

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.AMERICANPOLICY.ORG

POLITICAL CORRECTNESS WON'T RUN YOUR CAR

By Tom DeWeese

When Congress passed the Energy Bill in December it did everything necessary to please a horde of special interests and very little to actually help Americans with their energy problems. Truth is, America still has no energy policy – just a lot of pork for those feeding at the tax-paid trough.

Political correctness comes from special interest groups who lay down the law with politicians (read: we won't give you any more money unless you say and do things our way). In such an atmosphere there is little room for reasoned thought on the consequences of the legislation Congress enforces on the rest of us. The Energy Bill is the prime example of law by sound bite.

The new law mandates that automakers must boost mileage by 40 percent – to 35 miles per gallon

– by 2020. The reason given by the politicians is that this move will help make America less dependent on foreign oil. Funny, though, there isn't a word in the bill about drilling for American oil in Alaska or increasing drilling off shore. Both areas have proven to have near unlimited reserves that could easily free the nation from the Middle East oil czars. Why? Drilling American oil simply isn't politically correct.

The main reason for the mandate is to satisfy the massive environmental lobby that nearly rules Capitol Hill. They have big bucks and a lot of power. Their ultimate goal is to get people completely out of their cars and onto public transportation. That's why you see little in the way of road improvement in transportation bills, but lots of money being thrown at public transportation. Public buses, subways and trains are politically correct. The problem is they just don't necessarily go where the average traveler needs to go – at the time they need to go there.

Of course, mandating higher mileage will force automakers to charge more for the cars because the technology to do it will cost more. And that works perfectly to the anti-car agenda of the environmentalists. The mandate will also force the

automakers to produce smaller cars – something the American people have made perfectly clear they do not want and won't buy. Alternative? Fewer cars. That's why public transportation is politically correct.

Another major provision of the energy bill is the production of Ethanol – again, a measure promoted as a way to get us off the foreign oil fix. The trouble is, American farmers can't raise enough corn to supply what is needed for the mandated Ethanol production, let alone supply enough to feed us. And the cost of corn products is already through the roof. As a result, to meet the congressional mandate, the U.S. now has to import corn to produce Ethanol. The main source is Communist China. So, perhaps the Ethanol mandate will help reduce our foreign oil dependency ... but, it seems we are just going to shift the pain to an even worse source – Red China. Ain't globalism and free trade grand? And it's politically correct.

Of course, the wise men in the Congress foresaw this problem so the bill mandates a large portion of ethanol to come from the conversion of other cellulose materials. The problem is, that technology has not yet been developed. So Congress passed a law for something not yet invented.

IN THIS ISSUE:

- 3. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT:
The Root of All Our Problems
- 6. INSIDERS REPORT:
National Heritage Areas: Assault on Private Property and Local Community Rule
- 8. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:
ID Cards and Databanks are Not the Solution

And that helps our energy needs...how?

In a bold move, Congress managed to ban the incandescent light bulb. Senate majority Leader Harry Reid said such action was "proper congressional action." Instead, Congress is mandating the politically correct compact fluorescent bulbs that use as little as a fourth the power of the conventional bulbs.

It's interesting to note that the major manufacturers of incandescent bulbs are not upset by the new legislation, in fact they helped write it. Why? Well, could it be that the standard incandescent bulb costs about 50 cents each and the new ones cost as much as \$3.00? Of course, they tell us they last longer, so the cost is only upfront – and so are the manufacturers' profits. Certainly they will be able to help write legislation to ban something else to increase their market share before the full mandatory transition to the new bulbs in 2012.

One more note on the new lights, reports are now coming out that they cause migraine headaches in many people because they work like standard fluorescent tubes, which subtly flicker constantly. Epileptics are especially affected. Moreover, they make a very harsh, cold white light. Gone will be the warm, cheery mood lighting of the incandescent bulbs. Again, Congress bans a product with only the information fed to them from global corporations who stand to gain. But, more importantly, the new lights are politically correct.

The compromise energy bill did resist the demands of environmentalists to eliminate tax breaks for oil companies (money they wanted used for the development of green energy sources). The greens wanted to mandate that power companies produce certain amounts of energy by renewable means such as solar and wind. However, while that bullet was dodged this time, alternative energy is still wildly popular and most definitely politically correct. So it is

important that all Americans understand the worthlessness of alternative energy in solving America's current crisis.

Here are some facts concerning energy production. Producing 50 megawatts of electricity using a gas-fired generating plant, as is in use today, requires 2 to 5 acres of land. Getting the same amount from photovoltaics means covering a minimum of 1,000 acres with solar panels. Of course there also has to be access for trucks to clean the panels. Using the sun to meet California's energy needs would mean paving over hundreds of thousands of acres of desert habitat – along with their resident plant and animal life. And if the sun doesn't shine for, say six months, as in Alaska, well, we freeze in the dark.

A 50-megawatt wind facility requires even more land: at least 4,000 acres. The 100-200 foot tall wind turbines ruin habitat and scenic vistas and represent "an imminent threat" to millions of birds and bats. Today, just in Northern California's Altamont Pass, wind turbines kill thousands of birds every year, including eagles, hawks, owls and other birds of prey. Some call the wind turbines "Cuisinarts in the air." In addition, wind energy is unreliable. If the wind doesn't blow, no energy.

If produced by wind, the 7,000 to 10,000 megawatts of additional electricity California needs immediately would require sacrificing over 400,000 acres to wind turbines, foundations and road access. If solar power were used, more than 100,000 acres would have to be blanketed with panels.

On a national scale, the environmental impacts of wind and solar alternative energy become truly staggering. Former Deputy Energy Secretary Ken Davis has calculated that, to produce the 218 gigawatts of "additional" electricity America will need by 2010, using only wind or solar power, we would have to blanket 9,400,000 acres with wind mills or solar panels. That's *(Cont'd on Page 4)*

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 14, No. 2 February 2008

Published by
American Policy Center

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Copy Editor
Virginia DeWeese

Correspondence/Fulfillment
Sascha McGuckin
Carolyn DeWeese

Graphics/Layout
Kristy Wilson

The DeWeese Report
70 Main Street, Suite 23
Warrenton, VA 20186

Phone: (540) 341-8911
Fax: (540) 341-8917

E-mail:
ampolicycenter@hotmail.com

Web Page:
www.americanpolicy.org

© 2008 American Policy Center
ISSN 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

Newsletter of the
American Policy Center

Permission to photocopy, reprint and quote articles from The DeWeese Report is hereby granted, provided full acknowledgment is included. All reprinted articles must say: "Written by Tom DeWeese, editor of The DeWeese Report (unless another author is listed). All reprints must carry The DeWeese Report address and phone number. Samples of the reprint must be provided to The DeWeese Report.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: THE ROOT OF ALL OUR PROBLEMS

By Tom DeWeese

In his book, *Earth in the Balance*, Al Gore warned that a “wrenching transformation” must take place to lead America away from the “horrors of the Industrial Revolution.” The process to do that is called Sustainable Development and its’ roots can be traced back to a UN policy document called Agenda 21, adopted at the UN’s Earth Summit in 1992.

Sustainable Development calls for changing the very infrastructure of the nation, away from private ownership and control of property to nothing short of central planning of the entire economy – often referred to as top-down control. Truly, Sustainable Development is designed to change our way of life.

Many are now finding non-elected regional governments and governing councils enforcing policy and regulations. As these policies are implemented, locally-elected officials are actually losing power and decision-making ability in their own communities. Most decisions are now being made behind the scenes in non-elected “sustainability councils” armed with truckloads of federal regulations, guidelines, and grant money.

In fact, a recent study reported that elected city councils and commissioners have lost approximately 10% of their legislative power during the past 10 years, while, through the consensus process, the power of private groups called Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) has increased by as much as 300%. It is a wrenching transformation, indeed.

THE THREE ES

According to its authors, the objective of sustainable development is to integrate economic, social, and environmental policies in order to achieve reduced consumption, social equity, and the preservation and restoration of biodiversity.

The Sustainablists insist that society be transformed into feudal-like governance by making *Nature* the central organizing principle for our economy and society. As such, every societal decision would first be questioned as to how it might effect the environment. To achieve this, Sustainablist policy focuses on three components; land use, education, and population control and reduction.

The Sustainable Development logo used in most literature on the subject contains three connecting circles labeled **Social Equity**; **Economic Prosperity**; and **Ecological Integrity** (known commonly as the 3 Es).

SOCIAL EQUITY

Sustainable Development’s Social Equity plank is based on a demand for something called “social justice.” It should be noted that the first person to coin the phrase “social justice” was Karl Marx. Today, the phrase is used throughout Sustainablist literature. The Sustainablist system is based on the principle that individuals must give up selfish wants for the needs of the common good, or the “community.” How does this differ from Communism?

This is the same policy behind the push to eliminate our nation’s borders to allow the “migration” of those from other nations into the United States to share our individually-created wealth and our taxpayers-paid government social programs. Say the Sustainablists, “Justice and efficiency go hand in hand.” “Borders,” they say, “are unjust.”

Under the Sustainablist system, private property is an evil that is used simply to create wealth for a few. So too, is business ownership. Instead, “every worker/person will be a direct capital owner.” Property and businesses are to be kept in the name of the owner, keeping them responsible for taxes and other expenses, however control is in the hands of the “community.”

ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

Sustainable Development’s economic policy is based on one overriding premise: that the wealth of the world was made at the expense of the poor. It dictates that, if the conditions of the poor are to be improved, wealth must first be taken from the rich. Consequently, Sustainable Development’s economic policy is based not on private enterprise but on public/private partnerships.

In order to give themselves an advantage over competition, some businesses -- particularly large corporations – now find a great advantage in dealing directly with government, actively lobbying for legislation that will inundate smaller companies with regulations that they cannot possibly comply with or even keep up with. This government/big corporation back-scratching has always been a dangerous practice because economic power should be a positive check on government power, and vice versa. If the two should ever become combined, control of such massive power can lead only to tyranny. One of the best examples of this was the Italian model in the first half of the Twentieth Century under Mussolini’s Fascism.

Together, select business leaders who have agreed to help government impose Sustainablist (*Cont’d on Page 4*)

SUSTAINABLE...(Cont'd from Page 3) Habitat I conference said: *"Land green positions in their business policies, and officials at all levels of government are indeed merging the power of the economy with the force of government in Public/Private Partnerships on the local, state and federal levels.*

As a result, Sustainable Development policy is redefining free trade to mean centralized global trade "freely" crossing (or eliminating) national borders. It definitely does not mean people and companies trading freely with each other. Its real effect is to redistribute American manufacturing, wealth, and jobs out of our borders and to lock away American natural resources. After the regulations have been put in place, literally destroying whole industries, new "green" industries created with federal grants bring newfound wealth to the "partners." This is what Sustainablists refer to as economic prosperity.

ECOLOGICAL INTEGRITY

"Nature has an integral set of different values (cultural, spiritual and material) where humans are one strand in nature's web and all living creatures are considered equal. Therefore the natural way is the right way and human activities should be molded along nature's rhythms." from the UN's Biodiversity Treaty presented at the 1992 UN Earth Summit.

This quote lays down the ground rules for the entire Sustainable Development agenda. It says humans are nothing special – just one strand in the nature of things or, put another way, humans are simply biological resources. Sustainablism policy is to oversee any issue in which man reacts with nature – which, of course, is literally everything. And because the environment always comes first, there must be great restrictions over private property ownership and control. This is necessary, Sustainablists say, because humans only defile nature. In fact, the report from the 1976 UN

...cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Private land ownership is also a principle instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth, therefore, contributes to social injustice."

Under Sustainable Development there can be no concern over individual rights – as we must all sacrifice for the sake of the environment. Individual human wants, needs, and desires are to be conformed to the views and dictates of social planners. The UN's Commission on Global Governance said in its 1995 report: *"Human activity...combined with unprecedented increases in human numbers...are impinging on the planet's basic life support system. Action must be taken now to control the human activities that produce these risks"*

Under Sustainable Development there can be no limited government, as advocated by our Founding Fathers, because, we are told, the real or perceived environmental crisis is too great. Maurice Strong, Chairman of the 1992 UN Earth Summit said: *"A shift is necessary toward lifestyles less geared to environmentally-damaging consumption patterns. The shift will require a vast strengthening of the multilateral system, including the United Nations."*

The politically based environmental movement provides Sustainablism camouflage as they work to transform the American systems of government, justice, and economics. It is a masterful mixture of socialism (with its top down control of the tools of the economy) and fascism (where property is owned in name only – with no control). Sustainable Development is the worst of both the left and the right. It is not liberal, nor is it conservative. It is a new kind of tyranny that, if not stopped, will surely lead us to a new Dark Ages of pain and misery yet unknown to mankind.

POLITICAL...(Cont'd from Page 2)

almost 10 percent of California. It's an area equal to Connecticut, Delaware and Massachusetts combined. Moreover, to get all of this electricity into urban areas, miles and miles of wind turbines and solar panels must be linked to miles and miles of high tension power lines – the same kind all other energy sources need. There is no gain from solar or wind power – only loss of energy.

A true energy policy would see government getting out of the energy business and standing aside as the real experts fix the problem in a free market where consumers could pick their power of choice. A few acres for nuclear power plants would solve much of the nation's energy needs. Drilling for oil off shore and in Alaska will give us complete independence from foreign sources and will also keep America out of a lot of foreign turmoil.

Above all, American energy policy must allow for the building of new oil refineries. There hasn't been a new one built since the 1970's and several have been shut down – 10 in California alone. Every time one shuts down simply for repairs gas prices spike.

Yet these ideas are rejected for the politically correct alternatives. Such ideas are the current "wisdom" of our day. The source of such bad policy is special interest groups lining the pockets of mindless politicians to get their own agenda locked into federal mandate – but it doesn't solve America's energy problems. In fact it adds to them. As we fool around with such silly, unworkable dreams of a "carbonless footprint," Americans are paying \$3.00 at the pump and potential power blackouts threaten our cities. This is no way to run a country.



ID CARDS... (*Cont'd from Page 8*)

additional requirements, including biometric scans such as finger printing, retinal scans, or facial scans. Homeland Security has expressed a strong desire to require Radio Frequency Identification chips (RFID).

Eventually, through the use of smart chips, the driver's license will be transformed to include not only identification information, but employment, medical, financial and school records. It will serve as an ATM card, credit card, voter ID card, and, in the coming cashless society, access to your bank accounts.

The backers of such a system tell us that it will never be abused. It will exist solely to protect us. It will keep us safe from terrorists. Fingerprints and biometric scans will make it impossible to counterfeit, they assure us.

Not so. Here are the facts: The Fraunhofer Research Institute in Darmstadt, Germany, set out to see whether it could fool fingerprint, facial recognition and retinal scan security technology. Starting with facial recognition, they could fool it by holding up a photo of the authorized person. Further, since the system must store the photos of authorized persons in a database, hackers can break into the computer and steal them. Some systems are more sophisticated and watch to see if the person moves before allowing access. To beat it, simply put a video in front of the scanner.

Fingerprints are even easier to foil. When you put your finger on the reader you actually leave your fingerprint. Investigators found that often they could simply cup their hands around the reader and breathe on the old print, whereupon it would show up and let them in. And retinal scans; simply a high-resolution picture did the trick.

Americans are being fingerprinted at work and school and even Disney World on a routine basis. It goes into a database. Nearly every single super market issues a discount card where shoppers can get incredible discounts just by using the card. But to do so, establishes a data bank of your buying habits. Every credit card tracks where you purchase, establishing a database. Every bank profiles your finances, establishing a database. Should you acquire a sudden spike in your usual banking routine, the banks are required to notify the federal government, because you have broken your profile.

Under the Real ID system, the burden is put squarely

on legal, law abiding citizens in order to punish those who have broken our laws. Is that justice? Is that truly how we want our nation to operate? It's certainly not freedom.

But, say those who advocate such policy, we have no alternative. How else can we stop the invasion of illegals? How can we protect ourselves from terrorism?

Here are some actions that require no data banks and maintain freedom:

- A serious deployment of the National Guard along the border.
- Build the wall – not a virtual wall but a real one. Congress already approved it. Make it so.
- Encourage and support, not intimidate and prosecute Border Patrol Agents.
- Detain interdicted illegals until their court appearances and then immediately deport them, so we don't have over 600,000 disappearing while awaiting trial.
- Deny all but true emergency benefits and services to illegals.
- Prosecute sanctuary cities.
- Stop granting citizenship to the newborns of illegals. Federal law prohibits a criminal from benefiting from the fruits of their crime.
- Driver's licenses should not be issued to those who don't show proof of citizenship. No data bank is necessary for this. Americans have been doing it for years. This puts the burden on the illegals – not legal Americans.
- For those entering the country on a visa and applying for a driver's license, make the license expiration date correspond with the visa.

Where is the courage of our nation's elected officials to do these things before entrapping legal Americans in a totalitarian nightmare?

Americans should object to "solutions" that burden American private enterprise, hospitals and local services. It is so easy to hand down edicts that force private companies and hospital workers to bear the burden and the cost of screening for illegals. Yet government refuses to even force local police to do those tasks.

Federal data banks and national ID cards enforced on law abiding Americans isn't a bold solution for protection – rather it's political cowardice.



INSIDER'S REPORT

NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS: ASSAULT ON PRIVATE PROPERTY AND LOCAL COMMUNITY RULE

One of the dangerous pieces of legislation lying in wait as Congress reopens for business is the "Celebrating America's Heritage Act." The bill has already passed the House (H.R.1483) by a vote of 291-122 and now awaits action in the Senate. Why is it so dangerous?

If passed, it would create six new national Heritage Areas and increase federal funding for nine existing heritage areas by 50 percent. The bill would send over \$135 million of federal pork to special interests to be used to influence local zoning laws and help lock away private land in the name of historic preservation.

The six Heritage Areas to be created by the legislation include The Journey Through Hallowed Ground National HA, covering parts of Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania and West Virginia; Niagara Falls National HA in New York; Muscle Shoals National HA in Alabama; Freedom's Way National HA in Massachusetts and New Hampshire; Abraham Lincoln National HA in Illinois; and the Santa Cruz National HA in Arizona.

To understand the massive size and impact of these designations, consider the controversial "Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area" (JTHG). JTHG is designed to cover a 175-mile corridor from Thomas Jefferson's "Monticello" in Charlottesville, Virginia to the battlefield in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Sold as a way to "honor" and promote tourism to the many historic sites in the area where much of the Civil War was fought, the Heritage Area really serves as a stealth land grab. Heritage Areas are federal land use mandates with specific boundaries foisted on local communities. Those boundaries have consequences for property owners caught inside.

It must be understood the Heritage Area affects all the land in the designated area, not just recognized historic sights. The federal designation, made from congressional legislation, like H.R.1483, creating federal regulations and oversight through the National Park Service, require

a form of contract between state and local governmental entities and the Secretary of the Interior. That contract is to manage the land-use of the region for preservation. That means federal control and zoning, either directly, under the terms of the "management pact" or indirectly.

Such "indirect" control is the real danger. In spite of the specific language in the bill which states property rights will be protected, the true damage to homeowners may well come from private groups, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and preservation agencies which receive public funds through the Park Service to implement the polices of the Heritage Area.

The funds flowing from the Park Service provide a seductive pork barrel system for private advocacy groups to enforce their vision of development of the Heritage Area. The experience with more than twenty-four such Heritage Areas now in existence nationwide clearly shows such groups will convert this money into political activism to encourage local community and county governments to pass and enforce strict zoning laws. While the tactic makes it appear that home rule is fully in force, removing blame from the federal designation, the impact is fully the fault of the Heritage Areas designation. The result being private property owner's rights are diminished and much of the local land use brought to a standstill.

Zoning and land use policies are and should be local decisions to be made by locally elected officials who are directly accountable to the citizens they represent. However, National Heritage Areas corrupt this inherently local procedure by adding federal dollars, federal oversight, and federal mandates to the mix.

Specifically, when an area is designated a National Heritage Area, the Park Service partners with environmental or historic preservation special interest groups to "restore, preserve, and manage" anything and everything that is naturally, culturally, historically, and recreationally significant to the Heritage Area. That is exactly what

legislation for HR. 1143 says. This sweeping mandate ensures that every square inch of land, whether private or public is a prime target for regulation or acquisition.

But what of the promised tourism that is supposed to help local communities? Many members of Congress admit they support the concept of Heritage Areas for that very reason: jobs created by people visiting their little part of the world to see why it's so special. Is it true?

As has been stated, those boundaries have consequences – strict control over the use of the land. Certain industries may prove to be too “dirty” to satisfy environmental special interests. Eventually such existing industrial operations will find themselves regulated or taxed to a point of forcing them to leave or go out of business. Property that is locked away for preservation is no longer productive and no longer provides the community with tax dollars. Roads most assuredly will be closed (to protect the integrity of the historic area). That means land is locked away from private development, diminishing growth for the community. It also means hunting and recreational use of the land will most certainly be curtailed.

Eventually, such restrictions will take away the community's economic base. Communities with sagging economies become run-down and uninviting. Preservation zoning and lack of jobs force ordinary people to move away. Experience has shown tourism rarely materializes as promised. And it's never enough to save an area economically.

These are the reasons why the specific language in the Heritage Area legislation designed to protect private property rights is basically meaningless to the actual outcome. While the land is not specifically locked away in the name of the federal designation, its very existence creates the pressure on local government to act. The result is the same.

It is interesting to note that proponents of Heritage Areas refuse to even consider a program to officially notify landowners of pending Heritage Area designations. When specifically asked to include such notification in their plans, they shuffle their feet, say there is no way to do it and then drop the subject. Of course the ability is there. The mailman delivers to each and every one of the homes in the designated area every day. No matter how noble a project may sound, alarm bells should go off when proponents want to enforce their vision in secret.

The fact is the Heritage Area designations are completely unnecessary. Most of the historic sites are already under the control of the National Park Service, including Thomas Jefferson's home, Manassas Battle field (Bull Run – to you Yankees) and Gettysburg Battlefield. Several other birthplaces and significant historic sights are also well preserved.

The boundaries of Gettysburg, for example, were specifically laid out by the men who fought there. Most of the land was private and donated to the park by the owners more than 125 years ago. While protecting private property and the farms across which the battle raged, they preserved the most significant parts into what today is a comprehensive memorial.

This old system of voluntary contributions and non-coerced purchases of the land is far superior to a process that uses the massive power of the federal government to rip out the roots of property owners who are simply unlucky enough to live near something that should be special and precious. Given their way, many preservationist special interest groups would set out to turn the entire nation into a museum.

In contrast, it is significant to note that today, as a coercive preservation policy is imposed in Gettysburg, the community has seen the near destruction of its once vital downtown where private businesses are being forced out. Many parts of downtown now seem rundown and void of significant businesses like clothing shops or hardware stores. Most businesses in the downtown area today are restaurants and tee shirt shops designed for the tourist industry. That's not the way for a town to build a future.

Every step of land had something from the past occur on it. But let us remember, those who fought on these fields of “hallowed ground” did so to protect our liberty, including ownership of private property. One must ask how they would react to huge government restrictions over the land now, simply because they fought there. One can envision them again taking up arms to free it from government clutches.

Proponents of Heritage Areas are using our great love of history as an emotional sledgehammer to impose a massive federal pork barrel scheme that enriches the pockets of private advocacy groups by helping to impose draconian controls over the dreams of average American homeowners.



SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY



ID CARDS AND DATABANKS ARE NOT THE SOLUTION



In this age of terrorism and out-of-control illegal immigration, it is a growing belief by many Americans that we must all be regulated, restricted, licensed, registered, directed, checked, inspected, measured, numbered, counted, stamped, authorized, fined, harassed, disarmed, exploited and taxed in the name of protection. Trouble is, that outlook is just plain wrong and it isn't freedom.

According to a report from the London-based Privacy International, "privacy is being extinguished in country after country." The report also noted that privacy was improving in the former communist states of eastern Europe, but it is worsening across Western Europe and the United States. According to the report, of forty seven countries surveyed, Malaysia, Russia and communist China ranked worst, but Great Britain and the United States also fell into the lowest-performing group of "endemic surveillance societies."

As technology develops, data banks of personal information are being collected on everything from medical records, to financial and employment histories, to school records, to buying habits at the super market. The government is building data banks on farm animals. Our cars have little black boxes, which record data on our driving habits. In addition, the uses of video cameras, computer chips and biometric screening to monitor our activities are growing rapidly.

Step by step, using a wide variety of good excuses, Americans are allowing themselves to be fingerprinted, their eyes scanned, computer chips inserted under their skin, providing DNA, and more.

The most important question one must ask before relying completely on available technology is "who's in control of it?" We can create technology to do literally anything. But should we? The question is important because some of the same technology that will make our lives better can, in the wrong hands, make our lives a living hell. As more and more legislation is offered as solutions to illegal immigration, we must also ask

"where are the guarantees to legal Americans that there is identity protection?"

Creation of the National ID

In 2005, Congress passed the Real ID Act, a "counter-terrorism" measure recommended by the 9/11 commission. The act sets national standards for driver's licenses. The bill requires states to link databases containing sensitive personal information such as Social Security numbers. State databases must contain a digital image and a paper copy of each birth certificate and other identifying documents.

Although issued by the states, through the Department of Motor Vehicles, the Real ID is a national identification card system. States must comply with federal guidelines by May, 2008. If states fail to meet that deadline, then driver's licenses from non-complying states will not qualify as official identification and so cannot be used to get on airplanes or obtain services, including medical care.

Without authorized federal identification, access to voting booths may be denied. Many states now use computerized voting machines. In those states, a voter's name is now issued a bar code and permanent identification numbers on registration lists. Unless everything matches up, one can't be allowed in the voting booth.

As the Real ID Act is fully implemented, federally-authorized driver's licenses will be essential for one to be a full participant in American society. Failure to have it will literally shut one out from opening a bank account, getting a loan, gaining employment, a marriage license medical care and purchase of firearms.

Yet, the government continues to deny that the Real ID Act is a National ID.

Proponents argue that no national data bank will be established, that it will only use the records created by the state Departments of Motor Vehicles. At a minimum, states must include on their new driver's license name, birth date, sex, ID number, a digital photo and employ "machine readable technology." Therein is the danger.

Under the Act, Homeland Security can mandate

(Cont'd on Pg. 5)