

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 21 - Issue 4

April 2015

The Threat to Freedom: The Southern Poverty Law Center and the Department of Homeland Security

Author's Note: Last year Dr. Ben Carson upset Barrack Obama by speaking out against Obamacare during a public meeting in which Obama was also present. It caused shock waves and immediately catapulted Dr. Carson into the public eye and many now promote him as a possible presidential candidate in 2016. Yet, for this act, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) has now placed Dr. Carson on its "Extremist" watch file. That's what every American is faced with if they dare speak out against the radical Progressive agenda.

A while back I was asked to address the Congressional Tea Party Caucus on Capital Hill concerning the threat to Conservatives by the Southern Poverty Law Center. This past year the SPLC issued yet another attack against me and those fighting Agenda 21, calling us a radical fringe element. And still, the SPLC has its contracts with the Department of Homeland Security. That's why I believe the SPLC is a danger to freedom and why I'm renewing my call for the new Republican led congress to seriously investigate this dangerous anti-free speech hate group. Here was my testimony. TD

Briefing to the Tea Party Caucus of the US House of Representatives

By
Tom DeWeese

My name is Tom DeWeese, President of the American Policy Center, and according to the Southern Poverty Law Center I am a right wing extremist, a racist and a potentially violent terrorist.

In March, 2010, SPLC issued a report entitled "Rage on the Right: The Year in Hate and Extremism," in which groups opposed to issues like the Obama health care plan and illegal immigration were lumped with white supremacist groups like the National Socialist Movement and Skin Heads.

In August, 2010 SPLC launched an attack against my

organization and our national conference, The Freedom Action Conference, held at Valley Forge, PA, and featured such speakers as best selling author Tom Woods, former presidential candidate Michael Badnarik, Sheriff Richard Mack, several respected state legislators, and many more well known spokesmen.

The title of the SPLC attack against me read, "Patriot Rhetoric Becomes Increasingly Violent," and said we were "united by rage" at the federal government. Not one speaker at our conference advocated violence or lawlessness of any kind. Yet we were labeled as dangerous and potentially violent terrorists.

Annually SPLC puts out a list of what it calls “hate” groups and individuals it deems dangerous to the nation. That list is almost exclusively respected pro-Constitution spokesmen.

Now why do I care what this private organization, with its own political agenda, says about me?

Because the Southern Poverty Law Center has direct ties to the Department of Homeland Security, helping to write official DHS policy that may affect my life, my freedom, my ability to travel and my ability to speak out.

Consider the following facts:

Item: In 2009, The DHS issued a report entitled “*Right-wing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment.*”

That official document of an agency of the United States government said “Right-wing extremism in the United States can be broadly divided into those groups, movement, and adherents that are primarily hate-oriented (based on hatred of particular religious, racial or ethnic groups), and those that are mainly anti-government, rejecting federal authority in favor of state or local authority, or rejecting government authority entirely. It may include groups and individuals that are dedicated to a single issue, such as opposition to abortion or immigration.”

Item: Two weeks later, the DHS released a second report entitled: “*Domestic Extremism Lexicon,*” designed to provide specific definitions of just who may be Right wing extremists.

That report labeled the following to be extremists, bordering on terrorism: Those concerned over the economy; loss of jobs; foreclosures; antagonism toward the Obama Administration; Criticism of free trade programs; anti-abortion; oppose same sex marriage; believe in the “end times;” stock pile food; oppose illegal immigration; oppose a New World Order; oppose the UN; oppose global governance; fear of Communist regimes; oppose loss of US manufacturing to

overseas nations; oppose loss of US prestige; and use of the internet (or alternative media) to express any of these ideas.

Right after both of these reports were issued, there was the shooting at the Holocaust Museum. Next to their news reports on the incident, many newspapers carried side bar articles citing the DHS reports, basically confirming that such violence is perpetrated by right wing nuts and justifying the concerns of the DHS – just like clockwork.

Yet there was absolutely no connection found between that shooter and the right wing. But the damage was done.

And there’s more.

The Department of Homeland Security has established Fusion Centers in each state. These are designed to combine federal, state and local law enforcement. Their stated purpose is to assure immediate and efficient response to a terrorist attack or a Katrina-like disaster without bureaucratic red tape.

Item: In 2009, the Missouri Fusion Center set off a fire storm over a report it issued entitled “*The Modern Militia Movement.*” Reported Fox News, the report, “identifies the warning signs of potential terrorists for law enforcement communities.”

In other words, this report was issued to law enforcement agencies across the state as official documentation warning who the cops should look out for as potential violent terrorists.

The list of potential terrorists included Americans who voted for presidential candidate Ron Paul; Constitution Party presidential candidate Chuck Baldwin; and Libertarian Party presidential candidate Bob Barr. It also cited those of us who opposed the creation of a North American Union with Canada and Mexico.

Item: In January, 2011, immediately following the shooting of Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, the Arizona Fusion Center issued a report saying that the shooter was influenced by a right wing group called American Renaissance.

DeWeese Report

Vol. 21, No. 4
April 2015

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

Copyright 2015
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

Immediately, the mainstream media picked up the report and flooded the airways with the story that the radical and violent right wing was responsible for the shootings.

The information was completely wrong. There is no evidence that there was ever any connection between the shooter and American Renaissance. Moreover, American Renaissance has never advocated violence or extremism. The only connection between American Renaissance and extremism is that the Southern Poverty Law Center listed them as a hate group. A detail that interestingly found its way into the Arizona Fusion Center report as fact.

Item: in the Spring of 2010, the Department of Homeland Security organized a “*Countering Violent Extremism Working Group*.” This is an advisory council given the task of creating a plan to reach out to local law enforcement and community activists for training to respond to potential violence and terrorist threat.

Leafing through the report one gets the distinct impression that the plan is basically a “turn in your neighbor,” neighborhood- watch approach. It talks extensively of “sharing” information, along with “training, training, training.”

Training for what? To identify potential terrorists, of course. And who are those potential terrorist? A look at the members of the working group offers a clue.

While the group includes several public officials and law enforcement officials from around the nation, and it also includes Mohamed Magid, president of the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), and unindicted co-conspirator in a case concerning the funding of Muslim terrorist organizations.

And the working group member list also includes Richard Cohen, President of the Southern Poverty Law Center.

In addition, as one of the “Subject Matter Experts,” it lists Laurie Wood, an analyst for the Southern Poverty Law Center and an instructor for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

That training center is run by the Southern Poverty Law Center and is one of the most visible direct links between DHS, the Fusion Centers and SPLC. Law enforcement agencies actually send their personnel to these training classes to gain Federal Law Enforcement Training Center certification.

That means that policy for this DHS working group is being created by the very organization that has labeled those who advocate Constitutional law to be potential terrorists.

In addition, the “training” called for in the report will most likely be conducted, at least in part, by the SPLC’s Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

The pattern is clear, one of the nation’s leading hate groups, the Southern Poverty Law Center, which opposes even the right of free speech by people it labels potential terrorists, is helping the largest federal enforcement agency in the nation to create its policy.

That policy clearly states, according to DHS reports, that anyone disagreeing with actions of the American government is a potential terrorist and must be, at least, watched and monitored by federal, state, and local authorities.

The result of such surveillance could possibly lead to loss of freedom, loss of jobs, loss of the ability to travel, and loss of the ability to speak publicly for anyone who opposes the private agenda of the Southern Poverty Law Center.

It is an effort to silence their opponents. Honest political debate is now being interpreted as dangerous extremism.

Why is DHS dealing with such people? Are the policies of SPLC the same policies of the United States? If so, then freedom in America is in grave danger, indeed.

I believe there needs to be an immediate Congressional investigation into the ties between the Department of Homeland Security and the Southern Poverty Law Center and any other radical groups.

Particular attention should be paid to SPLC’s tax exempt status and the amount of money it receives from DHS or any other agency. And there should be an immediate stop to American law enforcement being trained by SPLC’s Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

The specific purpose of the Department of Homeland Security is to protect the “STATE” against all enemies. That has come to include anyone who uses their first amendment right to speak out against specific policies.

Apparently, that has been interpreted by DHS to mean a threat to the STATE.

May I remind you that the tanks that ran over the student protesters in Tiananmen Square in Communist China were also protecting the STATE against its enemies.

I fear that if private groups with their own political agendas, like the SPLC, are allowed to continue feeding their own brand of hatred into the policies of DHS then such a comparison with China is not too far off. I don’t think that is the America each of you pledged to serve. ●

Never Underestimate the Power of a Pebble in Your Shoe!

A plan to Stop Agenda 21?

By Tom DeWeese

Thousands of grassroots activists across the nation have taken up the fight against Agenda 21 and its policy of Sustainable Development.

Where once there were only a very few of us speaking out against this “comprehensive blueprint” for the complete transition of American society, now hundreds speak in meetings and testify in legislative hearings.

We know it is an assault on property rights, energy use, building development, even education and health care. The policy’s impact is massive and, to many, overwhelming.

Yet, our voice of opposition continues to be ignored. We get the roll of the eyes, the snide remarks, the accusations of conspiracy theorists and fringe fanatics. They smirk. They laugh and they move forward with their plans conceived in the back rooms out of sight of a sleeping public.

How can we stop it? Where do we start? How do we overcome the almost unlimited political power and funding controlled by the other side?

I have fought this mega-force for over 20 years. I have been thrilled to see our little rag tag band of grassroots activists score enough victories to make the planners and Non-governmental organization (NGOs) very nervous.

But it’s not enough. They continue, regardless of opposition because we fail to make them feel pain for their actions. They suffer no personal or political consequences, even when their plans go so very wrong.

We need a plan. We need to organize the many individual activists into one mighty fist of opposition. We need to show the planners that their actions have consequences that are forcing American citizens to suffer.

I have such a plan. It’s divided into three sections:

- Activist organization, training and recruitment

- Legislative action
- Outreach to the general public

I have used my own 47 years of activist experience to design this plan. And, in preparing it, I have reached out to some of the most successful leaders and elected representatives to help me perfect it. Above all, while fully aware that there are other things that can be done, given our limited resources, I know that I can put my plan in place almost immediately, if I have the necessary funds in hand.

Here is an outline of the plan that I believe will finally produce substantial victories in the battle to finally stop Agenda 21.

National Training Seminar

1. A gathering of national leaders, activists, and elected officials to create a plan of action, prepare legislative language, and open lines of communications to organize the nationwide fight to stop Agenda 21. This will not be a conference where attendees sit in an auditorium and listen to speakers. This will be a series of working sessions.

Elected representatives (city council, country commissioner and state legislator levels) will meet in sessions to network, and work to create effective language for various legislation designed to protect property rights and stop Agenda 21. Sustainable Development programs.

Meanwhile, activists from across the nation will meet in concurrent sessions to learn new organizing tactics and tools for effective ways to fight pro-SD programs and to effectively support elected officials who introduce pro-property rights/anti-Sustainable Development legislation.

In addition, activists will learn to use new methods to create precinct organizations to build a permanent infrastructure to support and elect candidates who oppose Agenda 21.

Bottom line for both of these sessions is to create a plan of action to write and introduce effective legislation and to then prepare a strong force of support in each legislative body to help pass it. In addition, we will build a permanent local precinct structure for local and state election victories.

2. Agenda 21 Video to every elected official

A 15 minute video prepared specifically for elected officials entitled “Your Actions Have Consequences.” This video will be narrated by an elected official and it will detail the dangers of planning programs that are being used to change our American system of government and the consequences of sustainable development programs they are enforcing.

The video is to be sent to every Member of Congress, Governors, state legislators, mayors, county commissioners and city councilmen in the nation.

Proponents of Agenda 21 have buried our elected officials under tons of information to promote their agenda. Yet, many still say they have never heard of Agenda 21. Others fail to understand it.

3. Field Coordinators in every region (4)

There are dedicated activists throughout the nation who are ready to organize against Agenda 21 in their communities. But they lack the knowledge of how to get started. APC will provide field coordinators who will answer the call. They will establish a presence in every region of the nation and will go into a community to work directly with local residents (or state organizations) to provide leadership, materials and strategy for countering the pro-Agenda 21 forces at work there.

4. Website Clearing House listing pro-property rights/anti-Agenda 21 candidates, organizations and activists nationwide

How do activists know which candidates to support in any election cycle? Politicians are always trying to say the popular thing to any group they are addressing? But all too often, once elected, they do the opposite when faced with policy decisions.

The American Policy Center will create a special web site to act as a clearing house for such information on candidates across the nation, at every level of government.

Many organizations send out questionnaires and polling to provide such information. But there is no central clearing house where activists can easily gain access to the data.

The site will also list contact information for activists and organizations in states and local communities so those concerned with fighting such policy can easily connect and network with like minded activists. The site will also list any recent activities taking place in each state.

Providing a steady stream of up-to-date information, successful legislation victories and new tactics are the key to exposing and defeating Agenda 21. It is imperative that APC have the very best flow of information to feed to the media, elected officials and the public in general.

5. Reaching out to the general public with the Stop Agenda 21 message: A national television ad campaign to build support for property rights victims

Americans have been emotionally moved by ads on television depicting the plight of neglected dogs and cats. However, there is much more unseen suffering taking place across the nation by human property owners. These are our friends and neighbors, suffering at the hand of their own government. Shattered dreams, destruction of homes, families, businesses, even whole industries, are the result of Agenda 21/Sustainable Development policies.

Yet most Americans remain ignorant of such disasters. Rarely does a news program talk about the plight of property owners. By making the American public aware of this plight, we can create awareness of the consequences of these outrageous policies and gain a lot of support in our fight to stop Agenda 21.

To that end, the American Policy Center plans to produce an ad similar to the animal ads, complete with a depiction of the victims and with original music that tells the story. The song, “Shattered Dreams” has been written and recorded by singer/song writer Susan Toms. Readers can see the rough draft of the ad on www.americanpolicy.org.

Regardless of the great divide in this nation, one thing remains. People are fair-minded and react to injustice. Our ads are designed to reach out to the average American and show them how their neighbors are hurting. That is a powerful message we intend to tell.

In addition, as part of the outreach to the general public, APC has created an international symbol for Property Rights Freedom. That symbol will be used by every activist group fighting Sustainable Development world wide. It will be used in our ads, publications, web sites and correspondence to show we are united.

In addition, as we build support for property rights freedom among the business community, we will ask them to display the symbol in their advertising to let people know they support our cause. To gain the right to display the symbol will require signing agreement to a Property Rights Statement of Principles.

These then are the five points to my plan to fight and stop Agenda 21/Sustainable Development policy. Fully implemented, this plan will bring major changes to our fight and start us down the road to restoring local government control. And I believe that if we can restore freedom on the local level, then we can restore it as a nation.

But how do we make it happen? The budget for this plan is \$500,000. That may seem like a lot of money for our little movement of dedicated activists, but it's a drop in the bucket considering the millions of dollars controlled by the Sustainablists.

I need 100 volunteers – dedicated activists – who will take one very specific action. To raise the funds to make this plan a reality, I have created the “Living Room Money Bomb.” One hundred people, bringing their friends and neighbors into their living rooms for the sole purpose of teaching them about Agenda 21 and raising the money to make this plan a reality.

And I don't expect these 100 people to do the talking. I will. It's easy. I have recorded a one hour video presentation that tells the details of Agenda 21 and why it is such a threat. I then go through the plan to stop it and then I make the pitch for funds. It's that simple. The full plan, video, and budget can be seen at www.apcmoneybomb.com.

If each of the 100 “Living Room Money Bombs” raise just \$5,000, I will have the \$500,000 needed. Or, as one activist said the other night during a discussion of the plan, if activists in each state would

raise a total of \$10,000 per state, we would have the needed funds.

That is such a small number considering the entire nation and the thousands of dedicated Americans trying to save our Republic.

Of course, there are the doubters who don't believe we have a chance of winning. They hang their heads in despair, crying that we have lost the Republic. They tell us that someone behind the scenes makes all the decisions. “They” decide the future of our lives goes the cry. How can we possibly compete with their billions of dollars, ask the doubters? How can we overcome their massive political power?

My plan is designed to play to our strengths of grassroots organizing. It uses assets that we already have - elected representatives who understand and are fighting from the inside of our government. Americans know something is very wrong in this nation, but many just don't understand what it is.

This plan will unite us, train dedicated activists with new tools and new tactics, and bring together a great number of elected officials who want to do something, but now lack the ability or the knowledge. We will fix that.

Step by step, we will move forward, take the offensive and march inland to attack and destroy the Sustainable Development policies that are infesting every community in this nation. And we will help those officials who are blindly implementing Sustainable Development understand that their actions have consequences on American citizens.

And so, I'm looking for just 100 dedicated Americans who want to stop Agenda 21. All you have to do is go to www.apcmoneybomb.com and sign up to host a “Living Room Money Bomb” to help provide the resources I need to put this plan in place to defeat Agenda 21. It's that simple.

Yes, we're small! Out numbered! Out spent! But, never underestimate the power of a pebble in your shoe, because a few pebbles carefully placed, after time, create a festering sore that can stop an army. And that is exactly what my plan is designed to do. ●

Continued from page 8

Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, North and South Dakota and Wisconsin in corn for fuel. Wind and solar currently provide just 3% of global energy consumption, the U.S. Energy Information Administration reports; by 2040, as the world's population continues to grow, hydroelectric, wind, solar, biomass and geothermal energy combined will still represent only 15% of the total, the EIA predicts.

Not using fossil fuels is tantamount to not using energy. It is economic suicide and eco-manslaughter.

Over the past three decades, fossil fuels enabled 1.3 billion people to escape debilitating energy poverty – over 830 million thanks to coal alone – and China connected 99% of its population to the grid and increased its steel production eight times over, again mostly with coal. However, 1.3 billion people are still desperate for electricity and modern living standards. In India alone, over 300 million people (the population of the entire United States) remain deprived of electricity.

In Sub-Saharan Africa, some 615 million (100 million more than in the USA, Canada and Mexico combined) still lack this life-saving technology, and 730 million (the population of Europe) still cook and heat with wood, charcoal and animal dung. Millions die every year from lung and intestinal diseases, due to breathing smoke from open fires and not having the safe food and water that electricity brings.

Ending this lethal energy deprivation will require abundant, reliable, affordable energy on unprecedented scales, and more than 80% of it will have to come from fossil fuels. Coal now provides 40% of the world's electricity, and much more than that in some countries. That is unlikely to change anytime soon.

We cannot even build wind and solar facilities without coal and petroleum: to mine, smelt, manufacture and transport materials for turbines, panels and transmission lines – and to build and operate backup power units that also require vast amounts of land, cement, steel, copper, rare earth metals and other materials.

Coal-fired power plants in China, India and other developing countries do emit large quantities of sulfates, nitrous oxides, mercury and soot that can cause respiratory problems and death. However, modern pollution control systems could – and eventually will – eliminate most of that.

Divestment activists try to counter these facts by claiming that climate science is settled and the world faces a manmade global warming cataclysm. On that basis they demand that colleges and universities forego any debate and rush to judgment on hydrocarbon divestment. However, as we have pointed out here and elsewhere, the alleged “97% consensus” is a fiction, no manmade climate crisis is looming, and there is abundant evidence of massive “pHraud” in all too much climate chaos “research.”

We therefore ask: What right do divestment activists and climate change alarmists have to deny Earth's most destitute people access to electricity and motor fuels, jobs and better lives? To tell people what level of economic development, health and living standards they will be “permitted” to enjoy? To subject people to policies that “safeguard” families from hypothetical, exaggerated, manufactured and illusory climate change risks 50 to 100 years from now – by imposing energy, economic and healthcare deprivation that will perpetuate disease and could kill them tomorrow?

That is not ethical. It is intolerant and totalitarian. It is arrogant, immoral, lethal and racist.

To these activists, we say: “You first. Divest yourselves first. Get fossil fuels out of your lives. All of them. Go live in Sub-Saharan Africa just like the natives for a few months, drinking their parasite-infested water, breathing their polluted air, enduring their disease-ridden flies and mosquitoes – without benefit of modern drugs or malaria preventatives... and walking 20 miles to a clinic when you collapse with fever.

To colleges, universities and pension funds, we suggest this: Ensure open, robust debate on all these issues, before you vote on divestment. Allow no noisy disruption, walk-outs or false claims of consensus. Compel divestment advocates to defend their positions, factually and respectfully. Protect the rights and aspirations of people everywhere to reliable, affordable electricity, better living standards and improved health. And instead of “Global Divestment Day,” host and honor “Hydrocarbon Appreciation Day.”

Paul Driessen is senior policy analyst for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (www.CFACT.org) and author of *Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death*. Dr. Roger Bezdek is an internationally recognized energy analyst and president of Management Information Services, Inc., in Washington, DC (www.MISI-net.com). ●

Divesting people of better living standards

“Disinvestment” of fossil fuel holdings is misguided, irresponsible, lethal – and racist

By Paul Driessen and Roger Bezdek

“Social responsibility” activists want universities and pension funds to eliminate fossil fuel companies from their investment portfolios. They spotlighted their demands on “Global Divestment Day,” February 13-14. Their agenda is misguided, immoral, lethal ... even racist.

A mere 200 years ago, the vast majority of humans were poor, sick and malnourished. Life expectancy in 1810 was less than 40 years, and even royal families lived under sanitation, disease and housing standards inferior to what poor American families enjoy today. Then a veritable revolution occurred.

The world began to enjoy a bonanza in wealth, technology, living standards and life spans. In just two centuries, average world incomes rose eleven-fold, disease rates plummeted, and life expectancy more than doubled. Unfortunately, not everyone benefitted equally, and even today billions of people still live under conditions little better than what prevailed in 1810. Bringing them from squalor, disease and early death to modernity may be our most important economic, technological and moral challenge.

Many factors played vital roles in this phenomenal advancement. However, as Julian Simon, Indur Goklanv, Alex Epstein and the authors of this article have documented, driving all this progress were fossil fuels that provided the energy for improvements in industry, transportation, housing, healthcare and environmental quality, and for huge declines in climate-related deaths due to storms, droughts, heat and cold. Modern civilization is undeniably high energy – and 85% of the world’s energy today is still coal, oil and natural gas. These fuels support \$70 trillion per year in global gross domestic product, to power virtually everything we make, grow, ship, drive, eat and do. The rest of the world deserves nothing less.

Demands that institutions eliminate hydrocarbon stocks, and society stop using fossil fuels, would reverse this progress, jeopardize people’s health and living standards, and prevent billions of still impoverished people worldwide from enjoying the living standards that many of us take for granted.

Trains and automobiles would not run. Planes would not fly. Refrigeration, indoor plumbing, safe food and water, central heating and air conditioning, plastics and pharmaceuticals would disappear or become luxuries for wealthy elites. We would swelter in summer and freeze in winter. We’d have electricity only when it’s available, not when we need it – to operate assembly lines, conduct classes and research, perform life-saving surgeries, and use computers, smart phones and social media.

Divesting fossil fuels portfolios is also financially imprudent. Fossil-fuel stocks are among the best for solid, risk-adjusted returns. One analysis found that a 2.1% share in fossil fuel companies by colleges and universities generated 5.7% of all endowment gains in 2010 to 2011, to fund scholarship, building and other programs. Teacher, police and other public pension funds have experienced similar results.

That may be why such institutions often divest slowly, if at all, over 5-10 years, to maximize their profits. One is reminded of St. Augustine of Hippo’s prayer: “Please let me be chaste and celibate – but not yet.” The “ethical” institutions selling fossil fuel stocks also need to find buyers who are willing to stand up to divestment pressure group insults and harassment. They also need to deal with hard realities.

No “scalable” alternative fuels currently exist to replace fossil fuels. To avoid the economic, social, environmental and human health catastrophes that would follow the elimination of hydrocarbons, we would need affordable, reliable options on a large enough scale to replace the fuels we rely on today. The divestment movement ignores the enormity of current and future global energy needs (met and unmet), and the fact that existing “renewable” technologies cannot possibly meet those requirements.

Fossil fuels produce far more energy per acre than biofuels, notes analyst Howard Hayden. Using biomass – instead of coal or natural gas – to generate electricity for one U.S. city of 700,000 people would require cutting down trees across an area the size of Rhode Island every year. Making corn-based ethanol to replace the gasoline in U.S. vehicles would require planting every single acre of Iowa, Illinois, Indiana,