ND Senate Race

Republican Governor John Hoeven leads Democratic Senator Byron Dorgan 55 to 36 percent in a hypothetical 2010 matchup, according to a Zogby poll conducted November 17-18 of 502 likely voters in North Dakota (MoE = +/-4.5%).

Ayotte Leads Hodes in NH Senate Race

Republican Kelly Ayotte leads Democrat Paul Hodes by 8 points (46 to 38 percent) in their race to succeed Senator Judd Gregg (R) in New Hampshire, according to a Rasmussen poll conducted September 14 of 500 likely voters in New Hampshire (MoE = +/-4.5%). ###

Top Ten Obama Nobel

(Continued from page 8)

so he knows an exemplary community organizer when he sees one.

So how could Jagland and his comrades on the committee ignore President Obama's already lengthy list of achievements? What achievements, you ask? In the interest of conserving space, I will only give you the top 10 reasons Obama won the Nobel (in no particular order of gravity and importance):

1. Valiantly pulled rank on his top commander in Afghanistan by putting off Gen. Stanley McChrystal's urgent request for more troops.
2. Boldly turned a deaf ear to Iranians who only wanted a free and fair vote in that country's recent rigged election crisis.
3. Successfully blamed former President George W. Bush for winning the war in Iraq.
4. Humbly helped Brazil win the 2016 Olympics by not warning of military intervention.
5. Put an end to the horribly accurate phrase "global war on terror" and replaced it with the sublimely bureaucratic "overseas contingency operations."
6. Bravely turned his back on our allies (Poland and the Czech Republic) by stripping them of the missile shield the U.S. had promised them.
7. Courageously denounced America's founding as a Christian nation when visiting Turkey.
8. Astutely appointed a Supreme Court justice who believes that international laws can take precedence over U.S. Constitutional laws.
9. Eloquently called Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez "mi amigo" during a conversation at a summit of Western Hemisphere leaders.
10. Continues to work tirelessly to award U.S. citizenship to the 12.5 million illegal aliens currently residing in America. ###



The O'Leary Report is a publication of PM Direct Marketing and Associated Television News.

Editor: Peyton Knight


V.P. Research: Tim McGinnis

To arrange interviews with Brad O'Leary, contact:

Shawna Shriner • (703) 272-1500 • ShawnaShriner@pm-direct.com

For a one-year, e-mail subscription (12 issues), mail a check for \$35 made out to "The O'Leary Report" to: The O'Leary Report * ATTN: Shawna Shriner * 11250 Waples Mill Rd. * Suite 310 * Fairfax, VA 22030

Subscribers will receive these two books by Brad O'Leary as a gift:



The Audacity of Deceit: Barack Obama's War on American Values



Shut Up, America! The End of Free Speech

Barbour Says Obama Re-elect at 42%

(Continued from page 3)

jobs in 2010.

Almost 42 percent of voters in competitive 2010 gubernatorial races say they do not trust the Obama administration "at all" to get job-creating legislation passed, while just 28 percent trust the Administration "very much." An additional 12 percent don't trust the Administration much to pass such legislation, and only 18 percent trust "somewhat."

"We saw how President Obama's popularity is sinking in the recent Virginia and New Jersey gubernatorial elections, where not

much more than 40 percent of voters in each of those two states voted for the Obama-backed candidate," said Governor Haley Barbour, chairman of the Republican Governors Association.

**Competitive Gubernatorial Races in 2010: ME (Baldacci), NM (Richardson), OR (Kulongoski), IL (Quinn), MA (Patrick), OH (Strickland), PA (Rendell), CO (Ritter), IA (Culver), MI (Granolm), WI (Doyle), OK (Henry), TN (Bredesen), WY (Freudenthal), KS (Parkinson), AZ (Brewer), CA (Schwarzenegger), CT (Rell), FL (Crist), GA (Perdue), HI (Lingle), MN (Pawlenty), NV (Gibbons), RI (Carciari), VT (Douglas), AL (Riley), AK (Parnell), SC (Sanford), TX (Perry), UT (Herbert). ###*



11250 Waples Mill Road, Suite 310
Fairfax, VA 22030
www.OLearyReport.com