

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.FREEDOM21.COM

GOVERNMENT GONE MAD IN A TOTAL SURVEILLANCE SOCIETY

By Tom DeWeese

I've heard it all- the cries, the pleas, the whines, the double speak and the lies. "We need the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to protect us from terrorists." "We must have Real ID to protect us from illegal immigration." "We must have E-Verify to protect American jobs." "Traffic light cameras are necessary to make the streets safer." "Security cameras on street corners make our neighborhoods safer." "I'm glad the TSA is there at the airport - I feel so much safer getting on an airplane." And my favorite lie of them all - "If you have nothing to hide you have nothing to fear."

Take note: every single one of these issues results in bigger, more invasive government, and not a single one will do anything to solve the intended problem. Every single one will make you less free, less happy and less safe. Here is my guarantee - put each and every one of these programs fully into place and learn the hard way that it

isn't the final solution - but only the beginning. The government has much more in store for Americans and their privacy and personal security - and you are not going to be happy. Get ready, Americans. Here it comes like a freight train. And if you've uttered one of the whines listed above, then you have no one to blame but yourself.

I've argued that the Department of Homeland Security is the greatest threat that liberty Americans have ever faced. It began with 170,000 employees by combining 22 existing federal agencies, including Border Patrol, Coast Guard, Secret Service, FEMA, Transportation Security Agency (TSA), Immigration and Naturalization, Customs Service, Animal and Plant Health Inspection, Federal Protective Service, FBI's Domestic Preparedness, Federal Computer Incident Response Center, and several more lesser agencies of the same type.

All of these agencies are under the control of one manager, the Secretary of Homeland Security. As a result of provisions in the Patriot Act (a monstrous law, passed in the panic of 9/11 and admittedly never read by a single member of Congress before it was passed) the DHS Secretary - one person - has the power to send federal law enforcement into private homes

without a search warrant. Records and materials may be taken from private homes, computer records searched, phones tapped and e-mails monitored, without the knowledge of the suspect.

Now, some may argue that all of that is necessary to catch a terrorist and that it is not intended to affect innocent citizens. Again, it's the -"IF YOU HAVE NOTHING TO HIDE - YOU HAVE NOTHING TO FEAR" excuse. Before moving forward, let's get rid of this naive utterance once and for all.

First, that statement really says that *government always gets it right*. So fear of searches is just nonsense - if you are innocent. Well, have you heard the recording of Campaign for Liberty employee Steve Bierfeldt when he was detained by the TSA simply because he was carrying about \$4000 in cash from a conference? All young Steve did was ask the TSA agents to show him the law that said they had a right to ask him why he was carrying the money. The checks in the same metal box as the cash were made out to the Campaign for Liberty. Any moron could have figured out where the money came from and what it was for. But the TSA didn't care - they wanted to show their authority. Bierfeldt presented the entire box to TSA agents, not trying to conceal it in any way. TSA tried to

IN THIS ISSUE:

- 5. Firestorm in Spokane
- 8. INSIDERS REPORT:
'Execute' Skeptics!
- 10. Climate Change Morality
- 12. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:
Gods Come Cheap These Days

bully him and threatened to turn him over to drug enforcement authorities, as an attempt to make it appear he was carrying the cash from drug deals. Steve's reply was basically, "Fine – will they be able to show me the law?" Innocent Steve had nothing to hide and plenty to fear from TSA thugs.

Second, that statement says that *the Bill of Rights was only created to protect the guilty*. You see, if you have nothing to hide, then you obviously don't need to be protected from government. The Constitution was written by men who feared government – even the one they were creating – and they put safeguards in it to force government to recognize and respect our property and our right to be innocent until proven guilty. DHS and the Patriot Act, and those who use the mantra "If you have nothing to hide you have nothing to fear," reject and ignore those guarantees. Under the Patriot Act and its agents in the DHS and TSA, you are not secure in your home or your person, you are not innocent until proven guilty and you are not allowed to face your accusers. That means tyranny, not the Constitution, is in control.

Supposedly, the DHS mission is to be our frontline against terrorism. An added bonus, say its supporters, is to help reduce illegal immigration. Yet the department has opposed the most obvious element of "homeland security" - securing the nation's borders. DHS has blocked building the wall. It's done nothing about enforcing Visa violators. And sometimes it even blocks local law enforcement from arresting and deporting known illegals.

Instead, DHS has been on a rampage to impose rules, regulations and projects, all designed to put legal, law abiding Americans in a massive straight jacket.

Real ID is Not a Tool to Fight Illegal Immigration

First there was the Real ID Act. Unfortunately, some misguided Conservative leaders, both in the grassroots and in Congress continue to

support this terrible Act as a safeguard to stop illegal immigration. They are horribly wrong.

Real ID is argued to be an attempt to standardize the process and format for the creation of all state drivers' licenses to achieve increased security. Proponents argue that now we will know that anyone carrying a driver's license is legal in this country and therefore not a threat. What most Americans do not know is that Real ID did not originate in the United States, but in the back rooms of a UN organization called the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

Real ID mandates a certain picture quality for all drivers' licenses that are to be compliant with the ICAO's Document 9303 biometric format. Your photo taken by a local DMV is run thorough special software which measures and analyzes the unique personally identifiable characteristics of your face. The process results in a unique numeric code which identifies a person according to facial measurements. In other words, under Real ID, your face is reduced to a number code – a number which is read by a computer, tracked by surveillance cameras and distributed worldwide by the ICAO. Take a look at your drivers' license – if it has a blue background, it is ICAO-compliant.

Real ID is not a National ID card designed to protect us from terrorism and illegal immigration – it is an INTERNATIONAL ID card designed to track the movements of everyone wherever they go – anywhere in the world. As you read on you will find that it will get much worse, for Real ID is only the first step.

The Obama Administration is now talking about repealing Real ID because there is such opposition to it. Do not be fooled. They know they are caught with this monster and so the flimflam is on – repeal Real ID and replace it with something much worse. That's how they play the game.

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 15, No. 7 July 2009

Published by
Freedom21 Communications, LLC

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Copy Editor
Virginia DeWeese

Correspondence/Fulfillment
Sascha McGuckin
Carolyn DeWeese

Graphics/Layout
Kristy Hook

The DeWeese Report
70 Main Street, Suite 23
Warrenton, VA 20186

Phone: (540) 341-8910
Fax: (540) 341-8916

Web Page:
www.freedom21.com

© 2009 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.

E-Verify – Government Control of Jobs

Second, the E-Verify system has been sold with the same argument – just a tool to stop illegal immigration. And those opposing it have been accused of being either liberals who just want open borders, or greedy businesses who want cheap labor. While it is true that elements of both exist in the opposition to E-Verify, the overwhelming number of opponents do so because of its connection with the creation of an international biometric ID system.

Once again, because the government refuses to do its job, it has decided to make business the scapegoat in the battle against illegal immigration. It's so easy for these government hypocrites to put the burden of enforcement on the backs of those who simply wanted to start a business. Not only is business now forced to be the national tax collector and healthcare provider, it is also to be our first line of border defense. And we need government – why?

In truth, E-Verify, which uses Social Security numbers to determine if someone is an American citizen is, again, the brain child of the Department of Homeland Security. Are you seeing a pattern here? Under expanded DHS rules, as in Real ID, E-Verify will now use “enhanced photograph capability” that will allow employers to check photographs in E-Verify databases. And, again, those photographs are compliant to the UN's ICAO international databases. DHS is now also expanding compliant databases to include visa and passport files.

The main danger in E-Verify is that it sets the stage for a national workforce management system which gives the government ultimate power to decide who works and who doesn't. It is designed to ultimately help subject all Americans to an intrusive global

surveillance system as the information in DHS databanks is being transferred to international systems through DHS partners, including the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) and, of course, the ICAO.

Now, here's where the terrifying truth about the Department of Homeland Security and the Real ID-E-Verify matrix being created begins to come into focus. (Those Americans who supported these plans just because they wanted a little security are now going to find how wrong they are.)

Cameras On Every Corner

The world is now full of security cameras called CCTVs. They are in every public building, every airport, and every convenience store. And it's the same around the world. It is said that one can not travel anywhere in London without being on a camera. The same is quickly becoming true in Washington, DC and many other American cities. Washington, DC is now installing cameras on nearly every street corner in every neighborhood to watch for crime. Do you feel safer yet? Of course, now every city has found the quick-buck benefits of traffic light cameras. Police control by mail. How modern.

Now, what's the connection between Real ID and CCTV's? Your driver's license or more precisely, your digital facial image/photograph is, and will be used with CCTV to identify you. It will not matter if you are in your hometown or in Berlin, Germany. Government will be able to identify you without your even knowing it. The CCTV camera will be pointed at you, a scan of your face will be taken and the results of the scan will be compared to domestic and international databases to determine your identity. The main purpose of the Real ID Act is to ensure we are enrolled into a global biometric

identification system so government can know our whereabouts at all times. It has absolutely nothing to do with stopping illegal immigration – or even terrorists. You must understand most of these plans were at least being discussed long before 9/11 occurred. The only real barrier was the lack of technology. It's no longer a problem.

Suspicious Sweat

And so it gets worse. As we are all quietly enrolled in the international databases, there are plans to efficiently use that information. Comes now the Department of Homeland Security's “Project Hostile Intent” (PHI). Ohh – wait a minute – that's just too harsh (and revealing) for politically-correct public officials. Please just wait a minute while they rename it to “Future Attribute Screening Technologies” (FAST). That's better. Now we can all relax. The government just wants to keep us all safer, faster!

What ever the name, the result is the same. FAST is a computer software program that assesses whether or not a person is more or less likely to present a threat based on the way a person behaves, walks, dresses or other factors. In fact the government is now working to obtain sensors that will help them monitor our sweat to decide if you are a threat based on how much you perspire.

That means, if you are walking down the street, perhaps with your children, maybe sightseeing in a foreign town, and a CCTV monitor picks you up, you may be approached by law enforcement to determine if you are a security threat – simply because you matched the profile by the way you dressed or walked - or if you are sweating too much. You will be required to pull out your government-sanctioned ID and justify why you are there and what you are doing, regardless of the activity in which you are engaged. *(Cont'd on page 4)*

Do you get it yet? The point is law enforcement will not need actual probable cause to observe or detain you. All it will need to do is claim that you walk, dress or sweat suspiciously.

Control and Intimidation

There are two kinds of control – direct and indirect. Real ID compliance is direct control. Without compliance through the proper drivers' license you will lose access to public buildings, government services like marriage licenses, gun ownership, or travel by air or soon, even by train or bus.

Indirect control comes from intimidation. Russell Tice, former National Security Agency (NSA) analyst has warned about that agency's efforts to intercept American's e-mails and phone calls. He has also discussed the monitoring of cash transactions. Obviously this is the kind of intimidation young Steve Bierfeldt was experiencing when the TSA thought they had him hidden away in a windowless room at the airport as they harassed and attempted to scare him into submission. Luckily that courageous young man was not intimidated and turned the tables on them by recording their tactics. The idea behind it all is to make you afraid to speak out or fight back – “Just let me on my plane and I promise not to make a fuss.”

“Right-wing Extremists”

– Not Illegal Immigrants – are the Target

So for those of you who may still think this is all just an overstatement – a misunderstanding – for those who still think Real ID and E-Verify are just necessary tools for stopping illegal immigration - - let me bring all of this together.

In the June issue of *The DeWeese Report* (Volume 15, Issue 6) the lead article entitled “The Department of Homeland Security is a “Man-Caused

Disaster,” I reported on the MIAC Report from the State of Missouri and another report from the Department of Homeland Security. Both reports were intended to warn law enforcement to be on the lookout for rightwing extremists. It then went on to clarify what it meant: “*Right-wing extremism in the United States can be broadly divided into those groups, movements, 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.*”

The MIAC report stated that anyone who voted for Ron Paul, Bob Barr or Chuck Baldwin was a potential security threat, possibly violent and possibly a terrorist. The report was issued by the Missouri Fusion center, a department under the control of the Department of Homeland Security. These reports are so broad in their definition of “rightwing extremist,” that they can only indicate a growing attitude by the government that anyone who opposes its policies is a potential threat to the government and must be controlled or eliminated.

In June, a lone gunman entered the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC and opened fire on two security guards. Of course, gun control advocates haven't hesitated to use the incident as another excuse to confiscate guns. That's to be expected.

But the next day, *The Washington Times* reported in a sidebar article about the incident, saying, “*Even before Wednesday's fatal shooting of a security guard purportedly by a white supremacist at the U.S.*

Holocaust Memorial Museum, right-wing extremists have come under increased scrutiny.” The article went on to discuss the DHS report and quoted a professor from the John Jay College of Criminal Justice who said she worries that local law enforcement agencies do not keep close enough tabs on such groups and that the Internet allows them to put forth an extreme rhetoric that advocates violence. My friends, they are talking about you and me. Not enough surveillance on our “dangerous” ideas? This shooting couldn't have come at a better time for DHS. How convenient.

Mandatory IDs containing biometric information in international databases that can track our every move through CCTV cameras on every street corner, which monitor our facial expressions and measure our sweat – are not tools to make us safer. They are the weapons of tyranny designed to keep the government safe from apparently “dangerous criminals” who believe in the Constitution of the United States - the very document every single American public official from the President to the police officers swore to protect and defend. Does that connect enough dots for you?

Let me make it clearer. Because you believe in limited government, oppose immigration or abortion, or profess to be a Christian, you are being targeted by government as a threat. Total surveillance through Real ID and biometric databanks will be used to monitor and control your movements. E-Verify will be used to control whether you work or not. You can be shut out of society, unable to open a bank account, travel, or even drive a car because – just like the no-fly list – you will be targeted as an enemy of the state – all because of your political beliefs. You are the target in a nation where the government has gone mad. Do you feel safer yet?

Firestorm in Spokane

By Tom DeWeese

In March, 2009, I traveled to Spokane, Washington to address the annual Republican Lincoln Day Dinner. I reprinted my speech in the April issue of *The DeWeese Report* (Vol. 15, Issue 4), under the title, "The Wrenching Transformation of America." That speech caused a firestorm in Spokane as I detailed exactly how an organization called the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) is operating in more than 600 American communities (including Spokane). That group is guiding the local officials to impose Sustainable Development, the UN monster that transforms their community into a little soviet, with top-down control, robbing people of their private property, as it operates through non-elected boards and councils.

I explained in detail how ICLEI used the excuse of Climate Change to enforce these policies. Several people from my audience attended the Spokane City Council just two nights after my speech and confronted their local officials about what I had said. To their amazement, they found that every word I said was true. In fact, that very night, the city council was having the first reading of a sustainability plan for the community that ICLEI had helped prepare. It had been a year in the making and was now ready to be rammed through city council – unopposed.

That's when the firestorm ignited. Warned by me, the local residents did everything they could to warn the community and block the plan. In the end, they lost in a vote of 5 – 2, but they were heard loud and clear and the battle is far from over.

One effort to stop the ICLEI plan was made by a physicist, Dr. Edwin Berry, from Bigfork, Montana. Dr. Berry attended my identical speech in Kalispell, Montana, just one week prior to the Spokane speech. We met and had a wonderful talk. After the firestorm hit Spokane, he volunteered to go there and make several speeches, adding his scientific expertise to follow up my talk. He also sent a letter to the Spokane city council, strongly urging them to vote no on the ICLEI proposal. I reprint his letter here in the hopes it will help other communities to understand the monster they face in implementing sustainable policy. I will also tell you what I told the audiences in Spokane and Kalispell – If ICLEI is in your town – run them out of town on a rail with some high quality tar and feathers.

Open Letter to the City of Spokane

By Edwin X Berry, PhD

We are partying on the train to Auschwitz

Spokane signed on to the United Nations ICLEI Climate Protection Campaign in 2001. Since then, the city has spent money, resources and time attempting to comply with the requirements of ICLEI. The rationale for the program was to comply with the United Nations sponsored Kyoto Protocol to reduce GHG emissions.

The basis for the rationale is the United Nations Summary Reports for Policymakers of several years. The City of Spokane assumed that the United Nations IPCC made truthful statements about the effects of GHG emissions and especially carbon dioxide emissions on the earth's climate.

We now know without a shadow of doubt that the UN IPCC lied and is still lying about the effects of our carbon dioxide and other GHG emissions on climate.

Most blatantly, the IPCC represented to the City a chart of the supposed carbon dioxide content of our atmosphere for the last 10,000 years.

This chart claims carbon dioxide concentration was below about 280 ppm until present times and suggests that only recently have human emissions caused the carbon dioxide concentration to increase dramatically to the present 385 ppm.

The IPCC further claims our emissions, if not curtailed, will cause carbon dioxide concentration to continue to increase with the result being a significant increase in global temperature.

These IPCC claims are lies and a fraud.

The truth shows that the City has been subject to this fraud of the highest order. This fraud has causing significant damage and harm to the citizens of Spokane and if continued, it will cause very serious damage. Indeed, it is the opinion of this writer that the City has a legal basis for a cause of action against those who have perpetuated this fraud.

To respond to the carbon dioxide claim, true scientific data show that we had higher concentrations of carbon dioxide in 1820 and 1940 than we do now. True atmospheric science shows that we had periods in the last 10,000 years when carbon dioxide was much higher than shown on the IPCC ICLEI chart.

True atmospheric science shows that ocean temperatures, not human emissions, control our earth's carbon dioxide concentrations. True atmospheric science shows that carbon dioxide has negligible effect on climate, does not drive climate but

(Cont'd on page 6)

FIRESTORM.... (*Cont'd from pg 5*)

only piggybacks on natural climate change.

Prior to the promotion of the global warming fraud, the UN IPCC had access to scientific information that disproved its hypothesis that human carbon dioxide causes significant global warming.

Nevertheless, the UN IPCC produced Summary Reports for Policymakers that ignored and contradicted the input of scientists. The IPCC claimed to have a "consensus" of scientists on its side when it did not and does not.

Participating scientists who were betrayed by the UN IPCC Summary Reports wrote an Open Letter to the IPCC which states the scientific truth.

Here is a summary of the 2007 Open Letter signed by 101 scientists:

1. UN IPCC reports do not represent the input, views or consensus of scientists.
2. Changes in glaciers, sea-level, species, etc., are not evidence of abnormal climate change.
3. Climate models cannot predict climate (even IPCC reps agree).
4. Significant peer-reviewed research has discredited the global warming hypothesis.
5. We need more low-cost, reliable energy to adapt to natural climate change.
6. There is no scientific basis to cut CO2 emissions.
7. It is not shown that CO2 alters climate.
8. It is not possible to stop climate change.
9. The "precautionary principal" is irrational.
10. Reducing CO2 emissions is a tragic misallocation of resources.
11. Reducing CO2 emissions will decrease our ability to adapt to climate change.
12. Reducing CO2 emissions will increase human suffering.

Here are the 2009 conclusions of the Japanese Science Society:

1. The earth warming is not due to CO2.
2. Solar activity drives global temperatures.
3. The 1500-year solar cycle is confirmed.
4. The Pacific Decadal Oscillation, not CO2, drives temperatures.
5. We are now entering 20-30 years of cooling.
6. The IPCC global warming hypothesis is invalid.

The UN IPCC, ICLEI and all supporting groups like the Sierra Club, knowingly and purposely perpetuated a fraud upon the citizens of the City of Spokane. Their purpose is their own political agenda.

This sustainability proposal, and its companion proposals in some 400 cities across America, is but a small step to brainwash Americans into believing they must give up their abundant energy sources in order to save the planet. This is an evil delusion.

Once these small steps are locked in, the agenda of our enemies will continue with the help of our laws, some lawyers, our brainwashed citizens and our elected politicians.

This agenda, my dear friends, is nothing less than to dramatically reduce the standard of living of America and turn America into a third world country. The seemingly nice, feely-goody sustainability proposals are evil steps leading America to self-imposed destruction.

Here are some of the invalid assumptions built in to the sustainability proposal.

1. natural is optimal (natural is not defined)
2. climate is fragile
3. climate change can be mitigated
4. our carbon dioxide emissions change our climate
5. carbon dioxide is bad and dirty
6. oil is bad
7. oil is going to disappear soon (peak oil)
8. green is good
9. green jobs are good
10. alternative energy is good
11. wind energy is good
12. by omission, nuclear is bad
13. packing people in a city is good
14. living outside a city is bad

15. energy costs are world controlled
16. we cannot produce cheap, reliable energy in America

These assumptions are not supported by science or technology. These assumptions are brainwashing. Sustainability is built on a foundation of sand. It consists not of truth but of feelings.

Sustainability is a religion. Governmental enforcement of a religion is against the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Sustainability forces decisions to be made on unfounded criteria. It forces decisions to favor more costly alternatives. In the end it will help destroy our economy.

The false assumptions in the sustainability proposal are used to support the following scientifically false and economically costly conclusions:

1. emphasize renewable energy
2. replace hydrocarbon fuels with ethanol, even though it emits more CO₂ than using hydrocarbon fuels and it increases food costs
3. promote and track carbon sequestration
4. make it expensive for people to outside a city
5. the energy saving value of packing people in a city trumps the personal desire to live outside a city
6. incentivize green jobs and green businesses
7. reduce city's oil consumption and GHG emissions
8. reduce vehicle size
9. use electric vehicles
10. reporting systems and bureaucracies to monitor GHGs
11. hire sustainability officers
12. coordinate sustainability efforts
13. align efforts with federal efforts
14. create a culture of sustainability

All of the above are costs that can be eliminated from government. They should be eliminated because they waste voters money.

Damages from the fraud include all the direct costs to implement the ICLEI GHG agenda. They include indirect costs of the lost time and resources to pursue proper economic goals because of the diversion of the ICLEI agenda.

They include the indirect costs of promoting wind energy as a substitute for coal, oil and nuclear. Wind energy would not be cost competitive without federal income tax credits. But the tax credits merely shift the cost burden from an electric bill to federal taxes. They transport wealth from the middle class to the super rich.

A hidden cost of wind energy is the steel, concrete and transmission lines. A hidden cost is the investment necessary for utilities to rebuild their facilities to accommodate wind's unpredictable, variable power source on the electric grid. A hidden cost is the permanent damage done to the land.

If renewable means the ability to return nature and land to its original state then wind farms to not meet the definition of renewable.

All these costs are ignored by the sustainability delusion.

Do you see where this is leading?

On May 11, the New York Times announced that China has emerged as a leader in clean coal technology. And "clean" does not here mean carbon sequestration. Clean means achieving 44% fuel efficiency while the best America has done to date is 40%.

Clean means removing all the particulates, sulfur and undesirable emissions with the exception of carbon dioxide which is not really undesirable anyway. It helps plants grow and return the oxygen back to our atmosphere. Sequestered carbon dioxide never returns the oxygen back to our atmosphere.

While the Sierra Club brags about stopping 82 of 150 of America's planned coal-electric power plants since the year 2000 on the basis of the global warming fraud and boasts it will easily stop the rest under Obama, China is building one super efficient coal power plant per month.

Do you understand what is happening?

America could shut down today and stop all its carbon dioxide and other GHG emissions. Americans could disappear off the face of the earth. China, meanwhile, will continue to build its energy resources, and emit far more carbon dioxide than America saved by committing suicide. And in the year 2100 the self destruction of America and China's carbon dioxide will not have changed the global temperature by 0.000 degrees from whatever nature has planned for the earth. The only thing that will have changed is America. It will be gone.

Do you see where this train is going?

(Cont'd on page 11)

INSIDER'S REPORT

'Execute' Skeptics!

Shock Call to Action: 'At what point do we jail or execute global warming deniers' - 'Shouldn't we start punishing them now?'

By Marc Morano - Climate Depot

[Update: June 3, 2009 - 8:44 AM ET: Talking Points Memo (TPM) has removed the article from their website. "The file you are looking for has not been found" - But the url with a portion of the chilling message lingers as evidence: "at-what-point-do-we-jail-or-ex..." - Climate Depot has also saved a screen shot of the original article. Update: Washington Examiner weighs in: 'Hate sport': Is TPM poster simply lone fanatic? Excerpt: Poster "believes killing those who disagree with him politically is justified." Update: June 5, 2009: Talking Points Memo issues retraction for call to execute skeptics! -- 'A formal retraction and apology' -- Update: June 5, 2009: Joe Romm defends strangle skeptics in bed remark as 'not a threat, but a prediction' -- Strangle Skeptics in Bed! "An entire generation will soon be ready to strangle you and your kind while you sleep in your beds"]

A public appeal has been issued by an influential U.S. website asking: "At what point do we jail or execute global warming deniers." The appeal appeared on *Talking Points Memo*, an often cited website that helps set the agenda for the political Left in the U.S. The anonymous posting, dated June 2, 2009, referred to dissenters of man-made global warming fears as "greedy bastards" who use "bogus science or the lowest scientists in the gene pool" to "distort data."

The *Talking Points Memo* article continues: "So when the right wing fucktards have caused it to be too late to fix the problem, and we start seeing the devastating consequences and we start seeing end of the World type events - how will we punish those responsible. It will be too late. So shouldn't we start punishing them now?"

The article also claims the "vast majority" of scientists agree that man-made warming "can do an untold amount of damage to life on Earth."

The full text of the *Talking Points Memo* is reproduced below: (Note: The entry is posted under the anonymous byline "The Insolent Braggart")

At what point do we jail or execute global warming deniers - June 2, 2009, 9:42PM

What is so frustrating about these fools is that they are the politicians and greedy bastards who don't want a cut in their profits who use bogus science or the lowest scientists in the gene pool who will distort data for a few bucks. The vast majority of the scientific minds in the World agree and understand it's a very serious problem that can do an untold amount of damage to life on Earth.

So when the right wing fucktards have caused it to be too late to fix the problem, and we start seeing the devastating consequences and we start seeing end of the World type events - how will we punish those responsible. It will be too late. So shouldn't we start punishing them now?

Climate Depot Editor's Note:

The *Talking Points Memo* appeal to execute skeptics is not unique. As the science behind man-made global warming fears utterly collapses, many of the biggest promoters of the theory and environmental activists are growing increasingly desperate. **Looming Question:** If the promoters of man-made climate fears truly believed the "debate is over" and the science is "settled", why is there such a strong impulse to shut down debate and threaten those who disagree?

Small sampling of threats, intimidation and censorship:

NASA's James Hansen has called for trials of climate skeptics in 2008 for "high crimes against humanity." Environmentalist Robert F. Kennedy Jr. lashed out at skeptics of 2007 declaring "This is treason. And we need to start treating them as traitors" In 2009, RFK, Jr. also called coal companies "criminal enterprises" and declared CEO's 'should be in jail... for all of eternity.'

In June 2009, former Clinton Administration official Joe Romm defended a comment on his Climate Progress

website warning skeptics would be strangled in their beds. "An entire generation will soon be ready to strangle you and your kind while you sleep in your beds," stated the remarks, which Romm defended by calling them "not a threat, but a prediction."

In 2006, the eco-magazine *Grist* called for Nuremberg-Style trials for skeptics. In 2008, Canadian environmentalist David Suzuki called for government leaders skeptical of global warming to be thrown "into jail." In 2007, The Weather Channel's climate expert called for withholding certification of skeptical meteorologists.

A 2008 report found that 'climate blasphemy' is replacing traditional religious blasphemy. In addition, a July 2007 Senate report detailed how skeptical scientists have faced threats and intimidation.

In 2007, then EPA Chief Vowed to Probe E-mail Threatening to 'Destroy' Career of Climate Skeptic and dissenters of warming fears have been called 'Climate Criminals' who are committing 'Terricide' (killing of Planet Earth) (July 25, 2007) In addition, in May 2009, Climate Depot Was Banned in Louisiana! See: State official sought to 'shut down' climate skeptic's testimony at hearing.

Below are many more examples of the threats, name calling and intimidation skeptics have faced in recent times.

November 12, 2007: UN official warns ignoring warming would be 'criminally irresponsible' - Excerpt: The U.N.'s top climate official warned policymakers and scientists trying to hammer out a landmark report on climate change that ignoring the urgency of global warming would be "criminally irresponsible." Yvo de Boer's comments came at the opening of a week long conference that will complete a concise guide on the state of global warming and what can be done to stop the Earth from overheating.

September 29, 2007: VA State Climatologist skeptical of global warming loses job after clash with Governor: 'I was told that I could not speak in public' - Excerpt: Michaels has argued that the climate is becoming warmer but that the consequences will not be as dire as others have predicted. Gov. Kaine had warned. Michaels not to use his official title in discussing his views. "I resigned as Virginia state climatologist because I was told that I could not speak in public on my area of expertise, global warming, as state climatologist," Michaels said in a statement this week provided by the libertarian Cato Institute, where he has been a fellow since 1992. "It was impossible to maintain academic freedom with this speech restriction."

Skeptical State Climatologist in Oregon has title threatened by Governor (February 8, 2007) - Excerpt:

"[State Climatologist George Taylor] does not believe human activities are the main cause of global climate change...So the [Oregon] governor wants to take that title from Taylor and make it a position that he would appoint. In an exclusive interview with KGW-TV, Governor Ted Kulongoski confirmed he wants to take that title from Taylor.

Skeptical State Climatologist in Delaware silenced by Governor (May 2, 2007) - Excerpt: Legates is a state climatologist in Delaware, and he teaches at the university. He's not part of the mythical climate consensus. In fact, Legates believes that we oversimplify climate by just blaming greenhouse gases. One day he received a letter from the governor, saying his views do not concur with those of the administration, so if he wants to speak out, it must be as an individual, not as a state climatologist. So essentially, you can have the title of state climatologist unless he's talking about his views on climate?

October 28, 2008: License to dissent: 'Internet should be nationalized as a public utility' to combat global warming skepticism - Australian Herald Sun - Excerpt: British journalism lecturer and warming alarmist Alex Lockwood says my blog is a menace to the planet. Skeptical bloggers like me need bringing into line, and Lockwood tells a journalism seminar of some options: There is clearly a need for research into the ways in which climate skepticism online is free to contest scientific fact. But there is enough here already to put forward some of the ideas in circulation. One of the founders of the Internet Vint Cerf, and lead for Google's Internet for Everyone project, made a recent suggestion that the Internet should be nationalized as a public utility. As tech policy blogger Jim Harper argues, "giving power over the Internet to well-heeled interests and self-interested politicians" is, and I quote, "a bad idea." Or in the UK every new online publication could be required to register with the recently announced Internet watchdog...

November 5, 2008: UK Scientist: 'BBC SHUNNED ME FOR DENYING CLIMATE CHANGE' - UK Daily Express - Excerpt: FOR YEARS David Bellamy was one of the best known faces on TV. A respected botanist and the author of 35 books, he had presented around 400 programmes over the years and was appreciated by audiences for his boundless enthusiasm. Yet for more than 10 years he has been out of the limelight, shunned by bosses at the BBC where he made his name, as well as fellow scientists and environmentalists. His crime? Bellamy says he doesn't believe in man-made global warming. Here he reveals why - and the price he has paid for not toeing the orthodox line on climate change.

CLIMATE CHANGE “MORALITY”

The duplicitous politics of money, power, control and corporate rent-seeking

By Paul Driessen

The climate “crisis” is a “moral issue that requires serious debate,” Al Gore proclaimed in an April 27 AlGore.com blog post.

His conversion to the Anglo-American tradition of robust debate came a mere three days after the ex-VP refused to participate in a congressional hearing with Lord Christopher Monckton, former science advisor to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Republicans had invited Monckton to counter Gore’s testimony before the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

But Gore froze like a terrified deer in headlights, and Chairman Henry Waxman told the UK climate expert he was uninvited.

Their hypocritical cowardice simply reflects a recognition that their entire energy rationing crusade would collapse if they ever allowed real debate.

Monckton would have focused on the science. But it is morality that truly requires serious debate. Climate Armageddon claims are being used to justify malignant policies that have no rational basis.

Global average temperatures peaked in 1998 and since have cooled slightly, despite steadily rising CO2 levels. Except in its Western Peninsula, Antarctica is gaining ice, and Antarctic sea ice reached an all-time high in 2007. Arctic ice is seasonably normal, and in 2008 the Northern Hemisphere was covered by more snow than ever before recorded.

Scientists are hard-pressed to point to long-term state or country climate trends that differ from historic experience and can reasonably be linked to anthropogenic warming crises. Merely asserting that obesity causes warming or increased malaria and house cat populations are due to warming does not make it so.

Even more devastating to alarmist claims, long-held assumptions about the deep Atlantic counter-current or “conveyor belt” below the Gulf Stream have been undermined by recent studies. Those assumptions underlie many climate models and their scary worst-case scenarios about alleged planetary crises. The models and GIGO scenarios are now even more questionable.

Yet, model results are constantly portrayed as “evidence” – “proof” that immediate, drastic action is required to avert disaster. Nonsense. Climate changes and their causes are complex, our knowledge is still limited, and the inputs and assumptions are deficient.

Climate models are no more reliable than computer predictions of future Super Bowl winners and scores.

Their Frankenstein scenarios are no more valid as a basis for law and policy than the special effects in *The Day After Tomorrow* or *Jurassic Park*.

Worse, even the 942-page Waxman-Markey climate bill’s absurd target – a 17% reduction in US carbon dioxide emissions by 2020 and 83% by 2050 – would have no detectable benefits, even if CO2 does cause climate change. Research climatologist Paul “Chip” Knappenberger calculates that even these draconian measures would result in global temperatures rising a mere 0.1 degrees F less by 2050 than doing nothing, mostly because Chinese and Indian emissions would quickly dwarf America’s job-killing reductions.

Meanwhile, China and South Africa want developed nations to slash carbon emissions 40% by 2020 – and give poor countries \$200 billion annually, to help them cope with global warming’s imagined disasters. Bolivia wants \$700 billion a year. Our children will get the bill for that, too.

None of this apparently matters to congressional leaders, Climate Action Partnership members or other professional alarmists and rent seekers. If anything, it has spurred them into even hastier action, to transform America’s energy and economic system, regardless of the consequences. Waxman-Markey was approved by the E&C Committee May 21 on a mostly party-line vote.

Above all, they want to replace vile hydrocarbons with wind power. That would require \$\$\$ billions in taxpayer subsidies; hundreds of thousands of turbines, across millions of acres of scenic land, habitats and sea lanes; thousands of miles of new transmission lines and towers; and billions of tons of concrete, steel, copper and fiberglass – plus raw materials and natural gas for backup generators.

Spain’s experience should be cautionary, but probably won’t be. According to a study by Dr. Gabriel Calzada, Spanish taxpayers spent \$754,000 for each new job in the wind turbine industry (mostly installing towering turbines) – and destroyed 2.2 regular jobs for each “green” job, primarily because pricey “renewable” electricity forced companies to lay off workers, to stay in business.

A recent Lauer Johnson Research poll found 78% of respondents saying even a \$600 per year increase in utility bills would be a “hardship.” They should be so lucky.

Compared to no cap-and-tax regime, Waxman-Markey

would cost the United States a cumulative \$9.6 trillion in real GDP losses by 2035, according to an updated study by the Heritage Foundation's Center for Data Analysis. The bill would also cost an additional 1.1 million jobs each year, raise electricity rates 90% after adjusting for inflation, cause a 74% hike in inflation-adjusted gasoline prices, and add \$1,500 to the average family's annual energy bill, says Heritage.

The Congressional Budget Office says the poorest one-fifth of families could see annual energy costs rise \$700 – while high income families could see their costs rise \$2,200 a year. Harvard economist Martin Feldstein estimates that the average person could pay an extra \$1,500 per year for energy. MIT says household energy costs could climb \$3,000 per year.

Where will families find that extra cash? “What do I tell a single mom, making \$8 an hour?” asked North Carolina congressman (and Congressional Black Caucus member) G. K. Butterfield.

That was a few days before he and his Democrat colleagues voted against amendments to Waxman-Markey that would have suspended the punitive law if electricity prices go up more than 10% after inflation, unemployment reaches 15% or gasoline prices hit \$5. What will he tell that single mom?

Eco-activists gleefully predict that oil, gas and coal companies, utilities, vehicles and investors are destined for extinction. No wonder lobbyists have descended on Washington – over 2,300 of them just on climate change:

FIRESTORM.... (Cont'd from pg 7)

China is on its way to becoming the world's next superpower. America is on its way to becoming China's next slave. Wake up, America. Continue as you are and within 10 years your dumbed-down Americans will supply the labor now being provided by China's slave camps. You will build the world's mercury-laden lamp bulbs and die after 30 years. You will support China's new standard of living.

China will own your National Parks, your national forests, your vast coal and oil reserves, your technology, your universities, and your house. China will be your master and you will be China's slave. Your children will be crammed into your sustainability cities which will not be as pleasant as you may dream. Your masters won't care if your garbage is removed or if you have hot water. You will not be free to drive to the country, hike in your hills, learn about the world or even to be educated.

You will work six days per week in slave camps. You will be brainwashed animals who cannot escape. Gone will be your churches. Gone will be your freedom. You will know only the propaganda of their masters. All future generations of Americans will be slaves. Their only hope will be that some miracle will happen, that a future Moses will appear to free them.

You who support the slippery path of sustainability, who are consumed by the global warming delusion, who pay no attention as your country slides toward self destruction, you are the useful idiots carrying out the plan of your world super masters.

4.4 per member of Congress.

Some are getting \$400-\$850 an hour for their skill in promoting mandates, subsidies, legal measures to hobble competitors, and cap-tax-and-trade versions of the mortgage derivatives market. Al Gore alone boasts of having received \$300 million (from unnamed sources) to trumpet alarmism and draconian legislation.

Colleges, scientists, activists, unions and companies receive billions in taxpayer money, to hype climate chaos claims, intimidate skeptics and lobby Congress. African bureaucrats get millions from the UN (and thus US taxpayers) to hype climate disaster claims that keep millions of Africans impoverished and deprived of the life-enhancing benefits of reliable, affordable electricity.

President Obama says the Bush Administration “made decisions based upon fear, rather than foresight, and all too often trimmed facts and evidence to fit ideological predispositions.” He and his Democrat allies in Congress should take that critique to heart on global warming.

As it stands, this Congress is rapidly shaping up to be the most unethical, immoral and dictatorial in history. When the people finally rebel, it won't be a pretty sight.

Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and Congress of Racial Equality, and author of Eco-Imperialism: Green power – Black death.



Somewhere in our beautiful but dangerous world the super masters are raising their glasses to toast their coming success in their little game: to bring down America as the world's super power without firing a shot and to raise up China and make it America's master. It is their little experiment. It is their power trip. We are but their puppets.

Do you understand how to take control of a country?

The way to destroy a country is to take away its energy production, remove its will to resist its own destruction, and to dumb down its citizens. We are so brainwashed, we are allowing these to happen. The final step will remove our ability to prevent our own destruction. At some point, we will be unable to defend our country and our homes.

Get off the train now before it reaches its destination.

You elected officials of the great City of Spokane have two clear choices:

You can vote YES to perpetuate the global warming fraud, sponsor an earth worship religion, and to send Spokane and America to its eventual destruction.

Or you can vote NO to become the first city in America to reject the sustainability fraud and send Spokane and America on a path to enlightenment and recovery.

NO is a vote for Good. YES is a vote for Evil.

Spokane, you can save America.



SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY

Gods Come Cheap These Days

By Chuck Baldwin

When President George W. Bush was first elected back in 2000, I well remember the way Christian conservatives went gaga over him. They would deny it, of course, but it was more than hero worship: they acted as if he were a god. Life-size posters filled Christian bookstores. Religious broadcasters and televangelists swooned over him like 16 year-old girls used to swoon over Elvis Presley. Pastors invoked his name almost as a prayer. The Religious Right acted like they had died and gone to Heaven. In the minds of Christian conservatives, G.W. Bush could do no wrong. The result of all this sophomoric silliness was that the Religious Right became blind, impotent lackeys to a Big-Government, big-spending, Orwellian, and inept administration-- maybe one of the worst in U.S. history.

And all of this was not lost to the political left. They called Christian conservatives “dupes,” “buffoons,” “gullible,” and a whole lot more. But now it is the liberals’ turn to take a voyage in the vehicle of villainous vulnerability.

First, there was the major media’s “anointing” of President Barack Obama. Yes, I use the word “anointing” on purpose. Make no mistake about it: in the minds of the major media, Obama was not inaugurated; he was canonized. No pope, king, or potentate of history received the coronation that Barack Obama received. To the liberals who dominate the news media and entertainment industry in this country, Obama is not a President: he is a god.

For example, did readers see the way NBC newsman, Brian Williams, bowed to his majesty, Barack Obama?

Where are Keith Olbermann’s eloquent rebukes of the Military Commissions Act (MCA), the suspension of Habeas Corpus, and many other Big-Government intrusions into the private lives of the American people that were first instituted under George W. Bush and that now continue under Barack Obama? When he wants to, Olbermann can be a very convincing, articulate defender of constitutional liberties. However, it seems that Olbermann is only interested in constitutional government when it is a Republican trampling it. Since Obama became President, Olbermann has not only muted his criticism against unconstitutional policies emanating from the White House, he has joined the chorus of mindless worship of the new President.

The list of ways that media and entertainment lemmings fawn over Barack Obama is almost endless. And just when one thinks he has heard it all, out comes the blathering balderdash from Newsweek editor-at-large Evan Thomas.

Appearing on last weekend’s Inside Washington, Thomas lauded President Obama as a “brave,” “great teacher” who “stands above everybody.” But Thomas saved his most outrageous oratory for last Friday’s Hardball program. On Hardball, Thomas gushed, “I mean in a way Obama’s standing above the country, above-- above the world, he’s sort of God.”

There you have it: according to Newsweek’s Evan Thomas, Barack Obama is “sort of God.”

Well, now that God is in the White House, I suppose we don’t need the Constitution; we don’t need the Bill of Rights; we don’t need Congress; we don’t need the Supreme Court; we don’t need individual sovereign states; we don’t need the media; and we certainly don’t need Evan Thomas, do we?

There it is, my friends: because Barack Obama is the President, the major media now worships toward 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Goodbye resistance; goodbye objectivity (if they ever had it); goodbye fairness; goodbye investigative reporting; goodbye accountability (at least for Obama); goodbye professional journalism; and goodbye free and independent press. Hello propaganda; hello favoritism; hello yellow journalism; hello socialism; hello “monarchalism”; hello globalism; hello elitism; and hello Pravda.

What in the world has happened to us? How is it that otherwise intelligent and educated people can so quickly forget virtually everything their principles and values taught them, and become little more than clumsy chumps for a Presidential administration-- any Presidential administration? Are we that slavish? That childish? That foolish? Apparently so.

As bad as it was under Bush, it will be twice as bad under Obama. Only because, at least with Bush, the major media’s natural liberal bias tended to want to keep Bush somewhat honest, which meant that Bush would often face criticism from the media for some of his unconstitutional policies (such as Olbermann’s eloquent repudiation of Bush’s policies regarding the MCA and Habeas Corpus referenced above).

Forget it with Obama. The liberal bias of the major media will tend to cause them to support anything this guy says or does, and to always look the other way whenever unconstitutional or illegal activity surfaces.

For eight years, Christian conservatives had “Lord Bush.” Now, liberals have “Lord Obama.” Seems to me that gods come pretty cheap these days.

Chuck Baldwin - www.chuckbaldwinlive.com

