

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 20 - Issue 4

April 2014

Some Thoughts on the Article V Issue

By Tom DeWeese

I've written many articles in the past concerning my opposition to a Constitutional Convention (Con Con). I've also helped in successful fights in Ohio and Kansas to stop Con Con Resolutions. But recently there is a new twist in the effort to amend the Constitution to preserve freedom. It's called an Article V Convention of the States. Proponents say it answers my concerns over the dangers of a Con Con, and so many activists have asked me where I stand on this new effort. So here are a few thoughts.

I certainly feel the pain of patriotic Americans over the state of our Constitution. The original document has been basically put in a museum on Connecticut Ave. in Washington, DC and forgotten. We are told it is old and outdated. Not relevant to today's age of technology, and moral reality. Old guys in powdered wigs wrote it. They knew nothing about instant communications, international terrorists, and besides, they were slave owners. How could their ideas possibly be relevant to us today? I'm sure Nancy Pelosi never read the Constitution because she would have had to pass it through Congress before she could find out what's in it. For Obama, it's just a road block keeping him from his need to change the country.

Well, you've all heard those arguments. The result is a government out of control. Spending is skyrocketing. Gun rights are under siege. Obamacare...right! Property rights, American industry, the dollar, personal privacy, and even our ability to choose the foods we want to eat, are all disappearing under an out-of-control government.

Something has to be done. There are those who argue that we can't wait to try to elect the right kind of representatives in Congress and the White House. We have to take matters into our own hands immediately.

We have to see that the Constitution is strengthened to assure a balanced budget. Some have gone so far as to declare 10 Amendments for Freedom, including a plan to repay the national debt, enforce legislative transparency, a line item veto, term limits, immigration control, English as the national language, only U.S. laws over America, no socialism and a government bound by "In God we Trust." And there are amendment ideas floating around to assure the Constitution is sound and strong for future generations.

Few of us would disagree with most of these ideas. They are put forth by respected leaders who have a record of promoting limited and Constitutional government. But how do we put these plans into action?

Radio host Mark Levin wrote a compelling book suggesting that there is a pressure valve written into Article V of the Constitution that shows us the way, through a convention of the states - an Article V Convention, as it is called. And we are assured that this is not a Constitutional Convention (Con Con) through which states call on Congress to convene. Too dangerous they tell us - and I agree.

No, an Article V Convention is different. We are told that the term Constitutional Convention or Con Con is inaccurate. That an Article V Convention is designed to precisely avoid the need for a Con Con. Specifically an Article V Convention is a meeting of the states -out of the control of Congress and the Pelosis of the nation. Each state will get one vote, and that will prevent a runaway convention that could result in the gutting of the Constitution. And through such a process, the states can control the agenda of the convention and therefore pass Mark Levin's freedom amendments. It's that simple. Moreover, the idea has captured the support of major Conservative leadership, including Sean

IN
THIS

PAGE 4 - SHORTS: NEWS FROM THE CENTER ON CONSUMER FREEDOM
PAGE 5 - SIX NEGLECTED ISSUES OF AGENDA 21 BY TOM DEWEESE
PAGE 8 - TYRANNY: LIES MY PRESIDENT TOLD ME BY PAUL DRIESSEN

Hannity, Home School leader Michael Farris, former Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli, commentator Tim Baldwin, the Goldwater Institute, and the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), and many more. All well respected leaders and advocates of limited government and Constitutional law.

I won't begin to question them, their integrity, or their honorable intentions. I believe most are sincere in their concern and desire to save our Republic. But I have a few questions and observations.

First, what is the real issue here? What is the real reason why we have to even consider trying to redefine what the Founders meant our government to be? After all, it's all in the Constitution already. Article V advocates, and Conservative movement in general, will readily tell you that the real issue is that our government, from the White House, to Congress, to the Supreme Court, are failing or refusing to follow Constitutional Law. They ignore it. So, say Article V proponents, that's why we must amend the Constitution to assure our freedoms are guaranteed.

But, here is my real question for Article V advocates: If government today refuses to follow the Constitution, what will change once it is amended with the Articles of Freedom? What motivation will suddenly drive the Obamas and Pelosis to say "oh, the Constitution is the law of the land and we must follow it?" Especially when they oppose those freedom amendments for the same reasons they today ignore the entire Constitution. The Progressives who are in charge simply do not believe in balanced budgets, gun rights, and control of our borders. In addition, they really don't care what a majority of Americans want, either. So an argument that the passage of the

amendments will confirm that Americans want such a government cuts no ice with them.

Frankly, I believe that if we don't change the atmosphere and mind set in the nation to one that supports the ideas behind our Constitution (free markets, individual liberty, limited government, and private property rights), then all the amendments in the world aren't going to change the drive toward more and more government. The place to start that effort is by working to take back control of our local school systems, out of the clutches of the Federal Department of Education. Then, if we do first succeed in changing the mind-set of the nation to accept our ideas, a convention won't be needed. We will have the necessary support around the nation to elect the right kind or representatives to restore Constitutional law through their legislative action. That, I believe, is the real task that lies ahead of us. There is no short cut or silver bullet around it.

Second. As I listen to Article V proponents make their arguments about how they're going to bring about change - that they are going to bring all of these states together, hold a convention and pass their amendments, they seem to ignore the very existence of the Progressive movement that today controls nearly every aspect of our governing process. What do Article V proponents think these forces are going to do while the convention process is going on? Here's what my research has found. Progressive groups like the Open Society Institute, the Center for American Progress, and the American Constitutional Society, to name a few, all groups funded by George Soros, are behind a movement for a more "Progressive Constitution." They are simply not going to let conservatives have the playing field to themselves. They will use every trick, spending every dollar in their bulging war chests, to assure they control the process. Tim Baldwin has

DeWeese Report

Vol. 20, No. 4
April 2014

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.deweese-report.com

Copy Right
2014 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 number.

Samples of the reprint
must be provided to the
DeWeese Report

written with great vigor in support of the Article V Convention. But I think it is interesting to note that his father, Chuck Baldwin, former Constitution Party presidential candidate, author, columnist and a personal friend of mine, was quoted in a World Net Daily column in 2009, entitled "Globalists 'Salivating' over Collapse of America," said, *"The globalists who currently control Washington, D.C., and Wall Street are, no doubt, salivating over the opportunity to officially dismantle America's independence and national sovereignty, and establish North American Union -- in much the same way that globalists created the European Union. A new Constitutional Convention is exactly the tool they need to cement their sinister scheme into law."* Yes, Chuck was talking about a Con Con, but what will be different in an Article V Convention of the States if the Progressives get into the process?

Third I have a great concern over how the Article V Convention is being promoted. I have been an activist all of my life. I have seen pretty much every tactic used by powerful forces who are trying to railroad the people. The tactics always seem to be the same. Use the facilitation process to bring people into the fold, control the debate, and attack the opposition with accusations of deceit and fringe ideas. I have many times been awarded a tin foil hat by such forces for advocating ideas contrary to their vision for America. So, I'm a little sensitive to such tactics when I see them. And I know that the Tea Party is well aware of such tactics. That, in fact, is one of the things that motivates true Tea Party patriots to take action against rich, powerful, DC based groups which try to usurp or control the Tea Party. Yet, these are exactly the tactics I see being employed today by Article V proponents. Some of my associates have attempted to speak out at meetings where Article V is being promoted, and are not allowed the floor. That should sound familiar to Ron Paul supporters who have had microphones yanked out of their hands or turned off at state conventions. A couple of my friends have even been asked to represent the anti-Article V position. But, while the Article V proponent is given all the time he wants, the opposition is usually allowed only a few minutes to make their case. If the Tea

Party is opposed to such tactics by County Commissioners, legislative committees, or Republican leadership at state conventions - then why don't they question it at their own meetings? A full, open debate is always healthy in a free society. A deliberate attempt to silence opposition should cause people to question the motives of the perpetrators.

Finally, the proponents of Article V take great comfort in reciting the powerful names of those supporting their efforts. As I said, many are very respected leaders of the Conservative movement. But, how dare they deride in such nasty fashion, those who oppose them? They've called Phyllis Schlafly an old lady and out of touch. Phyllis was fighting for the Constitution when most of these Article V proponents were still in school. She risked everything she had to stop the Progressives' Equal Rights Amendment. Home school advocate Mike Farris has called the John Birch Society evil. JBS has been unwavering in its dedication to the Constitution through the dark days of Communist infiltration of the 1950's to today's fight against Agenda 21. The fact is, I was forced to part ways with Mike Farris and his tactics in the 1990s. At the time I was heavily engaged in a three year war to stop the destruction of our public school system through the "reforms" known as Goals 2000, School-to-Work and The Work Force Development Act. Today, these "reforms" have morphed onto Common Core. When we had a chance to stop them in the 1990s, Mike Farris refused to support my efforts against the Work Force Development Boards, saying they didn't affect home schoolers! I considered that a betrayal to every student in the nation.

It is with great pain that I acknowledge that some people I really respect have joined the Article V effort. But I can't join them because, to me, something really smells about this Article V movement. Its arguments don't past scrutiny. Its tactics are underhanded. Its source of funding is not in the open. I think honest Tea Party members and dedicated freedom activists should ask a lot of questions before risking our precious Constitution to their lot. ●

News from the Center on Consumer Freedom

Some “Sportsmen” Groups Hide Big Green Agendas

Here at CCF, we’re no stranger to catching activist groups hiding radical front agendas. Whether People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) was actually providing grants to eco-terrorists and arsonists (when not killing shelter pets) or the “Humane Society” of the United States runs no pet shelters of its own and gives only one percent of its budget to local pet shelters, activist groups often have misleading names and imagery. We recently took note of a new set of agenda-obscuring activist groups: “Sportsmen” organizations that are funded by anti-energy and anti-development green radicals.

We call these groups the “Green Decoys,” and we’re debuting GreenDecoys.com to help expose their true agendas. As our Senior Research Analyst writes in the Tampa Tribune:

Many of these organizations started out furthering an agenda that ensured hunters and anglers could continue their favorite pastime for generations to come. But more recently, many of these groups have been co-opted by wealthy grant-making bodies notorious for their support of anti-gun, radical environmentalist agendas, all the while purporting to represent the hunting and fishing community.

We researched five groups that we identified as Green Decoys. They are:

- [The Izaak Walton League of America](#), a national office whose local chapters advocate sport shooting, has received funding from a Chicago anti-gun foundation;
- [The Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership](#), which receives funding from the environmentalist Turner Foundation and has close ties to organized labor;
- [Trout Unlimited](#), which has become ever more radically environmentalist as millions of dollars of left-wing foundation money has poured in;
- [Backcountry Hunters and Anglers](#), which is funded by the radical environmentalist Western Conservation Foundation and is led by a Democrat-supporting Montana activist; and
- [Bull Moose Sportsmen’s Alliance](#), which runs a liberal-leaning “Action Fund” and is run by former big-shots at other environmentalist groups.

You can learn more about these organizations and the web of environmentalist funding that supports them at [GreenDecoys.com](#). ●

Activists Assault Soft Drinks with Biased Studies, Needless Warnings

With soda taxes proving to be widely unpopular, activists are looking at new strategies to drive up regulations on Americans' chosen beverages. Today, National Journal reports on a new study funded by the food activist piggy bank, the \$8-billion Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, which claims that soda taxes won't cost jobs. And in California, land of warning labels on everything courtesy of the overbroad, misguided Proposition 65, a would-be soda taxer has decided to propose additional warning labels on soft drinks.

The study is little more than big-government agitprop. Even taking its results at face value, the study itself claims private-sector jobs would be lost and government jobs would be gained. There's a reason New York State's 2010 soda tax was backed by the state's public sector unions and hospital trade association, which spent millions lobbying for it: They needed extra cash during a budget crunch. Activists won't give up their efforts for a government cash grab, even though liberal areas like Richmond, California and Telluride, Colorado are dismissing soda taxes by two-to-one margins or more.

Meanwhile in California — land of the dubious “health” initiative — State Sen. Bill Monning has moved on from trying to tax soda to trying to scare people about it. Monning's

new measure, Senate Bill 1000, would place a warning label on any soft drink that contains 75 or more calories per 12 ounces.

Californians already suffer from “warning fatigue” because of the labels mandated by Proposition 65 that claim that all kinds of products, from fishing rods to cars to Christmas lights, contain allegedly cancer-causing chemicals. There's no reason to believe that one more warning will have a meaningful effect on obesity rates, and Monning's boneheaded proposal would set a dangerous precedent. Soft drinks provide only seven percent of Americans' daily caloric intake: Will California require warning labels on the food products that provide the other 93 percent? We're noticing that activists are starting to line up pizza to be the next food choice victim; will pizza parties in the Golden State have to come with liability waivers in triplicate?

We hope California lawmakers will set Monning's proposal aside, as they did his previous tax proposal. People need to know that the balance of calories consumed versus calories burned (for exercise and daily activity) determines weight gain and loss, not whether activist-approved or activist-hated products are consumed. Sound policy would emphasize balance, not particular foods or beverages. ●

Six Neglected Issues of Agenda 21

By Tom DeWeese

We seem to be drowning in a sea of endless political fights and issues that affect our actions every day. Where do these issues come from? Who has time to think them up? Who is advocating them? Recently a local activist asked me to name six issues that would surprise most people to learn are directly connected to Agenda 21.

Agenda 21, according to the Planners, the Greens, and Progressives (I know, I repeat myself) is just an “innocuous 20 year old document that has no connection to local planning.” Moreover, they tell us it is just a guideline for conservation and “smart growth” of our communities. Nothing more. In fact, in their own words, they assure us that, *Sustainable communities encourage people to work together to create healthy communities where natural resources and historic resources are preserved, jobs are available, sprawl is contained, neighborhoods are secure, education is lifelong, transportation and health care is accessible, and all citizens have opportunities to improve the quality of their lives.*”

It all sounds so innocent. What could possibly be wrong with that? Well, putting these plans into place is where the problems begin. Here are six neglected issue that are rarely connected to Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development (especially when we are assured that Agenda 21 has nothing to do with local, state or federal government policy).

Issue 1: Global Warming/Climate Change. It has been so discredited in the true scientific community that proponents have become almost silly in their continued attempts to push it. Why don't they stop, even to question if their science is sound? They instead use great energy to attack any scientist who does dare ask questions or finds data contrary to the “official” line. Why is it so vitally important that they continue to promote something that clearly questionable? It's because all of Agenda 21 policy is built on the premise that man is destroying the Earth. Climate Change is their “proof.” To eliminate that premise is to remove all credibility and purpose for their entire agenda. They are willing to go to any length, even lies, to keep the climate change foot on our throats.

But don't take my word for it. I'll let them speak for themselves:

"No matter if the science of global warming is all phony...climate change provides the greatest opportunity to bring about justice and equality in the world." Christine Stewart (Former Canadian Minister of the Environment)

"We've got to ride this global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing in terms of economic and environmental policy." Timothy Wirth (President, UN Foundation)

"It doesn't matter what is true. It only matters what people believe is true." Paul Watson (Co-Founder of Green Peace.)

Issue 2: Fear of over population is the central driving force behind nearly every Sustainable policy initiative. The fact is, in developed nations population is actually going down. The only real growth in the US population in recent years has been from immigration, legal or otherwise. There is a major divide in the Green movement over the issue of population and how to handle it. Some in the Sierra Club advocate that U.S. borders be closed to stop population growth here. Most conservatives would agree. Illegals, they say, overcrowd our cities and damage our way of life, our environment, and use up our natural resources.

The majority of environmentalists, however, insist that the borders must be open to allow as many to immigrate here as possible. They argue that the U.S. has a greater ability to control them and protect the environment than if we left them in third world countries. That's because the Greens already have a stranglehold over our nation's industry through massive green regulations.

In the face of their fear of overpopulation, however, studies have shown that there is no world wide over population crisis. In fact one study insists that we could put the entire population of the world in an area the size of Texas with a population density of Paris, France. Over population, and its accompanying environmental degradation, is a problem primarily in poor countries where the poor are deprived by government to improve their conditions. Nations that refuse to legalize private property ownership for the masses, for example, are a primary reason for growing poverty. Meanwhile, Sustainablists work to keep these nations from developing or increasing energy use, thereby keeping them poor. Green regulations stop the building of infrastructure. They panic at the idea of increased energy use in dev eloping nations. Instead of working to solve the real problems – the root of poverty- they exploit the excuse of over population and advocate enforcing polices to drastically reduce populations. China's brutal one child policy of forced abortions and sterilization has become their model.

Do you think I'm joking? There consider these quotes from the Sustainablists:

"Childbearing should be a punishable crime against society, unless the parents hold a government license. All potential parents should be required to use contraceptive chemicals, the government issuing antidotes to citizens chosen for childbearing." David Brower (Sierra Club)

"A reasonable estimate for an industrialized world society at the present North American material standard of living would be 1 billion. At a more frugal European standard of living, 2 to 3 billion would be possible." *United Nations Global Biodiversity Assessment.*

Issue 3: The goal of Agenda 21 is the destruction of the free market system. We have heard statement after statement from the UN; from members of Congress; the news media; and from Hollywood, all deriding the free market system as evil, corrupt and a tool of the rich to hold down the poor. So now, they are suddenly worried about the poor – if it leads to their ability to raid our bank accounts. So are they really worried about protecting the environment – or honoring the tactics of Jesse James?

Redistribution of wealth is behind every policy that comes out of the UN, and now the Obama Administration as well. The EPA is the attack dog to shut down entire industries like coal. It has become very difficult to operate a manufacturing business in the US, and nearly impossible to start a new one. Environmental protection is always the excuse, even when Obama's own State Department says the Keystone Pipeline is not an environmental threat. Just recently, radical greens wielding torches, demonstrated outside the home of the head of the Keystone pipeline company. Visions of the terror of the Dark Agenda?

At the UN's Rio + 20 Summit held last year, the idea of "Zero Economic Growth" was advocated - just to keep things fair. It was stated that even the building of new roads upsets the status quo and disrupts a well ordered society. Such idiotic ideas are the driving force behind Sustainable Development. Again, images of the Dark Ages come to mind.

Again, not my words, let them tell you themselves:

"We must make this an insecure and inhospitable place for capitalists and their projects. We must reclaim the roads and plowed lands, halt dam construction, tear down existing dams, free shackled rivers and return to wilderness millions of acres of presently settled land." *Dave Foreman, (Earth First).*

"Global sustainability requires the deliberate quest of poverty, reduced resource consumption and set levels of mortality control" *Professor Maurice King (Population Control Advocate)*

"We believe planning should be a tool for allocating resources...and eliminating the great inequalities of wealth and power in our society... because the free market has proven itself incapable of doing this." *Plannersnetwork.org Statement or Principles. the American Planning Association is a member and supporter of these principles.*

Issue 4: Cheap Energy is the enemy of the Earth. To the average person the drive to stop any ability to obtain cheap

energy makes no sense. People are hurting economically. Jobs are lost. Energy costs are skyrocketing. Any attempt to drill oil, fracking of shale gas, and mining coal are all vigorously blocked by government and green policy. Yet the government spends billions of dollars on "alternative energy" such as wind and solar, which provides less than 3% of our energy needs. Why? What is the motivation to put such shackles on the US economic engine? The excuse is that energy use drives up CO2 emissions and accelerates global warming - the excuse necessary to "harmonize" the US into the socialist, Sustainable global noose.

But, according to some anti-energy advocates, the fear of cheap energy goes beyond environmental protection - energy availability helps build wealth for individuals and removes them from the rolls of the dependent - the true goal of sustainable policy.

"Giving society cheap, abundant energy is the worst thing that could ever happen to the planet." *Prof. Paul Ehrlich (Professor of Population Studies, Stanford University).*

"Complex technology of any sort is an assault on human dignity. It would be little short of disastrous for us to discover a source of clean, cheap, abundant energy, because of what we might do with it." *Amory Lovins (Rocky Mountain Institute).*

"The prospect of cheap fusion energy is the worst thing that could happen to the planet." *Jeremy Rifkin (Greenhouse Crisis Foundation).*

Issue 5: Common Core. Many people see the reorganization of the public school issue as separate from Agenda 21. It's not. Those who are promoting what they call the Agenda for the 21st Century understand that it is going to be a long drawn out process. To reform a nation that has been created on the ideals of limited government, free enterprise and individual liberty into one that unquestioningly accepts government top down control as an absolute necessity will take time. They must wait out those of us who were educated in the old system, who were taught that we were born with our rights and that government's job is to protect those rights. The sustainable system says government will grant us our rights.

To enforce such a radical turn around of our society requires that the children be indoctrinated to accept it. The effort started in earnest in the 1990s under the Clinton Administration through the Department of Education and programs including Goals 2000, School To Work and Workforce Development Boards. These programs set children on the path to accepting top down control as schools became mainly training centers to create the workers of tomorrow. The original American education system effectively provided an overall academic education from which students could choose their own futures. No longer. Today, the new curriculum has morphed into what is called Common Core. It's a State run curriculum that revamps schools into little more

Lies *Continued from Page 8*

fuel regulations is *offset* by lives *lost or shortened* because of those rules.

The policies, laws and regulations affect everything we make, grow, ship, eat, drive and do – 100% of our energy based economy, not just one-sixth under ObamaCare – and put legislators, bureaucrats, activists and courts in ever-increasing control over our lives, livelihoods, liberties, living standards and life spans.

Even worse, it's all for nothing – even if carbon dioxide plays a bigger role in climate change than many scientists believe it does. Germany is relying increasingly on coal for power generation. Australia has junked its cap-tax-and-trade program. Britain is reexamining its commitment to CO2 reduction. China and India are building new coal-fueled power plants every week, and neither they nor any of the real “developing countries” are required to commit to “binding targets” for lower carbon dioxide emissions.

Under agreements signed at the just-concluded UN climate conference in Warsaw, 130 developing nations must merely make “contributions” toward lower emissions, and only when they are “ready to do so.”

But then international climate programs were never really about preventing climate change. As IPCC official Ottmar Edenhofer has admitted, they are about “how we redistribute the world’s wealth.” First, tens of billions continue flowing annually to IPCC scientists and bureaucrats and renewable energy programs. Then we start talking about real money.

Now that the IPCC, President Obama and hordes of other climate alarmists have convinced so many people that climate change is “real,” it’s “happening now,” humans are “contributing to” myriad disasters on an “unprecedented” scale – the Group of 130 expects the FRCs (Formerly Rich Countries) to pay up.

China, India, island nations and poor countries demand “compensation,” “adaptation” and “mitigation” money, to pay for “losses and damages” from rising seas and more frequent, more intense storms and droughts – which they say are happening already, and which they blame on industrialized nations that helped raise CO2 levels from 280 ppm at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution to 400 ppm today.

They want \$50 billion immediately, followed by \$100 billion to \$400 billion per year, plus free transfers of our best energy, pollution control and industrial technologies. It’s too late to prevent, mitigate or adapt to climate change, they say. You “rich countries” need to start paying for the damage you are causing.

20% of the EU budget will now go toward CO2 emission reductions and helping poor countries adapt to climate change: €180 billion (\$245 billion) by 2020. What the United States will have to pay in “compensation” and under ClimateCare schemes being hatched at EPA, DOI and Energy headquarters is yet to be determined. But the payments will be substantial, even crippling.

We are caught in a climate trap of our own (bureaucrats and politicians) making. How will we get out?

Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (www.CFACT.org) and author of *Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death*. ●

Agenda 21 *Continued from Page 6*

than job training and indoctrination centers.

Because, you see, today’s public education system is also designed to strip the children of their attitudes, values and beliefs that parents may have instilled, and indoctrinate them into accepting global values - global citizenship and a global economy based on the sustainable agenda. Little of American civics and history is taught in today’s classroom. But text books contain whole chapters on the Five Pillars of Islam, while ignoring the 10 Commandments of Christianity. The children are feed an unending diet of the evils of capitalism; the selfishness of individualism, and the social justice of redistribution of wealth. It punishes students for possessing individuality and is designed to eliminate such natural human tendencies. That is the “common” in Common Core. Common values, common goals, common future. Don’t rock the boat of a well ordered society.

Common Core is the curriculum necessary for the acceptance and implementation of Agenda 21. And today nearly every adult up to the age of 40 has gone through this indoctrination, trained to accept a future chosen for them by someone else.

Agenda 21? Simply Google “Sustainable Medicine” and you will find more than 5,850,000 English language references to the subject. Read through the ideas expressed there and you will find nearly every provision of Obamacare. An expert on Sustainable Medicine, the late Dr. Madeleine Cosman, put it this way: “Sustainable Medicine + Sustainable Development = Duty to Die.” Sustainable medicine makes decisions through visioning councils that determine what shall be done or not done to each body in its group in its native habitat. Sustainable medicine experts do not refer to citizens in sovereign nations, but to “humans” in their “settlements.” Sustainable medicine is the pivot around which all other Sustainable Development revolves. Principle #1 of the Rio Declaration that introduced Agenda 21 is that all humans must live in harmony with nature. It means rationing healthcare, low technology for health care treatment and emphasis on medical care not cure.

These are the stories that are not usually discussed or connected to Agenda 21. Americans must understand and connect these dots to every day policy so that they can understand the root and long term goals of policies that are affecting their personal lives. Agenda 21 is the “common core” and it has already invaded every corner of our society. Our battle cry must be to stop this monster in 2014 or watch freedom perish. ●

Issue 6: Healthcare. How is healthcare connected to

Lies my president told me

Climate exaggeration and prevarication bring horrid policies and massive wealth redistribution

By Paul Driessen

“Under my plan, if you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period. If you like your healthcare plan, you’ll be able to keep your healthcare plan. Period. Nothing changes, except your health insurance costs will go down.”

It was just a couple of renegade IRS agents in Cincinnati. Benghazi was a spontaneous protest that got out of control in direct response to an inflammatory video posted on the internet. During September 2012, our rebounding economy created an astonishing 873,000 jobs. And on and on.

If we have learned anything about President Obama and his administration, it is that they are compulsive, practiced prevaricators – determined to advance their agenda of “fundamentally transforming” America and imposing greater government control over our lives, living standards and pursuit of happiness. When caught, they dissemble, say they were “not informed directly,” issue false apologies, or fire back with “What difference, at this point, does it make anyway?!”

Keep all this in mind when the President and other Washington politicians bring up “dangerous manmade global warming,” insist that we slash fossil fuel use, and tell us we need to give poor countries billions of dollars a year to compensate them for “losses and damages” they incurred due to warming we caused.

When they claim “97% of scientists say the planet is warming and human activity is contributing to it,” remember: This is based on 75 of 77 “climate scientists” who were selected from a 2010 survey (that went to 10,257 scientists). 700 climate scientists, 31,000 American scientists and 48% of US meteorologists say there is no evidence that humans are causing dangerous warming or climate change.

Moreover, “contributing to” is meaningless. Is it a 1, 5, 20 or 90% contribution? Is it local or global? Do scientists know enough to separate human factors from the numerous, powerful, interrelated solar, cosmic, oceanic, terrestrial and other forces that have repeatedly caused minor to major climate changes, climate cycles and weather events throughout human and geologic history? At this point, they do not.

When the President says “carbon pollution in our atmosphere has increased dramatically,” remember: It’s not “carbon” (soot) – it’s *carbon dioxide*. It’s not “pollution” – it’s the plant-fertilizing gas that makes all life on Earth possible. Increased “dramatically” means rising from 330 ppm (0.030% of the atmosphere) in 1975, when scientists were concerned about global *cooling*, to about 400 ppm (0.040%) today.

(Oxygen represents 21% of atmospheric gases (210,000 ppm). Argon is 0.93% (9,300 ppm). About 90% of the

“greenhouse effect” is from water vapor. And roughly 95% of the annual addition to atmospheric carbon dioxide levels is from volcanoes, subsea vents and other *natural* sources.)

Over the past 16 years, while CO2 levels continued to increase “dramatically,” average planetary temperatures did not budge. The eight years since a Category 3 hurricane made landfall in the United States is the longest such period since 1900 or even the 1860s. Even with the recent Midwestern and East Coast twisters, US tornado frequency remains close to a record low. Is *that* due to CO2 emissions?

There is one point on which the President is correct. In 2008 he said “This was the moment when the rise of the oceans began to slow.” And indeed, they are now rising at a mere seven inches per century.

All of this should fascinate the scholar and climate realist that lurks inside each of us. But what should *concern* us is the pernicious effects that the constant barrage of “manmade climate change” hype and headlines is having on public policies, taxpayer and consumer expenditures, and our daily lives.

Like threads in a tapestry, “dangerous manmade climate change” is intertwined with anti-hydrocarbon, imminent resource depletion, renewable energy, sustainable development, and wealth redistribution theses and ideologies. They are used to concoct and justify energy and economic policies, ranging from delays and bans on oil and gas leasing and drilling, to the war on coal mining and use, and diehard opposition to hydraulic fracturing and the Keystone XL pipeline.

They promote spending 22 billion just in federal money during FY-2014 on climate change studies; costly solar projects of every description; wind turbines that blight scenic vistas and slaughter millions of birds and bats annually, while wind energy developers are exempted from endangered species and other environmental laws that apply to all other industries; and ethanol programs that require millions of acres of farmland and vast quantities of water, fertilizer, pesticides and fossil fuel energy to produce a gasoline additive that reduces mileage, harms engines, drives up food prices ... and increases CO2 emissions.

The policies pummel jobs, families and entire communities around coal mines and coal-fired factories and electrical generating plants, impairing the health and welfare of millions. Being unemployed – or holding multiple lower-paying part-time jobs – means greater stress, reduced nutrition, sleep deprivation, family discord, higher incidences of depression, greater alcohol, drug, spousal and child abuse, higher suicide rates and lower life expectancies. It means every life allegedly saved by anti-fossil

Continued to Page 7