THE **DEWEESE** REPORT

Volume 19 - Issue 2 February 2013

The key word in opposing a Con Con

By Tom DeWeese

The call for a new Constitutional Convention (Con Con), particularly from Conservative circles, is starting to grow at an alarming rate. Several Conservative organizations, particularly the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) and the Goldwater Institute (among others) are telling Conservative state legislators that they can call for a Con Con and control the subject and the outcome of such an event.

That is simply not true. The reason: "Precedent." There has been only one Con Con in U.S. history. That was in 1787. Delegates to this gathering (not originally planned as a Con Con) were given specific instructions by their states and a very strongly worded resolution by Congress limiting the meeting to the "sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation." Those instructions were completely ignored. As soon as the delegates arrived in Philadelphia, the doors were closed and the meeting was kept secret until finally they were opened to announce a complete new Constitution. That is a Precedent!

Second, the Articles of Confederation specifically called for 100% support from the states before any changes could be made to it. Obviously a new Constitution qualifies as a change! But ratification of the new Constitution operated under the yet unratified Article VII of the new Constitution, which called for a vote of approval of just three fourths of the states. That is a Precedent!

Further, there is nothing in Article V to give instructions on how to organize a Con Con after the required number of states call for it and Congress agrees to comply. There is nothing to tell us who the delegates should be, where they should come from, what their qualifications should be, or what rules they need to follow. The fact is, once Congress calls for the Con Con, and the delegates are chosen, that Con Con body becomes the most powerful force in the nation. Congress has no control over what they do, or how they do it. And the Precedents say they can do anything, including writing a new Constitution -- and that new Constitution can be voted into power anyway the delegates decide.

Those pushing for a new Constitutional Convention are deluded if they think they can dictate what issues are to be debated. Many proponents of the Con Con are smugly telling legislators in the many states that there is no danger of bad things happening because the states must ratify what they do. The **Precedent** says otherwise. It says the delegates can decide how a new constitution is ratified. Moreover, may I point out that just last year, 75% of the American people opposed Obamacare, but Congress passed it anyway. Do we really want to put our precious Constitution on an operating table so those who think like Obama, Reid, and Pelosi can operate on it to their own satisfaction? That is exactly what we are doing if we allow a Con Con to be called.

We were lucky in 1787. Our young nation had some incredible leaders who, while breaking the rules, gave us a great governing document. However, in today's political atmosphere, where the prevailing attitude by government leaders is that the Constitution stands in their way of enforcing massive government control over our lives and our fortunes, do we really want to gamble that a Con Con will improve things rather than destroy the greatest governing document in history? I fully believe the timing is all wrong for such a possibility and, for these reasons, will do everything I can to stop all calls in every state for a Con Con.

PAGE 2 - GOVERNMENT OF, BY AND FOR ACTIVISTS BY RON ARNOLD

PAGE 3 - QUOTES: OBAMA BRINGS GOD INTO THE CLIMATE-CHANGE FIGHT

PAGE 4 - SHORTS: NEWS FROM THE CENTER ON CONSUMER FREEDOM PAGE 5 - CONNECTING THE DOTS BY TOM DEWEESE

PAGE 8 - TYRANNY: WHO'S AFRAID OF FRACKING? BY PAUL DRIESSEN

February 2013 DeWeese

Government of, by and for activists

University think tank's lawsuit raises serious questions about the old and new EPA

By Ron Arnold

Lisa Jackson's resignation as administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has focused attention on the "unfinished agenda" she leaves for this agenda-driven agency's next director (probably Clinton era assistant EPA administrator and current California Air Resources Board chairwoman Mary Nichols).

One of the most notable leftovers involves an activist think tank that recently informed EPA it intends to file a lawsuit demanding that the agency establish a cap-and-trade system for transportation fuels. The group had petitioned EPA in 2009 to regulate and ration how much motor fuel goes into the U.S. economy from refiners and fuel importers - thereby putting EPA in charge of cars, trucks, boats, trains and planes, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prevent alleged "dangerous manmade global warming." Jackson's EPA did not respond, leaving the lawsuit and potential regulations to the next administrator.

The litigious attack dog is the Institute for Policy Integrity, an adviserridden think tank lodged at the New York University Law School and supported by foundation grants. Deeply incestuous connections between IPI, anti-fossil fuel groups and EPA officials raise troubling questions: Did the Jackson-era agency invite the lawsuit (or at least welcome the litigation), to "force" it to impose deeply unpopular regulations once President Obama was safely reelected? And why does "integrity" at NYU always seem to mean "do things in accord with leftleaning, anti-hydrocarbon ideologies and agendas"?

IPI was created in 2008 by two NYU professors, Law School Dean Richard Revesz and adjunct professor Michael Livermore, co-authors of Retaking Rationality: How Cost-Benefit Analysis Can Better Protect the Environment and Our Health. They are creating not the rule of law, but the rule of lawyers – in league with activists in and out of government (through a huge revolving door: out of green groups into government, and vice versa) who employ insider knowledge and

constant pressure to impose expensive, job -killing rules that Congress never intended and do little for the environment or human health.

The eco-elite's presence on the IPI's 22-member advisory board is impressive: high-ranking officials of the Environmental Defense Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council, World Wildlife Fund, League of Conservation Voters, Resources for the Future and Union of Concerned Scientists. The combined assets of these BANANA groups (Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near Anything) exceed \$885 million.

The IPI's former-bureaucrat firepower is even more staggering. It includes a deputy secretary of state for management and resources, two former head lawyers at the EPA, and one lawyer from the Food and Drug Administration. There are also lawyers from the Department of Justice, Office of Management and Budget, and Occupational Safety and Health Administration, along with legal advisers from the White House Council on Environmental Council Quality, Economic Advisers, Office of Science and Policy, Technology and administration's special Task Force on the Auto Industry.

Finally, the big guns: Clinton White House Chief of Staff John Podesta left IPI to lead the liberal think tank Center for American Progress, while Jack Lew departed the IPI in January 2012 to serve as President Obama's White House chief of staff.

They all share the same goal: enrich and empower activists, bureaucrats and liberal politicians – while controlling

DeWeese Report

Vol. 19, No. 2 February 2013

Published by The American Policy Center

> Editor Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/ Fulfillment Lola Jane Craig Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout
CJ Scrofani
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report PO Box 129 Remington, VA 22734

Web Page: www.deweesereport.com

Copy Right 2013 The American Policy Center Issn 1086-7937 All Rights Reserved

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 DeWeese Report (unless
another author is listed).
All reprints must carry the
DeWeese Report address
and phone numbed.
Samples of the reprint
must be provided to the
DeWeese Report

Continued to Page 6

DeWeese Report Page 3

Obama Brings God Into the Climate-Change Fight

President Adds Climate Change To Lengthy To-Do List

Barack Obama's second inaugural address was a manifesto on how he intends to transform the United States into a European- style socialism. Amazingly, he outlined it by using words rarely if ever heard from him, including quotes of our Founding Fathers and even God. Now he intends to use the threat of God's wrath over Climate Change as a new scare tactic. Dutifully, the world news media is falling all over itself to make it all sound like sanity. TAD

"Some may still deny the overwhelming judgment of science, but none can avoid the devastating impact of raging fires, and crippling drought, and more powerful storms... That is how we will preserve our planet, commanded to our care by God. That's what will lend meaning to the creed our fathers once declared." President Barack Obama, Second Inaugural Address, 21 January 2013

"By bringing in God, Obama is attempting to reframe the issue as one that transcends not only partisanship but the divide between those who believe in science and those who doubt science but believe in God. Left or right, atheist or creationist—either way, Obama is saying, we've got to do something." Will Oremus, Slate, 21 January 2013

"Obama's decision to include the climate issue in his speech signals that he's at least hoping to pursue yet another very difficult legislative goal. And climate change is about as difficult as any of the other items. Legislating the issue is even more difficult than finding a public consensus. With Democrats now in the minority in the House and with a smaller Senate majority, it's hard to see how [climate] legislation would pass now, without being significantly scaled back or without some pressing new impetus. Even in the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy, there wasn't a concerted push on climate change. And given all the more time-sensitive issues on the table right now, it's unlikely climate change will become a real priority any time soon."

Aaron Blake, The Washington Post, 21 January 2013

"Barack Obama has only four years to save the world. That is the stark assessment of Nasa scientist and leading climate expert Jim Hansen who last week warned only urgent action by the new president could halt the devastating climate change that now threatens Earth. Crucially, that action will have to be taken within Obama's first administration, he added."

Robin McKie, The Observer, Sunday 18 January 2009

"President Obama couldn't have been clearer today, and for most scientists, his vote of confidence would have come not a moment too soon... Unlike economic recession and wars, which pass, climate change does not, and there are deadlines if we want to avoid a point of no return. In fact, scientists calculate that Obama has four years in which to save the world. So Obama has a unique opportunity to fix the recession and fix climate change at the same time. He just has to have the nerve to follow through. And this year, of all years, leadership matters, because the world hopes to thrash out a global deal to cut emissions. So if he does stick to his promises on renewables, energy efficiency, carbon capture and storage and hybrid vehicles, he'll help loosen the grip that fossil fuels hold on all our lives."

Susan Watts, BBC Newsnight, 20 January 2009

"One of his most passionate moments was even devoted to addressing "climate change," of all things. He rarely mentioned the subject in the election campaign. But doing something about global warming is a commandment in the modern liberal catechism, and now Mr. Obama says it will be a major priority in the next four years. He even used the stock liberal description that those who disagree with him on climate change "deny" scientific fact. It's another example of deliberately stigmatizing his opposition." Editorial, The Wall Street Journal, 22 January 2013

Source: Dr. Benny Peiser, Director, Global Warming Policy Foundation

February 2013 DeWeese Report

News from the Center on Consumer

New York's Anti-Prohibitionists Get Day in Court

On January 24, 2013, a New York court heard the argument by groups opposing the New York City ban on sodas larger than 16 ounces in restaurants and other eateries. Advocates for consumer choice argued that the prohibition was improperly passed, discriminated against particular businesses, and unfairly targeted certain demographics.

A Senior Research Analyst for the Center on Consumer Freedom (CCF) told *AMNewYork* that the ban was improperly approved, and should have gone through the elected city council and not Mayor Michael Bloomberg's handpicked bureaucracy. The reason Bloomberg chose the route that he did is obvious: The ban is notoriously unpopular, even in liberal New York City.

However the New York court rules, the legal maneuvering behind the most prominent law banning the purchase of a beverage since the Volstead Act is informative. Anti-food crusaders know that they do not have the support of the public, so they have to find ways to impose their will while ignoring public opinion.

As the CCF Executive Director tells Forbes readers, activists won't be satisfied until laws like New York's ban are in force denying consumers choices. Their current claim is that food is "addictive" like illegal drugs, even though as Cambridge University scientists found in an assessment of the evidence, there is "no conclusive evidence of a human withdrawal syndrome from foods."

The goal? Kelly Brownell—godfather of the soda and food taxes opposed by roughly 60 percent of Americans in a litany of surveys by several pollsters—claims that food addiction will "change the legal landscape," opening the door to more regulations and large-scale lawsuits. In short, they hope that shaky science will lead to more hops on pop, and less consumer choice.

Would PETA Kill Monopoly's Scotty Dog?

The latest "press sluts" stunt by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) may just take the (noegg) cake for a combination of audacity and pointlessness. The group that would take away your right to eat bacon and eggs, watch performing elephants and whales, wear leather, fur, or wool, or take advantage of lifesaving medical advancements developed by animal trials is positioning itself as an advocate for shelter pets by demanding that the Monopoly game's Scotty dog token be changed to a mutt.

Mutts may be adorable, but they have no ally in PETA. After all, PETA kills the vast majority — frequently over 90 percent in a given year — of the dogs and cats it takes in at its Virginia animal shelter. According to records filed with the Commonwealth, PETA has killed nearly 28,000 shelter pets since 1998. Perhaps before it tries to "rescue" a pewter pooch, it should rescue the puppies right under its nose.

But would it? PETA—like its comrades-in-"fakon" at the Humane Society of the United States—may make a point of standing up for pets, but its real ideology of "total animal liberation" would make all pets cease to exist.

Don't believe us? Listen to PETA President Ingrid Newkirk, who has said that in her utopia "companion animals [pets] would be phased out." You could also ask the PETA staffer who called upon a Florida region to become a "no-birth community" or the PETA officials who publicly objected to Norfolk, Virginia's plan to reduce euthanasia at the city animal shelter. (Who needs a so-called "animal shelter" that kills over 90 percent of the pets in its care if the city pound does a better job of promoting adoptions?)

After all, North Carolina trial records show that PETA staff had no problem killing dogs and cats they classified as "adorable" and "perfect." It's probably good for both Scotty dogs and mutts both that PETA keeps away from them. Their brothers and sisters who have had the misfortune of getting too close to PETA have not generally lasted very long. In Monopoly, at least, PETA should go directly to jail.

Copyright © 2013 Center for Consumer Freedom. All Rights Reserved. P.O. Box 34557 | Washington, DC 20043 | Tel: 202-463-7112 | info@consumerfreedom.com DeWeese Report Page 5

Connecting the Dots

From the United Nations to your state government

By Tom DeWeese

Proponents of Sustainable Development constantly tell us that their plans are just local. And they deride those who accuse them of imposing an international agenda. Kooks. Fringe Fanatics. Conspiracy Theorists. These are just some of the labels they pin on those fighting to expose Agenda 21. Moreover, they sarcastically ask, "how can an obscure twenty year old document be a threat to local policy? Tsk Tsk."

Well, let's take just one example and follow it through the process. Let's get acquainted with the Earth Charter. If Agenda 21 is the blue print – the Earth Charter is the manifesto.

Below is a report, provided, in part, by Christopher Woodwardon detailing the Earth Charter, its history and its purpose. He writes...

"...The Earth Charter is an international declaration, which calls for "building a just, sustainable, and peaceful global society for the 21st century." It is a soft law document as opposed to a treaty (just like Agenda 21), backed by the United Nations. It has been launched onto the world stage through a UN operation called the Earth Charter Initiative. In its name, the UN is quietly building a grassmovement made up of Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and individuals to bring its ideas and principles into national government and local communities. This is being carried out through various Task Force groups and volunteer networks of supporters who are working to implement the charter into different areas of life, including business, education and religion."

The Fundamental Message of the Earth Charter

Woodwardon goes on to explain, "The Earth Charter is around 2400 words long and contains sixteen principles. The preamble states that the world is becoming "increasingly interdependent and fragile" and calls for a "sustainable global society." It states that the dominant patterns of production and consumption are causing "environmental devastation" and warns about overpopulation, the widening gap between rich and poor, the extinction of species and depletion of the world's resources.

It goes on to call for the emergence of a 'global civil society' and states that "our environmental, economic, political, social, and spiritual challenges are interconnected."

The underlying philosophy of the Charter is a pagan one, whereby Mother Earth and nature are to be worshiped, and as such it opposes the Judeo-Christian belief that God is separate from his creation and man has dominion over the Earth," says Woodwardon.

"This is the exact philosophy behind the purpose of Agenda 21, and in fact, the documents go hand in hand, much

like the American Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution are inseparable as our nation's founding documents. One, the Declaration, provides the philosophy behind the nation, the other, the Constitution, outline the way it is to be implemented. So too are the Earth Charter and Agenda 21. One, the Earth Charter, describes the philosophy, and Agenda 21 describes how is will be achieved," points out Woodwardon..

History of the Earth Charter

Concludes Woodwardon, "The idea of an Earth Charter originated out of the 1987 World Commission on Environment and Development, but the moves towards drafting the Earth Charter began in earnest in 1994 when Mikhail Gorbachev, as president of Green Cross International, and Maurice Strong, chairman of the Earth Council, joined forces to draft the earth charter as a civil society initiative, with funding from the government of the Netherlands. In late 1996 the Earth Charter Commission, co-chaired by Gorbachev and Strong was formed to oversee the drafting process, and a draft was presented at the Rio+5 Forum in 1997, where world leaders met to review their progress on the 1992 Rio Earth Summit.

The final text of the Earth Charter was agreed on at a meeting of the Earth Charter Commission at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris in March 2000, and the Charter was formally launched on June 29, 2000 at The Peace Palace in The Hague, the Netherlands.

Since its launch, over 4500 organizations have endorsed the Charter, including international bodies such as UNESCO and the World Conservation Union, the 2001 U.S. Conference on Mayors, various government bodies, faith-based groups and youth organizations."

The Ark of Hope

The original copy of the Earth Charter has been placed in a specially constructed Ark of Hope, a 49 inch (124.5cm) by 32 inch (81.3cm) by 32" (81.3cm) wooden chest that is built to resemble the Biblical Ark of the Covenant, but contains occult symbolism. The Ark of Hope was launched by Steven C. Rockefeller at an event called For Love of Earth, a celebration of the Earth Charter that took place on 9 September 2001 at Shelburne Farms, Vermont. The Ark is taken on tour each year across parts of

February 2013 DeWeese Report

Activists Continued from page 2

and impoverishing the rest of us – all in the name of protecting the environment.

Lisa Jackson leaves a scary legacy that time-bombs like IPI's transportation fuel cap-and-trade scheme will greatly expand. EPA is already prepared to unleash its first wave of carbon dioxide regulations — to augment punitive taxes that some members of Congress want to impose on hydrocarbon use and carbon-dioxide emissions, and new treaty obligations that United Nations climate alarmists are devising to regulate energy use at the international level.

Any one of these actions would send new shock waves through America's still weak economy. If all three are imposed – especially in conjunction with Obamacare, just-passed tax hikes on small business job creators, and reams of other government regulations – the impacts will be devastating. EPA alone inflicts some \$353 billion in annual regulatory burdens, notes a report by the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

Under President Obama and Ms. Jackson, EPA conducted illegal experiments on humans and imposed 2,071 new rules whose benefits exist mostly in computer models and press releases. Indeed, the rules often worsen human health and welfare, by increasing joblessness and thus poverty, stress, poor nutrition, and the risk of strokes and heart attacks, spousal, child and alcohol abuse, suicide and premature death.

Predictably, IPI's lawsuit notice to EPA exploited public susceptibility to misinformation about severe weather events. "The damage caused by Superstorm Sandy was widely linked to some of the potential risks associated with a warming planet." Climate alarmists have certainly tried to make that link.

However, as many analysts have noted, Earth has not warmed for 16 years, hurricane and tornado frequency and intensity are *below* normal, the rate of sea level rise has not changed, and storms like Sandy, Isabel, Katrina and the "Long Island Express" have repeatedly battered the United States and Canada over the centuries. Moreover, U.S. carbon dioxide emissions are at their lowest level in twenty years, even as 57 million new energy users have been added to America's economy since 1992. Global atmospheric CO2 levels nonetheless continue to rise, because of emissions from China, India and other nations.

Radical groups like IPI, grant-hungry scientists, and politicians seeking to scapegoat their decisions to allow development in low-lying coastal areas naturally want to link Sandy to hypothetical global warming. But numerous experts — including Martin Hoerling, chairman of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's climate variability research program — say there is no link.

The new EPA boss will have many other dimwitted and outright fraudulent regulatory disasters to cope with – or perpetrate and perpetuate. Among the most explosive are the agency's costly new standards for atmospheric ozone (which would send most U.S. counties into noncompliance) and rules slashing allowable soot emissions from smokestacks, diesel trucks and other sources. The science behind both the earlier and proposed soot standards is not just highly questionable; it has also involved unethical testing of human subjects at pollution levels that EPA claims are "deadly," but which did not kill anyone – or even make them sick. A lawsuit by the American Tradition Institute places the messy human rights, medical ethics, regulatory misconduct issue before the courts for the new EPA administrator to untangle.

But IPI's lawsuit will remain high on the new EPA's to-do list. IPI Executive Director Michael Livermore demands that the EPA "make a finding" that transportation emissions might endanger public welfare, "propose a cap-and-trade system" for transportation fuels, find that aircraft fuels "endanger" public health, "propose a joint rulemaking with the Federal Aviation Administration" to include aircraft fuels in the cap-and-trade scheme, and finalize the regulations within 90 days!

Lisa Jackson did not pick up the phone and immediately tell NYU Law School Dean Richard Revesz, "Yes, sir. Right away, sir. Anything else, sir?" In fact, she said nothing at all, which is what provoked the IPI's lawsuit – but also ensured that these messy issues did not create new problems for President Obama's reelection campaign.

However, if Jackson or her successor ultimately agrees to these claims, it will look suspiciously like a "sweetheart lawsuit" – one in which the agency welcomed IPI litigation, to justify implementing a long-hidden agenda, now that President Obama is safely ensured of his second term.

If EPA settles such a suit without going to trial, the public (and Congress) would have no voice in a decision that upends the transportation system that moves and supplies America. Of course, the EPA action would further advance President Obama's stated goal of "fundamentally transforming" the United States.

Columnist Ron Arnold is executive vice president of the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise. Portions of this report appeared originally in *The Washington Examiner* and are reproduced by permission.

DeWeese Report Page 7

Fracking? Continued from Page 8

- "We have never had any cases of groundwater contamination from hydraulic fracturing," Elizabeth Ames Jones said in 2011. The then-chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, which supervises natural gas, added: "It is geologically impossible for fracturing fluid to reach an aquifer a thousand feet above."
- "We have drilled 3,500 wells in Arkansas and explored every complaint of a compromised well," Lawrence Bengal, director of the state's Oil and Gas Commission, noted in 2011. "We have found no fracturing fluid in any of those well complaints."
- While California last month unveiled new disclosure and monitoring rules for fracking, Tim Kustic, the Golden State's oil-and-gas supervisor, told the *San Jose Mercury News*: "There is no evidence of harm from fracking in groundwater in California at this point in time. And it has been going on for many years."
- "We've used hydraulic fracturing for some 60 years in Oklahoma, and we have no confirmed cases where it is responsible for drinking water contamination nor do any of the other natural gas—producing states," Bob Anthony, chairman of the state's public-utilities commission, wrote in August 2010.
- "In the 41 years that I have supervised oil and gas exploration, production, and development in South Dakota, no documented case of water-well or aquifer damage by the fracking of oil or gas wells, has been brought to my attention," said the Department of Environment's Fred

Steece. "Nor am I aware of any such cases before my time." Steece commented in a June 2009 New York DEC document that cites regulators from 15 states who identified <u>zero</u> examples of fracking-related water pollution.

"Facts matter," says Robert Bryce, a Manhattan Institute senior fellow and author of four books on energy. "Over the past six decades, the fracturing process has been used more than 1 million times on American oil and gas wells. If it were as dangerous as the anti-drilling/antihydraulic fracturing crowd claims, then hundreds, perhaps thousands, of water wells would have been contaminated by now. That hasn't happened." Adds Bryce, who also appears in *FrackNation*: "The simple truth is that the shale revolution is the best possible news for the U.S. economy, and it's coming at a time when good economic news is desperately needed."

The officials quoted here are neither gas-company executives nor petro-publicists. These are public servants who oversee this industry, and many work or have worked for red-tape-loving Democrats. Nonetheless, they are unafraid of fracking. Clearly, frackophobes have nothing to offer but fear itself.

— New York commentator Deroy Murdock is a Fox News contributor, a nationally syndicated columnist with the Scripps Howard News Service, and a media fellow with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University.

January 11 2013

Connecting the Dots *Continued from page 5*

the world to promote the Earth Charter, visiting hundreds of schools and universities.

Implementation at the local level

So how is all of that a threat from local government. Let me guide you through three documents to connect the dots. The first, of course, is the Earth Charter. You can read it on the web at http://www.earthcharterinaction.org. Consider carefully its full impact, if implemented in your community or in state laws.

The second document is the ICLEI Charter (http://www.icleiusa.org). It boldly states ICLEI's "mission." "To build and serve a worldwide movement of local governments to achieve tangible improvements in global sustainability with special focus on environmental conditions through cumulative local actions." And then look at ICLEI's statement of "Principles," those goals it is organized to implement in its "cumulative local actions." "The Association shall promote, and ask its individual members to adopt, the following EARTH CHARTER Principles to guide LOCAL action." In other words, communities that join ICLEI for its local planning guidance are AGREEING TO ENFORCE THE EARTH CHARTER ON OUR HOME TOWN.

But, say your local officials, we aren't imposing international policy – it's all local. Well, consider the third

document in this effort to connect the dots. This is taken from the government website of the state of Washington, Department of the Ecology. In reading it (available on the state's official website http://www.ecv.wa.gov/Sustainability/) notice two things. First in paragraph 3, it quotes "Our Common Future." This was the special report from the Brundtland Commission This was the 1987 UN Commission on Environmental and Development, chaired by Gro Harlem Brundland, Vice President of the World Socialist Party. In that report the term Sustainable Development was first coined. And the report was the precursor to Agenda 21 and the Earth Charter. The Washington state government document describes the Earth Charter as a "reference document." In other words, the Earth Charter is being used by the government of the state of Washington as a guideline for state environmental and development policy.

Can the dots be connected any more clearly? This is a direct link between UN international Agenda 21 policy and American state government. That state government, using the Earth Charter as a guideline, passes regulations down to the local communities to enforce environmental and development policy. That's how it works in every federal, state and local policy today across the nation.

February 2013 DeWeese

Who's afraid of fracking?

Federal and state environmental officials have given hydraulic fracturing a clean bill of health. Why do radical environmentalists continue to wage war on this game-changing technology?

By Paul Driessen

If frackophobes are to be believed, naturalgas fracking is the most frightful environmental nightmare since Japan's Fukushima nuclear-power plant melted down amid an earthquake and tsunami in March 2011.

In *Promised Land*, Matt Damon's new antifracking film funded by the United Arab Emirates, one character demonstrates this production technique's "dangers" by drenching a toy farm with household chemicals and then setting it ablaze.

In the upcoming *pro*-fracking film, FrackNation, one Pennsylvania homeowner absurdly claims that fracking polluted his well water with *weapons-grade* uranium. (For details, watch AXS-TV on Tuesday, January 22, at 9 P.M. EST.)

In an agitprop poster from the group New Yorkers Against Fracking, the Statue of Liberty furiously topples natural-gas drilling towers with her torch as energy-company big rigs flee in horror.

These warnings might be believable if fracking regulators seemed even slightly worried. Instead, federal and state environmental officials appear positively serene about hydraulic fracturing, a decades-old technology that uses sand and chemically treated water to shatter shale deposits 5,000 to 8,000 feet below the water table and liberate natural gas from the ruptured rocks.

- "In no case have we made a definitive determination that the fracking process has caused chemicals to enter groundwater," Environmental Protection Agency administrator Lisa Jackson stated last April. In May 2011, she told the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: "I'm not aware of any proven case where the fracking process itself has affected water."
- The EPA tested drinking water in Dimock, Pa., which ecologists claim fracking has tainted. "EPA has determined that there are not levels of contaminants present that would require additional action by the Agency," it concluded last July. Regional administrator Shawn M. Garvin added: "The Agency has used the best available scientific data to provide clarity to Dimock residents and address their concerns about the safety of their drinking water."
- "A study that examined the water quality of 127 shallow domestic wells in the Fayetteville Shale natural-gas production area of Arkansas found no groundwater contamination associated with gas production," the U.S. Geological Sur-

vey announced Wednesday. "Methane is the primary component of natural gas," the report observed. "What methane was found in the water, taken from domestic wells, was either naturally occurring, or could not be attributed to natural gas production activities." USGS director Marcia McNutt elaborated: "This new study is important in terms of finding no significant effects on groundwater quality from shale gas development within the area of sampling."

- "Significant adverse impacts on human health are not expected from routine HVHF," or high-volume hydraulic fracturing, according to a February 2012 preliminary report from New York's Department of Environmental Conservation. Governor Andrew Cuomo (D., N.Y.) has pondered this issue since 2010 and promises further contemplation, including another draft of what DEC now calls an "outdated summary."
- "New York would be crazy not to lift the moratorium" against fracking, former governor Ed Rendell (D., Pa.) told the *New York Post* in November. The former chairman of the Democratic National Committee continued: "I told Governor Cuomo I would come to testify before any legislative committee. . . . It's a good thing to do.
- "I do find it stunningly hypocritical to buy gas that comes from fracking wells somewhere [else] in the U.S. and then say fracking is bad," John Hanger, Rendell's former secretary of environmental protection, remarked in the *Post*. "If you're saying no to gas, you're saying yes to more coal and oil." Hanger, a Keystone State Democratic gubernatorial contender, lately lauded the benefits of gas fracking:

Using more natural gas has slashed US carbon emissions and toxic air pollution — lead, mercury, arsenic, soot — in the nation's air by displacing large amounts of coal and oil. That cleaner air saves thousands of lives every year. And no nation in the world has cut its carbon emissions more than the US since 2006. Indeed, thanks in substantial part to shale gas, US carbon emissions are back to 1995 levels and fell about another 4 percent in 2012.