

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.FREEDOM21.COM

GOING GREEN = \$4 PER GALLON

By Tom DeWeese

You hear it everywhere now. On the nightly news; in car ads; in government reports; at the super market. Instructions on how to “reduce your carbon footprint,” “save the planet” and “go green” are the new national mantras for behavior modification of our daily lives.

It’s interesting to note that as the nation jumps on the “go green” band wagon, more Americans are beginning to feel that the American Dream is passing them by. “Fewer Americans now than at any time in the last half century believe they’re moving forward in life,” concluded a recent report by the Pew Research Center. The report went on to say that today’s economic malaise caps a prolonged period during which the typical American lost ground as median household income fell and inflation increased. Smirked economy reporter David Lynch about the Pew report, “Suddenly, a nation that

confidently had binged on McMansions, huge SUVs and flat-screened TVs faces a future of smaller dwellings, shrunken cars and painful credit card repayment.” Apparently, in Lynch’s world it is wrong for people to be successful, enjoying the fruits of their labor.

Lynch and the Pew report were dwelling on the economy. Funny how they seemed to fail to make the connection between the loss of American economic strength and the drive to “go green.” Is there a connection? You bet there is.

Going green (its real name is sustainable development) has led to Orwellian regulations resulting in the destruction of American businesses and the jobs that go with them, including manufacturing and industry; the locking away of American natural resources like oil, timber and minerals, forcing expensive imports; the near abolishment of private property, the bedrock of any economy’s source of wealth; and massive invasion of the farming industry to assure it is “sustainable,” including the mandated use of corn for the making of ethanol, leading to food shortages and higher prices.

Above all, the “go green” mindset has resulted in a refusal by political leaders and Congress to even consider anything but renewable fuels as a legitimate source of energy. Last year’s Energy bill, supposed to be the guideline for energy policy for coming years, literally made no mention of any kind of energy but alternative fuels like wind power, solar and ethanol. And

the American people, buried under an avalanche of environmentally-correct propaganda, have blindly accepted the go green mantra, missing its connection to their economic woes.

At a time when the nation is facing an economic meltdown because of rising gas prices, oil use is ignored in the most important energy policy in the nation. Astonishing. As prices continue to rise, Washington’s response is “there’s nothing we can do.” President Bush says, “I wish I had a magic wand.” John McCain says “prices will continue to rise.” Barack Obama says “tax the oil companies,” as Congress begins a witch hunt on them, pledging the get to the bottom of their “excess profits.” Senator Barbara Boxer says “now is the best time to raise energy prices.” The Democrats want to “sue” OPEC.”

In all of this rhetoric, notice how NO action that includes the drilling of oil is considered. It’s taboo. Off the table. Suffer America, because the wisdom of the day is that oil is out. Alternatives are in. Go green! This, of course, completely ignores the fact that the U.S. uses oil for 85% of its energy needs.

Such policy is driven by the Sustainable Development lobby. Led by massively wealthy and powerful special interests like the Sierra Club, Audubon Society, the National Resources Defense Council and Earthjustice, to name a very few. With their dollars and lobbyists, they are forcing Congress to implement the policies outlined in the UN’s Agenda

IN THIS ISSUE:

3. RESISTANCE TO REASON:
UN Millenium Project and the Drive for Global Governance
4. ABSOLUTES:
Responding to ‘None of the Above’
6. INSIDERS REPORT:
American Ranching Family Wins 17-Year Battle with the Federal Government
7. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:
Barack Obama and the UN’s Drive for Global Governance

21 soft law document. It pretends to be environmental policy, but is really a complete transformation of our society and economy to a top down control, leading toward global governance. The environment is just the excuse to convince unaware Americans to give up their liberties “to save the earth.”

Global warming has been the most convenient threat upon which all of the rhetoric has been based. What it is really leading to is the creation of a new economy based on trading carbon credits. Such policy is really nothing more than a massive redistribution of the wealth scheme designed to force industrial nations to make deals with less developed ones to trade for energy credits and get around severe energy use restrictions. It’s what Al Gore trades in order to allow him to claim he has a “zero carbon footprint” – even as he flies around the world in his jets and pays \$2000 electric bills on his Tennessee mansion. In the end, the same emissions are released into the atmosphere, but money and power exchanges hands from the industrial nations to the less developed. Where is the protection for the environment? Of course there isn’t any.

The International Energy Agency just reported the need for an “energy revolution” in which it will cost \$45 trillion to combat Global Warming. What bunk. Global warming is quickly proving to be little more than a natural phenomenon, having virtually nothing to do with man. Science has now shown that human caused CO2 emissions amounts to no more than .017% -- virtually insignificant. More and more scientists – by the thousands – are now expressing their skepticism about the whole global warming theory. But that hasn’t stopped the “go green” mind-set in Congress. Again, that’s because the real goal is a reorder of society and the economy – not the environment. The recently defeated Lieberman – Warner Climate Security Act was the latest attempt to “reorder” the American economy to the lie of Global Warming.

As more Americans are expressing frustration and outrage over the rising prices, demanding that American oil be drilled for Americans, the greens are in a panic to stop such blasphemy. They smugly dismiss the idea, saying such oil couldn’t possible reach their gas tanks for five to ten years. ANWR, they say, has only enough oil to provide us about a

year’s supply – hardly worth the effort.

The fact is, the only reason it would take that long to bring the oil to America’s gas tanks is because of the environmental regulations that are causing the problem in the first place. The United States is in an emergency situation. And that calls for emergency action by our leaders. This is the same country that, after being attacked at Pearl Harbor, transformed peacetime industry overnight into the greatest war machine in history. If we wanted to we could have that oil flowing within the year.

But it would take leadership from a president who knows how and cares to lead. President Bush doesn’t need a magic wand. He has the bully pulpit. He should go on national television and address the American people and tell them what he is going to do about this crisis. He should enlist the people to help him move Congress to immediately pass legislation to open up areas throughout the nation for drilling, from ANWR; to known reserves in the Rocky Mountains; to those off the coasts of Florida and California. He could demand that America begin drilling now. And the people would respond.

Finding alternative energy solutions is fine. It will certainly be a solution for the future. But a nation doesn’t destroy itself because of an as yet, unachievable dream. A nation’s leaders are supposed to look out for their own people and keep their nation strong.

Today’s cowardly political leaders are the Neville Chamberlains of our day, giving into the unceasing demands of the modern day Sustainablist Nazis. The Greens, in their lust for control over our lives, have proven they will stop at nothing, able to lie, cheat and steal to get their way. Obviously they have no regard for the poor, who are suffering the most in this “green” society. They are stomping on individual thoughts and actions if it is contrary to their vision of a green utopia.

Going green = sustainable development = a coming dark ages for all of mankind. Americans have only just begun to experience it and they are already feeling loss and a sense of hopelessness. \$4 per gallon of gas is only the start of what is to come, unless we fight back now. We can start by throwing off the shackles and drilling American oil for Americans. 

THE DeWEESE REPORT

Vol. 14, No. 7 July 2008

Published by
Freedom21 Communications, LLC

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

Web Page:
www.freedom21.com

© 2008 Freedom21
Communications, LLC
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 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.



RESISTANCE TO REASON

REVEALING FACTS OF THOSE WHO HAVE DECLARED WAR ON LOGIC



UN Millenium Project and the Drive for Global Governance

“A Plan to Save Humanity is Almost Always a False Front for the Urge to Rule.” H.L. MENCKEN

Those of us who have for years, warned of the coming of global governance and the threat of globalization to our freedom, have been marginalized and labeled as “kooks.” So here is what we are talking about in the words of UN documents and reports written by Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) for discussion at a variety of international (or should I say global) UN conferences.

The End of Sovereignty and Independence

“The bedrock of every country’s international relations must be the mission of using the United Nations system as the machinery for working and acting together.” - *Shridath Ramphal, co-chairman, UN Commission on Global Governance*

“Nationhood as we know it will be obsolete, all states will recognize a single, global authority... National sovereignty wasn’t such a great idea after all.” - *Strobe Talbott, U.S. Deputy Secretary of State in the Clinton Administration*

“It is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nation-states, however powerful.” - *Maurice Strong, co-chairman, UN Commission on Global Governance*

What is Globalization (No borders)

“Although globalization has become a very popular term, it is often misunderstood and confused. And globalization is sometimes understood as the same meaning as internationalization. However, globalization is quite different from internationalization. Globalization goes further beyond internationalization, where nation states are in increasing contact with one another, but nevertheless remain separate. **Globalization means**

that the globe becomes one world, where national borders have little significance. While governments controlled internationalization, today’s globalization is largely guided by market forces and non-state actors like transnational corporations are playing more and more roles beyond government intervention.” - *UN Millennium Forum discussion paper, May 8, 2000*

Economic Globalization (redistribution of your wealth)

“...The most urgent problem of our global village seems to be distribution of wealth rather than growth of production. The world production is already big enough to satisfy all needs – although never big enough to satisfy all greed.” - *UN Millennium Forum discussion paper, May 8, 2000*

Abolish or Control Private Property

“Land cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Private land ownership is also a principle instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth, therefore, contributes to social injustice.” - *UN Habitat II Summit, 1976*

Changing the Structure of Government to Force Global Governance

In 1997, UN Secretary Kofi Annan proposed that the Commission on Global Governance should serve to “link the UN and civil society (NGOs) in their collective trusteeship for the integrity of the Global environment and commons area.”

“‘Global governance’ in our vocabulary does not imply a global ‘government’, but rather the institution set up for cooperation, coordination,

and common action between durable sovereign states... people and nations are beginning to agree to take the next steps together. They are reaching a consensus by practical procedures rather than by formal voting of governmental representatives; many international functions, especially those requiring the most foresight and operational flexibility, and be carried out through non-governmental arrangements.” - *Report by the Club of Rome entitled “The First Global Revolution”*

“We call for: Decision making structures to be changed to enable a transition to sustainable production and consumption... the common threat in all of these debates is the challenge to develop new models of governance. Sustainable Development will not be achieved without institutional change” - *UN Millennium Forum discussion paper, May 8, 2000*

Why We Have \$4 Per Gallon Gas - And Rising

“A shift is necessary toward lifestyles less geared to environmentally-damaging consumption patterns. The shift will require a vast strengthening of the multilateral system, including the United Nations.” - *Maurice Strong, Chairman, 1992 Earth Summit*

“...current lifestyle and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class – involving high meat intake, use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and work air conditioning, and suburban housing are not sustainable.” - *Maurice Strong, Chairman, 1992 Earth Summit*

“Isn’t the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn’t it our responsibility to bring that about?” - *Maurice Strong, Chairman, 1992 Earth Summit*



ABSOLUTES....!

Responding to “None of the Above”

By Tom DeWeese

A few weeks ago I wrote an article about an addition to the election system called

“None of the Above” and I asked American Policy Center supporters if they would support it. The answers certainly told the tale of the frustration over our election process that produces candidates most of us don’t care for.

First, I asked three specific questions: 1. **Are you satisfied with your choices for president this year?** Overwhelmingly, APC supporters answered NO. Only 3 out of 1000 responses said they were satisfied with our choices. There were a few undecided. Of course, more than a hundred reminded me that Ron Paul is still running. *I get the message!*

The reason I didn’t mention Ron Paul (whom I voted for in the Virginia primary and whom I have worked closely with for more than 10 years) is because I wanted to make a point that the major parties were offering some very unsavory candidates for us to choose from. Regardless of how badly you want Ron Paul, he is not going to be the Republican candidate this fall. Even though he is still officially running, even he will admit that he isn’t going to be on the ticket.

There were also several who desperately admonished me to support John McCain out of terror that we will end up with one of those horrid Democrats unless we all pitch in to support McCain. Whether to support McCain or not is an issue for another article. It has nothing to do with the “None of the Above” issue.

The second question asked: **Would you support an official alternative on the ballot which would allow you to reject candidates, forcing a new election with new choices?** Again, the response was almost unanimous in support of the idea. However, the most often stated fear was that such a choice would throw elections to the Democrats. Apparently, APC

supporters are convinced that Democrats are happy with their candidates and would vote in lock-step for them while only Republicans would split their vote with some choosing “None of the Above.” One comment said, “Most Democrats would vote for Satan himself. Republicans would be split, handing Dems the victory.” It may be of interest to these folks to learn that there is no difference in support for “None of the Above” between Democrats and Republicans.

And the third question: **“If such a system were possible, would you support and encourage the American Policy Center to promote the implementation of that system?”** Again, a huge majority of responders said yes. However, several thought the effort would be much too costly and that APC would be much better off spending its time and resources working on our core issues of property and privacy rights, national sovereignty and illegal immigration. I want to make it clear; APC never intended to organize the necessary state-by-state ballot drives it would take to implement “None of the Above.” We are simply not equipped to do that. APC’s role would be to spread the idea and for others to pick it up at the local and state level and run with it. We have already started that process by issuing articles to our media list and discussing the issue on the radio. I would not commit APC’s limited funds to anything more. We aren’t big enough. So, no need to worry.

Beyond the answers to these three questions, there were lots of comments provided on the subject. Many said they thought “None of the Above” was the “*best idea*” they had ever heard. “*Fantastic idea. I believe it would work.*” “*This is the most common sense idea that APC has come up with yet.*” My favorite positive response was “*I have a better idea. How about Tom DeWeese on the ballot.*” Thanks just the same. I think I’ll stick with what I’m doing.

On the other hand, there were many who expressed

...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

doubt in the idea. So many misunderstood the process necessary to get “None of the Above” on the ballot. Several said it would take a Constitutional Amendment. While it could be in the states, “None of the Above” status does not require a Federal Constitutional amendment. Ballot items are state and local issues.

The biggest misunderstanding was the idea that I was suggesting this for the 2008 presidential election. Perhaps that’s my fault since I started the article by expressing dissatisfaction with the current presidential candidates. I was trying to make a point. This will be a long-term process and is primarily aimed at local, state and congressional candidates. While it should certainly be used in presidential elections as well, the real power comes from rejecting the lower level candidates.

Others said we should just run write-in campaigns or support third-party candidates. While both of these are options that many can and should follow, both take dedication, time and money to accomplish. With “None of the Above” on the ballot, no campaign is necessary. The choice is there for you if you don’t like any other candidates offered. It gives you an automatic choice. It will not win in most elections – only those in which unacceptable candidates are offered.

Here is why I support “None of the Above:” It gives the people complete control. Re-do elections would be rare, but always a threat if the political power brokers try to ignore the electorate and force candidates down our throats – as they do now. We currently have no option as a response to candidates chosen by those who are loaded with money and political clout. We just have to take it and it’s getting worse all the time.

The fear that Democrats will vote in lock step while Republicans split their vote is simply unfounded. Right now, legions of Hillary supporters are appalled at the prospects of Obama’s nomination and would love to have an alternative. If the choice was provided,

many of them would vote “None of the Above.” Their votes combined with dissatisfied Republicans could throw the election to “None of the Above” and voters would reject these very unsatisfying choices. It only has to happen once for the major parties to be forced to make changes. Moreover, the strongest threat is to local, state and congressional candidates. It only takes a couple of “None of the Above” victories to see that the electorate is back in charge.

Finally, the fear that such re-do elections would cost too much, is again unfounded, given the fact that “None of the Above” victories would be rare. Yes, it would cost extra money. However, if it means getting a better candidate, isn’t it worth it to hold a new election - especially considering how much a very bad candidate would cost us if he actually got into office? Yes, if “None of the Above” wins, the office remains vacant until it’s filled. To set up another election and fill the spot would work exactly like the process provided in the Constitution when an incumbent dies or resigns and a special election is held. It’s no different, except this time it would happen because of the will of the people.

Yes, getting “None of the Above” on the ballot in many states would mean that current elected officials would be agreeing to jeopardize their own jobs. Why would they do that? Only because we succeed in creating a strong movement of voters which demand it. No one is saying this will be an easy process. But such movements have succeeded before. For example, we could begin to force candidates to support the measure much like they now sign “no tax” pledges. In short, they would support it because they have no choice.

But all of that depends on the voters. Do you want to take back control or are you satisfied to have your choices made for you behind closed doors? Because that’s what we have now. How’s that working for you?

*... there is no
difference in
support for “None
of the Above”
between Democrats
and Republicans.*



INSIDER'S REPORT

American Ranching Family Wins 17-Year Battle with the Federal Government - Landmark decision in Hage v U.S. Issued by Federal Court of Claims

An epic 17-year battle between an American ranching family and the federal government has ended in favor of the family. The estates of Wayne and Jean Hage can finally claim a Fifth Amendment precedent-setting property rights victory. The court ruled that the Hages owned the water rights, ditch rights of ways, and range improvements on the federal grazing allotments. The court made clear that the government has the right to authorize grazing, but does not have the right to prevent the plaintiff from accessing their water rights on federal lands. Loren A. Smith, Senior Judge for the US Court of Federal Claims said, "As government seeks to change its policies concerning the purpose and use of public lands, private landowners have a valid claim to preserve their vested rights...the notion of private property is fundamental to the existence of our Nation...if private property is taken for public use, those citizens should be justly compensated."

Tonopah, Nevada (PRWEB) June 10, 2008 -- An epic 17-year battle between an American ranching family and the federal government has ended in favor of the family. The estates of Wayne and Jean Hage can finally claim a Fifth Amendment precedent-setting property rights victory.

Loren A. Smith, Senior Judge for the United States Court of Federal Claims issued his final opinion in Hage v. United States (Case No. 91-1470L), ending the decades-long battle by deciding that the federal government indeed took the private property rights of E. Wayne and Jean Hage and awarding them deserved compensation

The court ruled that the Hages owned the water rights, ditch rights of ways, and range improvements on the federal grazing allotments. The court made clear that the government has the right to authorize grazing, but does not have the right to prevent the plaintiff from accessing their water rights on federal lands. (Case #91-1470L, The Estate of E. Wayne Hage and the Estate of Jean N. Hage v. The United States, June 6, 2008.)

"This decision is important to every American because it reaffirms our basic right to own property, whether you live in a major US city or rural America," commented Margaret Byfield, the Hage's third daughter and executive director of the Stewards of the Range organization which has supported the case since the beginning.

Wayne and Jean Hage filed their takings case in 1991, claiming the U.S. Forest Service had denied their rights to graze their livestock on federal land and actively prevented them from accessing and maintaining their water rights.

The family has endured 17 years of court hearings and trials, and has won at every level, including the final round. "This is clearly a victory for my parents, who never gave up," commented Ruth Agee, the second of the five Hage children. Wayne and Jean are both buried on the private meadows at Pine Creek Ranch, which will remain with the family.

Pine Creek Ranch was established in 1865, and purchased by the Hage family in 1978. The private fee lands encompass 7,000 acres, but as the court points out, "To raise cattle economically in such an arid region, Plaintiffs depend upon access to large quantities of land, including federal land, and to the limited water supply."

In 1979, one year after the family purchased the ranch trouble began with the Forest Service when the USFS allowed the release of non-indigenous elk on the Hage's Table Mountain allotment. The elk began competing with their cattle for forage and water. However, instead of controlling the elk, the Forest Service reduced and ultimately canceled the Hage's grazing permits.

Years of harassment by the federal government followed, including over 70 "visits" from the Forest Service and 40 letters charging them with various violations, which many, the court noted, were "extremely minor infractions." The court further pointed out that the Forest Service made many unreasonable requirements. "In addition, the Forest Service insisted that Plaintiffs maintain their 1866 Act ditches with nothing other than hand tools."

After the Forest Service canceled the remaining grazing permits in 1990, the family was forced to file their takings case known as Hage v. United States.

Ladd Bedford, one of the attorneys for the Hage family, who was involved in the case from its inception, noted the important precedent: "There is now a deterrent to the federal agencies. The federal government has significant exposure by way of having to pay just compensation when they deny ranchers access to their water and range improvements."

“This is an important legal victory,” commented Mike Van Zandt, the other attorney who has been involved in the case since the early 1990’s. “The agencies have used their regulatory power to drive ranchers out of business with no regard for their property rights, and now the court has set limits on the agency’s actions.”

Internationally known western artist, Jack Swanson, a long time Hage family friend said; “Two American heroes and the western rancher have been vindicated by this decision.” Swanson painted the original oil painting entitled “Stewards of the Range,” from which the organization took its name and raised over \$100,000 for the case.

“My parents wanted resolution,” commented Byfield. “They were told by the agencies that they had no property rights on the federal lands. They pursued this case so that this 60-year conflict between ranchers and agencies could be settled, and future generations of ranchers would have the security of their property rights. They succeeded.”

The Court found that regulatory and physical takings occurred, and the government owes the estates of Wayne and Jean Hage \$4.2 million in compensation, plus 17 years of interest and attorney’s fees.



SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY

BARACK OBAMA AND THE UN’S DRIVE FOR GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

By Tom DeWeese

Senator Barack Obama has introduced a dangerous bill and it’s on the fast track to Senate passage, probably because of his high profile position as the expected Democrat presidential nominee. Obama hasn’t done much legislatively in his freshman Senate term, but this one is very telling about what we can expect from a President Obama.

The bill is the “Global Poverty Act” (S.2433) and is not just a compassionate bit of fluff that Obama dreamed up to help the poor of the world. This bill is directly tied to the United Nations and serves as little more than a shakedown of American taxpayers in a massive wealth redistribution scheme. In fact, if passed, The Global Poverty Act will provide the United Nations with 0.7% of the United States gross national product. Estimates are that it will add up to at least \$845 billion of taxpayer money for welfare to third world countries, in addition to the \$300 billion Americans spent for the same thing in 2006.

The situation is urgent because the Global Poverty Act has already passed the House of Representatives by a unanimous voice vote on September 25, 2007. The senate version has been passed out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by unanimous consent and ready for a full Senate vote.

Of course the United States has had an ongoing program of supplying foreign aid and assistance to the poor for decades. And the U.S. pays most of the bills at the UN for its herd of programs. So what’s new about Obama’s bill, and why is it dangerous?

Some history that led up to the Global Poverty Act. In 1999 and 2000 non-governmental organizations, NGOs held numerous meetings around the world to write what became known as the Charter for Global Democracy. The document was prepared to be a blueprint for achieving global governance. In reality it was a charter for the abolition of individual freedom,

national sovereignty and limited government.

The Charter for Global Democracy outlined its goals in 12 detailed “principles:”

- Principle One called for the consolidation of all international agencies under the direct authority of the UN.
- Principle Two called for UN regulation of all transnational corporations and financial institutions, requiring an “international code of conduct” concerning the environment and labor standards.
- Principle Three explored various schemes to create independent revenue sources for the UN – meaning UN taxes including fees on all international monetary transactions, taxes on aircraft flights in the skies, and on shipping fuels, and licensing of what the UN called the “global commons,” meaning use of air, water and natural resources. The Law of the Sea Treaty fits this category.
- Principle Four would restructure the UN by eliminating the veto power and permanent member status on the Security Council. Such a move would almost completely eliminate U.S. influence and power in the world body. In turn Principle Four called for the creation of an “Assembly of the People” which would be populated by hand-picked non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which are nothing more than political groups with their own agendas (the UN calls NGOs “civil society”). Now, the UN says these NGO’s will be the representatives of the “people” and the Assembly of the People will become the new power of the UN.
- Principle Five would authorize a standing UN army.
- Principle six would require UN registration of all arms and the reduction of all national armies “as part of a multinational

global security system” under the authority of the UN.

- Principle Seven would require individual and national compliance with all UN “Human rights” treaties and declarations.
- Principle Eight would activate the UN Criminal Court and make it compulsory for all nations -- now achieved.
- Principle Nine called for a new institution to establish economic and environmental security by ensuring “Sustainable Development.”
- Principle Ten would establish an International Environmental Court
- Principle Eleven demanded an international declaration stating that climate change is an essential global security interest that requires the creation of a “high level action team” to allocate carbon emissions based on equal per-capita rights -- The Kyoto Global Warming Treaty in action.
- Principle Twelve demanded the cancellation of all debt owed by the poorest nations, global poverty reductions and for the “equitable sharing” of global resources, as allocated by the UN -- here is where Obama’s Global Poverty Act comes in.

Specifically, the Charter for Global Democracy was intended to give the UN domain over all of the earth’s land, air and seas. In addition it would give the UN the power to control all natural resources, wild life, and energy sources, even radio waves. Such control would allow the UN to place taxes on everything from development; to fishing; to air travel; to shipping. Anything that could be defined as using the earth’s resources would be subject to UN use-taxes. Coincidentally, all twelve principles came directly from the UN’s Commission on Global Governance.

There was one major problem with the Charter for Global Democracy, at least as far as the UN was concerned. It was too honest and straightforward. Overt action displeases the high-order thinking skills of UN diplomats. The UN likes to keep things fuzzy and gray so as not to scare off the natives. That way there is less chance of screaming headlines of a pending takeover by the UN. So, by the time the UN’s Millennium Summit rolled around in September 2000, things weren’t quite so clear.

At the Summit, attended by literally every head of state and world leader, including then-president Bill Clinton, the name of the Charter had been changed to the Millennium Declaration and the language had been toned down to sound more like suggestions and ideas. Then those “suggestions” were put together in the “Millennium Declaration” in the name of all of the heads of state. No vote or debate was allowed -- just acclamation by world leaders who basically said nothing. And the deed was done. The UN had its marching orders for the new Millennium.

Now the principles were called “Millennium Goals,” and there were eight instead of twelve. Goal 1: Eradicate Extreme Hunger and Poverty; Goal 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education; Goal 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empowerment

of Women; Goal 4: Reduce Child Mortality; Goal 5: Improve Maternal Health; Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other diseases; Goal 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability; Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development.

Yes, these are sneaky guys, well trained in the art of saying nothing. Who could oppose such noble goals? The Millennium Project, which was set up to achieve the “goals” says on its website that it intends to “end poverty by 2015.” A noble goal, indeed. So what happened to the 12 Charter principles? Take a hard look – they are all still there.

Principles One, Two, and Twelve are right there in Goal 8 – to develop a global partnership for development. Now almost every world organization such as the World Bank carries a section on their web sites calling for “Millennium Development Goals” which control international banking and loan policy. They set policy goals for each country and sometimes communities to measure if nations are keeping their promise to implement the Millennium goals.

Principle Seven is clearly Goal 3, the only way to assure Gender Equality is to enforce compliance with UN Human Rights treaties. Principle Eight has already been achieved. Principle Nine is Goal 7. Al Gore is doing his best to enforce Principle Eleven. Global Warming, no matter how well the theory is debunked, just won’t go away because it is one of the Millennium Goals.

And then there is Barack Obama’s Global Poverty Act. Can you see which Principle that is? Of course, Principle 12 and Goal 1. Obama’s bill specifically mentions the Millennium Goals as its guide and the 0.7% of GNP is right out of UN documents. In order to eradicate poverty by 2015, they say, every industrial nation must pony up 0.7% of their GNP to the UN for use in eradicating poverty.

The UN is now becoming an international collection agency, pressing to collect the promises the world leaders made at the Millennium Summit. The UN wants the cash. In 2005 former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan said, “Developed countries that have not already done so should establish timetables to achieve the 0.7% target of gross national income for official development assistance by no later than 2015...”

At the Summit in 2000, the UN set clear goals to establish its power over sovereign nations and to enforce the greatest redistribution of wealth scheme ever perpetrated on the world. Now it has the Criminal Court; Sustainable Development is fast becoming official policy in every corner of the nation—only today we call it “going green;” and there is a full court press on to enforce Global Warming policy, in spite of the fact that there is now much evidence surfacing to debunk the theory.

Clearly, Obama’s bill has been introduced to assure the United States falls in line with the Millennium Declaration and all that it stands for. After all, the UN needs the money to pay for its new found power. Truth, science and American taxpayer interests be hanged. Barack Obama wants to be a “world” leader.

