

# THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.AMERICANPOLICY.ORG

## The North American Union is Really a Debate Over Political Ideology

By Tom DeWeese

If you believe there should be no borders marking a specific entity called the United States of America, then a North American Union will not concern you. If you believe nationalism, meaning love and pride of country, is a bad thing, then a North American Union will not concern you. If you believe government control of the market, of health care, and of energy policy is a positive force, then a North American Union will not concern you. If you believe anyone should be allowed to enter our nation, even illegally, obtain work, taxpayer-paid social programs, and owe no allegiance to the U.S., then a North American Union will not concern you.

On the other hand, if you believe the United States is the most unique nation on Earth with a government designed to protect your natural liberties, an economic system unlike any other -- designed to create economic independence, and a judicial system unknown to any other nation, then a North American Union is a threat to all you hold dear.

Those currently working on such a plan do not share your ideals; they do not support your political positions. They do not understand nor care about your concerns. It's their political ideology and they see nothing wrong with what they are doing. They consider your opposition to their plans to "harmonize" the U.S. with Mexico and Canada old fashioned and out of date.

### The question is where do you stand?

The other side intends to marginalize your love of country and support of limited government. In fact, the other side doesn't want to debate the issue at all. It just wants to force its way on you, without discussion, without a vote, and without your involvement. And that is why they are trying to operate in secret.

Those of us who oppose this Union on ideological grounds intend to force that debate and let the American people decide how they wish to be governed. And that is why the other side is attacking us so viciously.

Incredibly, some of the most vicious attacks have come from so-called spokesman on the right -- apparently threatened by other conservatives who question Bush Administration policies. For example, In December of 2006, news commentator Michael Medvid fumed and spewed in a couple of blogs and on his radio show about the "nuts"

and "crazies" who question the true purpose of the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP).

### THE CHARGE:

*"This paranoid and groundless frenzy has been fomented and promoted by a shameless collection of lunatics and losers; crooks, cranks, demagogues and opportunists, who claim the existence of a top secret master plan to join the U.S., Canada and Mexico in one big super-state and to replace the good old Yankee dollar with a worthless new currency called 'The Amero.'" Michael Medved, December 28, 2006.*

### THE TRUTH:

Mexican economist and researcher **Miguel Pickard** wrote in an article, published by foreign press, detailing the "deep integration" planned for North America. He said there will be no single treaty and nothing will be submitted to legislatures of the three countries. Instead, he says, the plan for a "merged future" will be implemented through "the signing of regulations not subject to citizen review." He went on to report of several secret meetings held in all three nations, after which representatives signed "close to 300 regulations" installing a "Unified American Border Action Plan."

Pickard went on to express his view that President Bush is "vigorously pushing" the idea of a "North American

### IN THIS ISSUE:

4. ABSOLUTES: AGENDA 21 OR FREEDOM 21: MAKING THE RIGHT CHOICE
7. INSIDER'S REPORT: Why We Need the "We The People" Act (H.R. 300)
8. SPOTLIGHT ON THE OPPRESSORS: Terrorism as Taught by International Baccalaureate By *Allen Quist*

community.” Pickard concluded by saying the schedule calls for beginning with a customs union, then a common market, then a monetary and economic union, and finally the adoption of a single currency.

**Democrat Congressman Barney Frank** said in a letter concerning the Security and Prosperity Partnership, “It was done for the United States by the President, with no Congressional involvement. Indeed it is not even a treaty because it has not been ratified by the Senate.”

**CNN Anchorman Lou Dobbs** said during a report on the SPP, “Have our political elites gone mad?”

#### THE CHARGE:

*“Another delusion usually associated with these fears involves the construction of a ‘Monster Highway’ some sixteen lanes wide through Texas and the Great Plains, connecting two nations on either side for the borders for some nefarious but never-explained purpose.” Michael Medved, December 28, 2006*

#### THE TRUTH:

In April, 2006, TxDOT released a 4,000 page Environmental Impact Statement that described a corridor that will be 1200 feet wide (the size of four football fields). It will parallel Interstate 35, and be five lanes north and five lanes south (3 lanes for cars, 2 lanes for trucks). In the middle will be pipelines and rail lines. It will also have a 200 ft wide utility corridor. The corridor will start in Laredo, TX, run past Austin to the Texas-Oklahoma border. Plans ultimately call for building some 4,000 miles of highway with –rail lines and utility lines combined into super-corridors throughout Texas over the next 50 years.

“The Oklahoma-to-Mexico stretch would be just the first link in a 4,000 mile, \$184 billion network. The corridor would be up to a quarter mile across, consisting of as many as six lanes for cars and four for trucks, plus railroad tracks, oil and gas pipelines, water and other utility lines, and broadband cables.” *Associated Press, July 21, 2006.*

Central to the construction of the Trans Texas Corridor is the massive taking of 584,000

acres of private rich farm land, ranches and homes. Supreme Court-approved Eminent Domain will be used to acquire the land.

The Trans Texas Corridor is the first leg of what is called the NAFTA Super Highway scheduled to go through heartland America all the way to Canada.

The main reason for opposition (*for some nefarious but never-explained purpose*) is the lack of inspection of the truck’s cargo as they carry containers loaded in China and off loaded in Mexican ports and driven straight through to an Inland port in Kansas City (KC SmartPort), relying only on electronic screening for drive-through inspections. Moreover, Mexico will control its own customs facility in Kansas City and therefore able to inspect their own trucks on U.S. territory.

“This spring (2006), (KC) city officials signed off on a 50-year lease for the Mexican facility, with an option for 50 more years... The council earlier this year earmarked \$2.5 million in loans and \$600,000 in direct aid to SmartPort, which would build and own the inland customs facility and sublet it to the Mexican government through agreements with U.S. Customs and Border Protection... The Mexican government would have no significant investment and would occupy the customs facility operation rent free... SmartPort set up the deal to avoid imposing any expenses on Mexico above its ordinary border costs... SmartPort meanwhile is seeking a \$1.5 million grant from the U.S. Economic Development Administration to purchase high-tech gamma-ray screening devices for drive-through inspections of truck cargo... Confusion and secrecy have been hallmarks of the ambitious project. At the outset, Gutierrez (President, KC SmartPort) and others have said the customs facility would be sovereign Mexican soil similar to a foreign embassy.” *Posted by the Kansas City Star, 7-18-06*

Another objection to the highway system is the fact that foreign companies will operate the highways and collect tolls.

“On a single day in June (2006), an Australian-Spanish partnership paid \$3.6 billion to lease the Indiana Toll Road. An

## THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 13, No. 4 April 2007

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:  
apcmail@americanpolicy.org

Web Page:  
www.americanpolicy.org

© 2007 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.

Australian company bought a 99-year lease on Virginia's Pocahontas Parkway, and Texas officials decided to let a Spanish-American partnership build and run a toll road from Austin to Seguin for 50 years." *Associated Press, 7-15-06*

"One principle player is a Spanish construction company, which plans to build the highway and operate it as a toll road. But don't be fooled: the superhighway proposal is not the result of free market demand, but rather an extension of government-managed trade schemes like NAFTA that benefit politically-correct interests." *Texas Congressman Ron Paul*

#### THE CHARGE:

*"The record couldn't be more clear on the 'North American Union' - there's no one anywhere near the Bush administration, the Congress of the United States, Cabinet departments or even major think tanks who believes it's a good idea to merge Canada, Mexico and the U.S." Michael Medved, December 28, 2006*

#### THE TRUTH:

"Away from the spotlight, from Sept. 12 to 14 (2006), in Banff Springs (Canada), Minister of Public Safety Stockwell Day and Defense Minister Gordon O'Connor met with U.S. and Mexican government officials and business leaders to discuss North American integration at the second North American Forum...The focus of the event...included topics such as 'A North American Energy Strategy,' 'Demographic and Social Dimensions of North American Integration,' and 'Opportunities for Security Cooperation' - all topics where the public interest is at odds with that of big business elites...The public has been kept in the dark while the business elite have played a lead role in designing the blueprint for this more integrated North America." *Reported by the Toronto Star, 9-20-06*

Attending the Banff meeting were Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, former U.S. Trade Rep. Carla Hills, and Assistant Secretary

of State for Western Hemisphere Dr. Thomas Shannon.

Arizona State University is teaching that the U.S., Mexico and Canada need to be integrated into a unified superstate, where U.S. citizens of the future will be known as "North Americanists." The program openly calls for the integration of economic issues across the continent, and in many places goes further - such as the call for a common North American currency and an implied joint military.

"Reformist Mexican President Vicente Fox raises eyebrows with his suggestion that over a decade or two NAFTA should evolve into something like the European Union, with open borders for not only goods and investment but also people. He can rest assured that there is one voice north of the Rio Grand that supports his vision. To wit, this newspaper." *Robert L. Bartley, editor, The Wall Street Journal, editorial, July, 2, 2001.*

#### THE CHARGE:

*"Concerning the feds, the entire horror story about 'North American Union' is based upon the 'Security and Prosperity Partnership,' an utterly innocuous, open, above-board, well-advertised and widely publicized initiative to promote inter-governmental cooperation to fight terrorism, the threat of Avian flu, improve and tighten border security, and promote mutual prosperity." Michael Medved, December 28, 2006*

#### THE TRUTH:

"The SPP was not created by a treaty between the nations involved, nor was Congress involved in any way. Instead, the SPP is an unholy alliance of foreign consortiums and officials from several governments." *Texas Congressman Ron Paul*

Also attending the Banff meeting, according to Canadian CBC News, was Mel Hurtig, noted Canadian author. According to Hurtig, "We're talking about such an important thing, we're talking

about the integration of Canada into the United States. For them to hold this meeting in secret and to make every effort to avoid anybody learning it, right away you've got to be hugely concerned."

"According to the U.S. government website dedicated to the project ([www.spp.gov](http://www.spp.gov)), the SPP is neither a treaty nor a formal agreement. Rather, it is a 'dialogue' launched by the heads of state of Canada, Mexico, and the United States at a summit in Waco, Texas in March, 2005. What is a dialogue? We don't know. What we do know, however, is that Congressional oversight of what might be one of the most significant developments in recent history is non-existent. Congress has had no role at all in this 'dialogue' that many see as a plan for a North American union. According to the SPP website, this 'dialogue' will create new supra-national organizations to 'coordinate' border security, health policy, economic and trade policy, and energy policy between the governments of Mexico, Canada and the United States. As such, it is but an extension of NAFTA-and CAFTA-like agreements that have far less to do with the free movement of goods and services than they do with government coordination and management of international trade..." *Texas Congressman Ron Paul, 8-30-06*

If you expect to find a Bush Administration declaration that the United States of America will be replaced by a North American Union, forget it. If you think such a drastic change in our nation won't happen without a national debate and voter referendum - think again.

A close examination of just a few facts shows that a legal and institutional framework is indeed being put in place that could easily be switched into a full-fledged regional government.

Step by step, America is moving from NAFTA - to the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America - and indications are the SPP will lead toward the creation of a North American Community as a logical precursor to a North American Union.



# ABSOLUTES....!

## Agenda 21 or Freedom 21: Making the Right Choice

*By Tom DeWeese*

Which do you choose? A way of life where you are the master of your destiny, or one where virtually all decisions are made for you by one ruling body or another? It's the classic struggle facing every human on earth. Freedom or control.

Truth be known, there are many who actually choose control. It makes for a well-ordered society with few surprises. In a controlled society one doesn't have to make complicated career choices. Health care is provided.

Community planners decide where housing will be placed. Committees decide what industries are to be allowed and how they will operate. Self-appointed watchdogs decide the foods that you shall be permitted to eat, to protect our health, of course.

Family planners decide the number of children allowed and how they will be raised. Those children, of course, will be well taken care of every day in public education centers that not only provide a centrally planned curriculum, but also provide for all physical and mental health needs.

Economic security is promised in a better world as everyone equally sacrifices their earned wealth to the State so all may live in harmony, free of greed and the stress of daily living. Everything is well organized, peaceful and controlled. Everyone is secure in the knowledge that tomorrow will be just like today.

On the other hand, there is the chaos of what some call freedom. In such a society, people are fully responsible for their own actions. Untethered individuals throw a monkey wrench into a well-ordered society by inventing new gadgets that make life easier and more productive, but threaten old ways.

Imagine such a society in which parents get to decide how best to educate their children. And think of the irresponsibility of individuals actually being able to choose if and how they want to invest their money to prepare for retirement. In the so-called free society, people eat what they want without benefit of government approval. Children are part of the family that bore them, not overseen by the State. People start enterprises without asking permission. Nothing stays the same, except that individuals are secure in their homes and have the ability to live their lives as they choose.

Control today has a name. "Agenda 21." This is the name of a policy document first unveiled at the United Nations' Earth Summit in 1992. Implementation of the treaty is through a policy called Sustainable Development. This program is now the official policy of the United States and is being systematically imposed in every single state of the Union and in every city and

town. There are very few exceptions. Sustainable Development is no less than a ruling principle through which decisions for all aspects of our lives are determined through public/private partnerships between government (at all levels) and private institutions in our communities. They provide guidelines to determine business decisions; property use; medical care; education curriculum; foreign policy; economics; taxes; labor policy; career decisions; housing; building material; farming policy; and much more. Agenda 21 is based on the principle that government is the maker of rights.

If you choose freedom, then there is a counter to Agenda 21 and its Sustainable Development program. It's called Freedom 21, and it's quickly growing into a "freedom movement." Freedom 21 is not an organization. It is a loose coalition of groups and individuals who believe that our nation's Founding Fathers had it right when they established this nation as one with tightly controlled reins on government. The Founding Fathers believed that all individuals were born with their rights of individual liberty, and that government's job is to protect those rights as individuals pursue their own dreams and goals. That's the basis for the Freedom 21 agenda.

Freedom 21 was organized eight years ago by Henry Lamb (Environmental Conservation Organization), Tom DeWeese (American Policy Center), Craig Rucker and David Rothbard (Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow), and representatives of Eagle Forum. Today, this group is joined by The Chicago-based Heartland Institute, Edwatch of Minnesota, Freedom 21 Santa Cruz, Sovereignty International, and the American Land Foundation, based in Texas.

In its eight years, the Freedom 21 Campaign has served as a mechanism for reaching out to the freedom movement to share ideas and unite grassroots activists. Through Freedom 21 projects and conferences, the movement has been able to introduce leaders in other movements to the principles of freedom. Even more, one-issue activists are beginning to learn that they share common goals and adversaries with other grassroots movements. Freedom 21 has been instrumental in uniting Second Amendment defenders; property rights activists; free market advocates; tax opponents; personal privacy protectors; family autonomy champions; back-to-basics education activists, and many more. These single-issue activists have come to understand that they all share a common foe in Sustainable Development.

Today, Freedom 21 is providing invaluable tools to help


## ...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

fight back against the threat of the UN's Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development. Three years ago, Freedom 21 leaders developed a six-hour DVD presentation entitled, "Americas' Choice: Liberty or Sustainable Development," designed to help educate activists and elected officials. That DVD is still the most comprehensive presentation on the subject. The DVD was followed with production of a booklet for elected officials entitled, "Understanding Sustainable Development: A Guide for Public Officials."

In 2005, Freedom 21 turned its efforts toward creating new sources of funding for a cash-starved freedom movement. Freedom21.com is a unique Internet news service that gives \$2 of every member's monthly subscription fee to the freedom organization of the member's choice. Now, in 2007, the Freedom21 Credit Union has opened its doors, offering a unique opportunity for depositors, through the credit union, to help fund the organizations of their choice.

The most important project each year is the Freedom 21

national conference, this year scheduled for July 19 to 21 in Dallas, Texas. This year's conference is the only conference of its kind to focus entirely on the debate over the creation of a North American Union. The conference will feature addresses by Phyllis Schlafly, Henry Lamb, Patrick Wood, Michael Coffman, Cliff Kincaid and myself, to name a very few. Also invited to speak are Rep. Ron Paul and Jerome Corsi. Participants will learn about the Security and Prosperity Partnership, the Trans Texas Corridor, the Kansas City Smart Port, the role of immigration to the process, and the connections of the SPP with Sustainable Development. The conference educates, unites, inspires, and renews the spirit. Go to [www.freedom21.org](http://www.freedom21.org) for all the details. Freedom 21 is the gathering place for the freedom movement.

Collectivism, and its false promise of security, may be the accepted policy of the day, but the freedom movement is learning how to fight back. You can join the fight by registering to attend the 8th Annual Freedom 21 National Conference. 

## Hate Crime Legislation Will Target Your Freedom of Speech

*By Tom DeWeese*

A battle has been waging during the opening months of the 110th Congress over proposed Hate Crime legislation. The main bill currently before the House is H.R. 254, titled, "The David Ray Hate Crimes Prevention Act," introduced by Rep. Sheila Jackson-Lee (D-TX).

Opposition is growing against the legislation because hate crime laws would make certain types of speech a federal offense, allowing federal "thought police" to interfere in the law enforcement authority of states and local government. Such interference is blatantly unconstitutional.


HR. 254 would require every state to pass and enforce "anti-hate" laws, making it a federal crime to express bias against specifically federally protected groups. Some hate laws have been interpreted to mean documents like the Bible are hate literature and preaching from it is hate speech. Nowhere was this more clearly shown than in England under a similar law, where two men who called Islam "wicked" were indicted, and now face seven years in prison. The British law blatantly says "truth" cannot be used as a defense.

The main force supporting the bill is the Anti-Defamation League (ADL). This group was behind passage of the British law. The ADL is a radical organization, which routinely charges organizations more to its right, of hate speech. It appears that nearly any organization that does not accept the ADL's worldview is marked for advocating hate.

Freedom of speech and hate crime legislation are not compatible. Many organizations who advocate hate crime legislation, such as the ADL, are pushing for control of the Internet to stop "hate speech." While most people would interpret hate speech as being on the lines of neo-Nazi white supremacy, in reality the ADL really means groups which advocate issues like free enterprise, property rights, gun rights, etc.

In 2005, the ADL targeted the Freedom 21 Conference as an advocate of hate speech. Prior to the conference in Reno, Nevada, the ADL sent out alerts about the gathering. Their premise that Freedom 21 was advocating hate was the group's advocacy of private property rights. The ADL believes ownership of private property is a social injustice that oppresses the poor.

Others are now advocating that skeptics of global warming theories be denied the right to speak out. Still others advocate making it a crime to use the term "illegal aliens." Reason and rationality are thrown out the window for political correctness under so-called hate speech.

To preserve freedom of speech in America H.R. 254 must be stopped. In fact, now that many are protesting the bill, supporters on Congress are trying a new tactic. While using H.R. 254 as a shield, House Judiciary Committee Chairman John Conyers is quietly gathering support for yet another hate crimes bill entitled, "The Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2007. This bill is actually worse than HR. 254. Both must be stopped. Call your congressman and demand he/she stand for free speech and against any hate crime legislation. 

# INSIDER'S REPORT

## WHY WE NEED THE *We The People* ACT (H.R. 300)

The United States of America was created to be a Constitutional Republic, not a democracy. A Constitutionally-limited republic is restricted to the protection of individual rights. As outlined in our Constitution, the role of the federal government is strictly controlled in well-defined responsibilities. According to the 10th Amendment, all other powers and responsibilities are assigned to the 50 individual, sovereign States, which also are Republican governments.

A democracy is ruled by a majority of votes. Under such a system, no rights may be guaranteed since they can be overturned by a simple majority. The result of a democracy is a form of collectivism which denies individual rights.

Today, judges in federal courts are handing down decisions that many times over turn specific State laws that should be protected by the 10th Amendment. The assault on our Republican form of government by the use of such judicial powers affects all aspects of our society.

The common term is “activist judges.” Many believe a more accurate term is “Constitutionally-defiant” judges. So great is their power that school boards are literally banning everything from voluntary prayer in schools to wearing a tee shirt with a Christian message, for fear federal courts will take action against school officials. Now even state and local courts are making identical rulings from fear of being overturned by higher courts.

***“CONGRESS HAS A RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT THE STATES FROM THREATS TO THEIR REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT, WHETHER BY A FOREIGN POWER OR ONE OF THE OTHER TWO BRANCHES. GOVERNMENT BY JUDICIARY IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT. THEREFORE, CONGRESS MUST ACT TO REIN IN THE OUT-OF-CONTROL FEDERAL JUDICIARY.”***

Congressman Ron Paul (R-TX)

### PROBLEM

1. Federal judges are using their bench power to effectively make laws that have not been Constitutionally-created by Congress.
2. In recent years Federal judges regularly have struck down State and local laws in subjects such as religious liberty, sexual orientation, family relations, education and abortion.
3. This “government by Federal judiciary” causes a virtual nullification of the Tenth Amendment’s limitations on Federal Power.
4. Further, when Federal judges impose their preferred policies on State and local governments, instead of respecting the policies adopted by duly elected legislatures, city councils and county commissions – bodies duly elected by – and thus accountable – to the people, our republican form of government is threatened.
5. The Supreme Court, the highest court in the land, has issued decisions that, in effect, have overturned abortion laws of all 50 states.
6. There is looming danger that Federal judges with political agendas will use their bench powers to overturn voter-approved ballot measures and legislative efforts in such issues as the definition of marriage.

As a result of this abuse of judicial power, the federal government grows ever more invasive, as the states become ever more subservient.

### SOLUTION

To that end, Congressman Paul has introduced the “We the People” Act, (H.R. 300)

1. Congress has a constitutional duty to act when the executive or judicial branch threatens the republican governments of the individual States. The Founders would certainly have supported congressional action to reign in Federal judges who tell citizens where they can and can’t place manger scenes at Christmas.

2. The “We the People” Act prohibits the Supreme Court and each federal court from making decisions on any claim, or relying on previous judicial decisions involving: (1) state or local laws, regulations, or policies concerning the free exercise or establishment of religion; (2) the right of privacy, including issues of sexual practices, orientation, or reproduction; or (3) the right to marry without regard to sex or sexual orientation where based upon equal protection of the laws.

The Act is specifically designed to insure federal judges observe the Constitution’s 10th Amendment which assigns to the States any powers not specifically assigned to the federal government elsewhere in the Constitution.

3. The “We the People” Act also protects the traditional definition of marriage from judicial activism by ensuring the Supreme Court cannot abuse the equal protection clause to redefine marriage.

4. In order to hold Federal judges accountable for abusing their powers, the act also provides that a judge who violates the act’s limitations on judicial power shall either be impeached by Congress or removed by the President, according to rules established by Congress.

### SPECIFIC POINTS TO CONSIDER

1. Attempts to resolve, by judicial fiat, important issues like abortion and the expression of religious belief in the public domain increase social strife and conflict. The only way to resolve controversial social issues like abortion and school prayer is to restore respect for the right of State and local governments to adopt policies that reflect the beliefs of citizens of those jurisdictions. Under our Constitutional system, there is no reason why the people of New York and the people of Texas (for example) should have the same polices regarding issues such as marriage and school prayer.

2. Unless Congress acts by passing legislation such as the “We The People” Act, a State’s authority to define and regulate marriage may be the next victim of activist judges. Congress must launch a preemptive strike against any further Federal usurpation of the States’ authority to regulate marriage by removing issues concerning the definition of marriage from the jurisdiction of Federal courts.

3. Although marriage is licensed and otherwise regulated by the States, government did not create the institution of marriage. Government regulation of marriage is based on State recognition of the practices and customs formulated by private individuals interacting in civil

institutions, such as churches and synagogues. Having Federal officers, whether judges, bureaucrats, or congressmen, impose a new definition of marriage on the people is an act of social engineering profoundly hostile to liberty.

### HOW TO PASS THE “WE THE PEOPLE” ACT

**ACTION TO TAKE:** There is only one way the “We The People” Act will get a fair hearing and a vote in the Congress. It needs co-sponsors – lots of them.

1. Call or write your Congressman and tell him/her to take a stand against activist judges by supporting the “We The People” Act (H.R.300). Most importantly, urge them to sign on as cosponsors of the bill. The bill needs at least 100 cosponsors, to get a fair hearing in the House Judiciary Committee.

Phone calls and letters are the most effective way to contact Congress. E-mails and faxes are many times ignored. Members of Congress have been changing their e-mail addresses and fax numbers when we send out alerts. You can send an e-mail by going to each member’s website at <http://thomas.gov>.

How to call:

Call the U.S. Capitol Switchboard: (202) 225-3121.

Ask for your congressman by name and the operator will connect you to his/her office.


How to Write:

Congressman \_\_\_\_\_  
United States House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

2. Call or write Rep. John Conyers (D-MI), Chairman of the Judiciary Committee to let him know you support the bill. He is the one who will determine the fate of the bill in committee.

Committee on the Judiciary Phone: 202-225-3951  
Address: 2138 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515-6216

3. Talk to your friends and neighbors and urge them to call Congress in support of HR 300.

4. Post or distribute these talking points at your church, club or office. Help spread the word that there is a way to stop activist judges from usurping our constitutional rights. 

*We The People*

# SPOTLIGHT ON THE OPPRESSORS

## TERRORISM AS TAUGHT BY INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE

BY ALLEN QUIST



Is terrorism real? Not according to the globalist education program known as International Baccalaureate (IB). To explain its theory of knowledge which is at the core of the IB curriculum, the IBO website provides the following information on a power-point slide:

- *The Learner Profile: A Shared Set of Values*
- *Freedom Fighter or Terrorist?*
- *Honest disagreement is often a good sign of progress. [Mahatma Gandhi]*
- *Whenever two good people argue over principles, they*
- *Are both right. [Marie Ebner von Eschenbach]*

That is, according to IBO, terrorists only exist in the mind of the beholder. Terrorists do not exist in a real or objective sense. Is this significant? IBO's views on relative truth and morality are central to its curriculum. The IBO website also explains that its purpose is creating world citizens meaning that IBO exists to create students who hold the attitudes, values and worldview dictated by IBO. The kids who are in the 680 American Schools that have adopted IB are being indoctrinated in its relativistic and globalist worldview.

To be specific, The IBO website describes its mission as follows: The International Baccalaureate Organization [consists of] programmes of international education [producing] learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right. Gene Edward Veith evaluates the IB philosophy this way: Theory of knowledge employs a hermeneutic of suspicion that undermines the very possibility of accepting any kind of objective truth. [World 1-13-07, p. 11]

As such, IB is hostile to the foundational principles of the United States. Our Declaration of Independence says, We hold these truths to be self-evident One of the foundational pillars of the United States is recognition of objective truth, real truth. IB undermines this principle and aggressively teaches the contrary view.

### What is International Baccalaureate?

The International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) was formed in the 1960s to provide a western system of education for the children of U.S. diplomats. In 1996, however, IBO formed a partnership with UNESCO to create a pilot program for what the IBO and UNESCO websites describe as an international system of education.

Today IB is essentially an arm of UNESCO, and when American schools join IB, they agree that IBO-UNESCO will train the teachers, write the curriculum, compose the important tests (which are sent to Geneva for scoring), and dictate the values, attitudes and worldview that will be taught to the students.

In order for IBO students and faculty to become world citizens, they are required to memorize the ten learner profile values of world citizenship. The Ten Commandments have been replaced with the 10 values of IBO-UNESCO. On its website IBO says: The attributes of the learner profile express the values inherent to the IB continuum of international education.

The Brooklyn Center, MN, Earl Brown and Evergreen Park elementary school IB grant application even calls for each school to have a General Assembly Room designed to resemble and simulate the general assembly room at the United Nations. A UN history room is added for good measure. No similar request is made for a U.S. Congress room or a Minnesota Legislature room, of course. This grant application also promises to integrate the IBO-UNESCO philosophy into its core content curriculum.

### The Values of IB

IBO says that it endorses the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Article 26 of UDHR says education shall further the activities of the United Nations. This means that IBO agrees to promote and teach all the activities of the UN including treaties and documents America has not signed such as the UDHR, the Treaty on the Rights of the Child, Kyoto, the UN

Treaty on Biodiversity, the Earth Charter and the treaty establishing the new UN Criminal Court, to name just a few.

The UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which IBO advocates, describes our fundamental human rights as follows: These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations [article 29]. Compare that UN view of human rights to the American view contained in our Declaration of Independence. The Declaration insists that human rights, including life, liberty and property, are inalienable and God-given.

The big question is which has greater standing and authority--our God-given, inalienable human rights or the policies of the UN? The Declaration of Independence, the philosophical foundation of the United States, insists on the former. The UDHR insists on the latter. Let us be perfectly clear on this: Our Declaration view is the foundation of liberty; the IBO--UN view is the foundation of tyranny.

### The Real Issue

It should not be surprising that IBO denies that terrorism is real. The values of IBO are hostile to the foundational principles of the United States including real truth and morality. The question for the United States is this: Do we have the moral courage to reaffirm our foundational principles, the principles of freedom, and teach those values to our children? Or will we welcome our own destruction by allowing our children to be indoctrinated in the worldview that is diametrically opposed to everything we believe in? And, yes, this is the real battle for freedom of our time.

*Allen Quist is adjunct professor at Bethany Lutheran College in Mankato, Minnesota. He served three terms in the Minnesota legislature and has authored three books on education: The Seamless Web, Fed Ed: The New Federal Curriculum and How Its Enforced, and America's Schools: The Battleground for Freedom.*

