

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.AMERICANPOLICY.ORG

GOP Endorses Life-Long Bread Lines

By Tom DeWeese

I've been waiting for the disbelief and outrage to emerge from Republicans across the nation over the Republican Party's recent announcement. Incredibly, the RNC says that it is endorsing the poverty eradication program of rock star Bono. There hasn't been any outrage yet from GOP rank and file. Is there nothing left of the old GOP?

For those who missed it, in August, the Republican National Committee took steps to endorse Irish rock star Bono's proposal to spend \$30 billion in U.S. taxes to eliminate global poverty. Bono, lead singer of the rock group U2, has dogged political leaders around the world, using his rock star status to pressure them into accepting his brand of global guilt. However, the GOP's

capitulation to Bono's charms goes much deeper than getting excited about the passions of a rock star.

This time, Bono is acting as the messenger boy for the United Nations. You see, back in 2000 every head of state in the world agreed to the UN's Millennium Declaration which calls for the end of poverty by the year 2015. There, the world's leaders agreed to put up the money for UN poverty programs. Now the UN is working to collect. Bono has declared himself to be the collection agent. And the Republicans jumped when he called.

How can it be that the Republican Party, which once advocated free enterprise, limited government and individual liberty, could fall for such a wealth redistribution scheme, and at the request of an avowed Marxist like Bono? The two should have nothing in common, what-so-ever. Or don't they?

Eradication of poverty is certainly a noble cause. People throughout the world are suffering from hunger, poor health and filthy water. The number of poor in the world is growing higher each year. There is no doubt that something must be done.

Of course, there are thousands of efforts in the world aimed at eradicating poverty or feeding and clothing the

poor. From churches to charitable organizations to local, state, federal and international government programs, billions of dollars are collected and presumably distributed to the poor.

Yet, every day we have more poor. Why? Because none of these efforts focus on the source of poverty. None of them take steps to reverse the situation and help the poor to help themselves. Neither will the GOP's new Bono-inspired scheme. And that is what's so astounding about the GOP's announcement. It should know better.

Poverty, as run by the international poverty cartel headquartered in the United Nations, is big business. As in almost every case where there is unlimited cash and little accountability by mindless, faceless bureaucrats and all-powerful potentates, corruption, embezzlement, exorbitant salaries and inside procurement deals fatten the pockets of a few and leave the poor hungry and left out.

Adam Lerrick, visiting scholar at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) told the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Security and International Trade and Finance that he estimates between \$100 billion and \$500 billion in World Bank funds intended for African development

IN THIS ISSUE:

3. RESISTANCE TO REASON
North American Union/Nafta
Superhighway: Joke or Threat?
4. ABSOLUTES:
The SPP and Government-
Sanctioned Monopolies
6. INSIDER'S REPORT:
Demand Senate Kill Journey
Through Hallowed Ground NHA!
8. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:
Wall Street Journal Lies
About Sea Treaty

have been smuggled into offshore accounts.

As poverty grows ever greater, Bono establishes himself as the self-proclaimed savior of Africa. He uses his concerts to enflame young audiences to hate the rich. He postures. He snarls. He marches up and down the stage waving a red flag while the music pounds a steady, military beat. And political leaders cower as he shakes them down for the cash.

Yet, where is Bono's indignation over the theft by the very organizations he promotes? Where are his revelations of radical environmental groups who openly advocate that African villagers must continue to live in mud huts and walk five miles for water, because that is "sustainable?" In fact, Bono, and the ilk he supports, arrogantly deny the poor the opportunity to live in the Twenty First Century because they don't want them to have electricity, cars, better roads and modern homes. This, they say would damage the environment. *And this is the policy the Republican National Committee has chosen to support?*

Even as the poverty cartel demands the eradication of poverty by 2015, how do they propose to achieve that success? How are the poor supposed to climb out of poverty? They aren't. Ending poverty would mean the end of the stolen funds and the political power that the poverty cartel has come to expect.

Instead, they have condemned the poor of the world to live in life-long bread lines, dependent on others for daily existence, no hope for a future of betterment. The poor are mere pawns in the game. *And this is the policy the Republican National Committee has chosen to support?*

Moreover, even without the corruption, redistribution schemes are not the answer to saving the poor. The GOP should know that taking money from hard working people and giving it to those who must

instantly consume it solves nothing. It's a momentary band-aid. Tomorrow the poor and hungry will need more. And more will be taken from the providers. Anyone who has ever studied economics 101 should know that the only possible outcome of such a scheme is to make everyone poorer. *And this is the policy the Republican National Committee has chosen to support?*

So why are some nations so poor, and others are so rich? What is the real answer to eradicating poverty? The "2007 Index of Economic Freedom," published jointly by the Heritage Foundation and the Wall Street Journal may hold the answer. It examines 10 economic characteristics of 157 countries. Those include, property rights, monetary stability, freedom from government, trade restrictions, business regulations and government corruption.

The report includes a color-coded map showing the nations that are free, mostly free, moderately free, mostly unfree, and repressed. Does it surprise anyone to discover that the most repressed nations also contain the poorest people in the world? People who lack freedom have no ability to produce wealth.

As Economist Walter Williams points out, "Extensive government control, weak property rights and government corruption almost guarantee poverty." Those three factors are almost universal in United Nations' anti-poverty programs and the very reasons why none of it programs will ever achieve the goal of eradicating poverty.

If the GOP was actually interested in helping the poor and making itself a hero to the masses it should abandon any connections with Bono and the UN. It should renounce any such wealth redistribution schemes. It should advocate the policies that made the United States the wealthiest nation on earth - the policies of private property ownership, limited government and free (Cont'd on Page 3)

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 13, No. 10 October 2007

Published by
American Policy Center

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Copy Editor
Virginia DeWeese

Correspondence/Fulfillment
Sascha McGuckin
Carolyn DeWeese

Graphics/Layout
Kristy Wilson

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

Phone: (540) 341-8911
Fax: (540) 341-8917

E-mail:
ampolicycenter@hotmail.com

Web Page:
www.americanpolicy.org

© 2007 American Policy Center
ISSN 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

Newsletter of the
American Policy Center

Permission to photocopy, reprint and quote articles from The DeWeese Report is hereby granted, provided full acknowledgment is included. All reprinted articles must say: "Written by Tom DeWeese, editor of The DeWeese Report (unless another author is listed). All reprints must carry The DeWeese Report address and phone number. Samples of the reprint must be provided to The DeWeese Report.

BREAD LINES... (Cont'd from Pg 2) enterprise.

The United States isn't wealthy because of an abundance of natural resources or good Karma. The United States is rich because it's free. And every nation on earth could be as wealthy if they too allowed their people to live their own lives without interference from busybodies who want to dictate how others should live - or seek to confiscate the fruits of someone's labor. Every nation could have it, no matter the education level of the country or the population.

If the GOP needs a hero to follow why not choose a real one - with real solutions - those which actually reflect the freedom the GOP insists it promotes? Peruvian economist Hernando de Soto is such a man.

De Soto wrote a book, *"The Mystery of Capital, Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else."* That book has become an international phenomenon with those who truly want to do something about eradicating poverty. De Soto has been sought out by at least 50 heads of state, each asking him to come to their country to help establish programs and guidelines for eradicating poverty, helping the poor build their own wealth.

So why hasn't the GOP endorsed de Soto's brand of freedom instead of Bono's tired old socialism? The answer may surprise most GOP supporters, for it is no accident or miscalculation.

Few Republicans are aware of an organization called the International Democrat Union (IDU). But they should know it because the GOP is a major player (Cont'd on Page 7)



RESISTANCE TO REASON

REVEALING FACTS OF THOSE WHO HAVE DECLARED WAR ON LOGIC

NORTH AMERICAN UNION/NAFTA SUPERHIGHWAYS: JOKE OR THREAT?

JUST A JOKE

On August 21, 2007, while wrapping up his Summit with the President of Mexico and Prime Minister of Canada, President Bush, was asked by Fox News if he was willing to categorically deny that there is a plan to create a North American Union or NAFTA Superhighways. His response was simply to make fun of the question with a non-answer:

"I'm amused by the difference between what actually takes place in the meetings and what some are trying to say takes place... It's quite comical, actually..." President George Bush, August 21, 2007, Montebello, Canada

"There's not going to be a NAFTA Superhighway connecting the three nations, and it's not going to go interplanetary either." Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper, August 21, 2007, Montebello, Canada

"The administration is not engaged in a secret plan to create a NAFTA superhighway." Vice President Dick Cheney, letter to a constituent

I am "not familiar with any plans at all, related to NAFTA or cross-border traffic." NAFTA Superhighways are an "urban legend." Jeffery Shane, undersecretary of Transportation, January 2007 Testimony before House subcommittee on Transportation

THE THREAT

"On July 23, 2007, the NAFTA Superhighway Coalition was formed. It is a non-profit corporation. Its mission is to team Federal and Provincial authorities with private business to promote a National Transportation Policy that will include improvements to Highway 401 (Canada) and associated corridors for facilitating the movement of people and goods to and from Canada, the US and Mexico under the North American Free Trade Agreement." Website: www.ambassadorbridge.com/nafta_case.html

"North America's SuperCorridor Coalition, Inc (NASCO) was officially amalgamated by the North American International Trade Corridor Partnership to promote the development of a trade corridor designed to expedite the flow of trade through the North American Continent." Official description of NASCO from its website as reported by Henry Lamb on World Net Daily, July 26, 2006

"We have to stay away from 'SuperCorridor' because it is a very bad, hot button right now." Tiffany Melvin, Executive Director of NASCO, e-mail correspondence to "NASCO friends and members." July 21, 2006

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



ABSOLUTES....!

The SPP and Government-Sanctioned Monopolies

On Monday, August 20, 2007, Tom DeWeese, President of the American Policy Center, a grassroots activist organization located in suburban Washington DC, participated in a news conference in Ottawa, Canada focusing on concerns about the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP).

The news conference was sponsored by the Coalition to Block the North American Union, of which APC is a founding member. Other leaders of the Coalition include Howard Phillips (Conservative Caucus), Phyllis Schlafly (Eagle Forum), Jerome Corsi (Author), and more than 50 organizations.

The Coalition is concerned that efforts to create the SPP will lead to the establishment of a North American Union along the lines of the European Union. While the Bush Administration continues to deny that SPP activity is anything more than a "dialog" with Mexico and Canada over trade issues, Congressman Virgil Goode of Virginia has introduced H. Con. Res. 40 opposing the establishment of a North American Union. In July, the U.S. House of Representatives passed legislation introduced by Duncan Hunter (R-CA) to cut off funding for SPP talks on transportation issues. The house vote was a bipartisan 362-63. The vote was generated from fears that the talks would lead to open border policies allowing illegal immigrants to continue to flood the United States.

President Bush was in Canada that week (August 20-21) meeting with Canadian Prime Minister Harper and Mexican President Calderon for more talks on the SPP. The meeting was held in Montebello, Canada amid anti-SPP demonstrations outside the compound. Below are Tom DeWeese's remarks at the news conference.

**STATEMENT BY TOM DEWEESE
PRESIDENT - AMERICAN POLICY CENTER
OTTAWA, CANADA - AUGUST 20, 2007**

It's not just the three governments and their agencies putting together the Security and Prosperity Partnership. Private corporations are also a strong force driving the policy.

They are working together with the governments in what are commonly referred to as Public/Private Partnerships.

Libertarians and so-called Free Traders promote these partnerships as a means to incorporate free market solutions to government. In this manner, they claim that such "private enterprise" limits the size and power of government and reduces its cost.

In fact, a project as massive as the SPP would be nearly impossible to implement purely through government edict.

So Public/Private Partnerships are becoming the fastest growing process to impose such policy. In the US, state legislatures are passing laws which call for the implementation of PPPs. The Canadian Parliament is doing the same.

NAFTA, GATT, CAFTA and the SPP institutionalize PPPs as the accepted way to implement policy.

Beware. These bonds between government and private international corporations are a double-edged sword. They come armed with government's power to tax, the government's power to enforce policy and the government's power to enforce eminent domain.

At the same time, the private corporations use their wealth and extensive advertising budgets to entrench the policy into our national conscience.

Further, participating corporations can control the types of products offered on the market. For example, when the proponents of a political or economic agenda such as sustainable development seek to enforce their will on the market, they simply create PPPs with government and business to control things like development, food consumption or energy use.

Banks and mortgage companies in the partnership can enforce policy by forcing borrowers to comply as a stipulation for the loan.

Government grants can enrich private corporations as the companies produce mandated products - free of development risks.

Private developers which have entered into a Public/Private Partnership with local government, for example, can now obtain the power of eminent domain to build on land not open to competitors. The fact is, current use of eminent domain by local communities in partnership with private developers simply considers all property to be the common land of the State, to be used as it sees fit for some undefined community good.

The government gains the higher taxes created by the new development. The developer gets the revenue from the work.

The immediate losers, of course, are the property owners. But other citizens are losers too. Communities give up control of their infrastructure. Voters lose control of their government.

...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

Private companies are now systematically buying up water treatment plants in communities, in effect, gaining control of the water supply. And they are buying control of the U.S. highway systems through PPPs with state departments of transportation.

Because of a public/private partnership, one million Texans are about to lose their land for the Trans Texas Corridor, a highway that couldn't be built without the power of eminent domain.

Foreign companies are being met with open arms by local, and federal officials who see a way to use private corporations and their massive bank accounts to fund projects. As the Associated Press reported July 15, 2006, *"On a single day in June (2006) an Australian-Spanish partnership paid \$3.6 billion to lease the Indiana Toll Road. An Australian company bought a 99 year lease on Virginia's Pocahontas Parkway, and Texas officials decided to let a Spanish-American partnership build and run a toll road for 50 years."*

In fact, that Spanish-American partnership in Texas and its lease with the Texas Department of Transportation to build and run the Trans Texas Corridor contains a "no-compete" clause which prohibits anyone, including the Texas government from building new highways or expanding exiting ones which might run in competition with the TCC. That is not free enterprise.

With inside information from its own Public/Private Partnership, Kansas City Southern Railroad (KCSR) has been able to grow overnight from a two-bit belt around Kansas City to controlling a 2,600-mile artery from Lazaro Cardenas to Kansas City, straight up the Trans Texas Corridor. KCSR has obtained the rail rights up the corridor. It is now a government-sanctioned monopoly.

Protected from competition, the railroad will set the costs and the shipping rules. And it will get very rich, no matter the quality of service. All because of whom its owner knows. That is not free enterprise.

At an April, 2007 meeting in Calgary, Canada, as part of the Security and Prosperity Partnership, government officials, business leaders and academics met to discuss redistributing Canada's water to Mexico and the U.S. Southwest.

Canada has water, lots of it, and the public/private partnerships of the SPP are swarming on it like locusts as they seek to drain it out of Canada's rivers and lakes and ship it to potential profit centers south of the Canadian border.

NAFTA describes water as a "good" and stipulates that *"No party may adopt or maintain any prohibition or restriction on the exportation or sale of exports or any good destined for the territory of any other party."*

In a leaked document of the minutes from the 2004 meeting of the Task Force on the Future of North American (a pre-cursor of the SPP), it said, *"No item, not Canadian water, not Mexican oil, not American anti-dumping laws is off the table."*

For that reason, it is understood that once Canada starts exporting fresh water to the US, it would be impossible to turn off the tap.

Now the case for selling Canadian water is being presented more forcefully in the media by SPP proponents, journalists, businesses strategists and investors seeking profits from this lucrative market. The Trans Texas Corridor will provide water pipelines for the shipping and PPPs will buy up the rights and dispose of the water as they see fit.

Canadians are suddenly feeling the raw power of the lethal combination of government and private industry working in concert to dictate policy. The people of Canada will soon understand that they will have little say in the matter.

Private companies operating in the free market lack one thing government has - the power of coercion. The free market operates with you making the decisions based on personal choice. Under Public/Private Partnerships the choices are decided for you in meetings behind closed doors.

Meanwhile, private companies that are not part of a PPP are unable to compete with those who are. They are shut out of competition from the establishment of economic development zones which provide the chosen elite with reduced real estate taxes and financial aid.

Companies which find themselves outside of the elite status of the PPP suddenly run into regulatory difficulties to get their own projects completed. It's not just a coincidence?

PPPs are one of the reasons many people find they can no longer fight city hall. The private companies gain the power of government to do as they please - and the governments earn the independence of the companies, no longer needing to answer to voters. It's the perfect partnership. But it's not freedom.

Such a process allows the private companies to be little more than government-sanctioned monopolies, answerable to no one. Their power is awesome and near absolute. Some call such policy corporatism. Another term would be corporate fascism.

Ultimately, corporatism does not trust the marketplace to do what the elites want. Thus the alignment of corporations and government is done at the expense of ordinary people - the exact opposite of free markets controlled by consumers.

This then is the future offered by the Security and Prosperity Partnership - corporate fascism and all-powerful government. It's not prosperity. It's not security. And it's not freedom. 

INSIDER'S REPORT

URGENT – Demand Senate Kill Journey Through Hallowed Ground NHA!

The Senate Environment and Natural Resources committee has marked up some 25 bills, all of which are an attack on private property rights and an expansion of government land ownership. Among the worst is S. 289 to establish the Journey Through Hallowed Ground (JTHG) National Heritage Area (NHA). Also bad is S. 278 to establish a permanent program to create new NHAs nationwide. APC has been the premier organization fighting NHAs. To date, because of your help, we have stopped them ... against all odds. It is urgent we stop them once again. Concentrate on stopping the JTHG NHA; stopping that should stop the effort to establish a national program. **Do it NOW before the Senate passes these bills in the dead of night, and recesses.**

We have issued a lot of Newswires and Sledgehammer alerts on this issue, but allow me to reiterate the serious threats NHAs pose to local communities and property owners. National Heritage Areas are a federal land grab scheme whereby federal money (pork) is funneled through the National Park Service to anti-property rights, anti-development, anti-capitalism local greens for the sole purpose of extinguishing your private property rights. Partnering with the Park Service, Gang Green is directed to use these federal taxpayer dollars to “preserve” whatever they consider to have natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic or recreational (did I miss anything?) value. To read more about the dangers of National Heritage Areas, go to: <http://www.americanpolicy.org/prop/senatetestimony.htm>.

The effort to establish the JTHG is pork barrel politics at its worst. Special interest groups are relying on deceit and outright lies to gain approval, hoping to pad their pockets at the expense of property owners and local economies.

During promotional and lobbying efforts, the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership has claimed their campaign has the support of towns and

communities throughout the four-state area. As you've read here before, this is an outright lie that cannot stand the light of day.

If the JTHG NHA is established, it will likely then make establishment of a national program unstoppable. This will result in a FLOOD of new National Heritage Areas, each of which will DEVOUR private property rights, CONTROL local land use, and DESTROY local businesses. If a national program is created, the march will be on. Virtually every square inch of these United States could soon be within an NHA boundary, subject to the iron-fisted regulatory rule of the National Park Service and its green partners. We must make a stand. Hold nothing back. We cannot let this happen!

ACTION TO TAKE

It is urgent you call your Senators NOW and tell them:

- **Oppose the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area.**
- This is a **massive federal land grab** and must not pass.
- The Senate can help you “protect” your private property rights best by keeping greedy federal (and allies’) mitts off your land.
- **This is pork barrel politics and must not be passed in the dead of night!**

Tell them you'll be watching, and will remember, their vote!

Call the Senate Switchboard: (202) 224-3121. Ask for your two Senators by name, or tell the switchboard what state you're in, and you will be directly connected with the desired offices.



BREAD LINES... (Cont'd from Pg 3) in it. It's no accident that every four years, at the same time and in the same city as the GOP National Convention, the IDU holds its own meeting.

Formed in 1983, the IDU says it's a "working association of over 80 Conservative, Christian Democrat and like minded political parties of centre and centre right." Some of the political party members of the IDU include the German Christian Social Union; British Conservative Party; Norway Conservative Party - and the U.S. Republican Party.

Now one would expect that an organization which is made of "centre and centre right" organizations which advocate "free enterprise, free trade and private property," as the IDU claims - an organization with the Republican Party as a major active member, would also advocate the greatest collection of ideas for freedom ever written - the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.

What an opportunity for the GOP to advance American ideals for eradicating poverty throughout the world.

But such is not the case with the IDU. A careful look at the group's founding Declaration of Principles reveals a very different message. The second paragraph of the IDU Declaration states: "Being committed to advancing the social and political values on which democratic societies are founded, including the basic personal freedoms and human rights, as defined in the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights...**" That, of course, is the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights that the IDU is promoting.

There are two conflicting philosophies of governing in the world. One, the American view, as outlined in the Declaration of Independence, states that all people have rights they are born with and that government's main job is to protect those rights at all costs. America's founding document says that these rights are forever and

unquestioned. It is the foundation of human freedom.

The other view says that government decides the rights we should have, professing that all such rights give way to an unidentified common good whenever the situation is warranted. That means that all so-called rights are subject to the whim of whatever gang is currently in power. This is the position promoted in the UN's Declaration of Human Rights. Moreover, Article 29, section (3) of the document says, "*These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.*"

To understand why the Republican Party has embraced the socialism of Bono instead of the freedom of de Soto, one only has to connect the dots. As an organization advocating human freedom, the Republican Party is a fraud.



WALL STREET... (Cont'd from Page 8)

has, in fact, undercut the Proliferation Security Initiative, a U.S. effort to enlist international help to cut off shipments of nuclear and missile technology to countries such as Iran or North Korea."

This is what some of the international lawyers from the Navy are saying. But they have failed to take into account the fact that the treaty and its tribunal of foreign judges will decide what constitutes "military" and "peaceful" activities and what is allowable in international waters. The treaty is a trap. This pact will enable foreign judges to determine what the U.S. can do on the high seas. Such an outcome could completely undermine the Proliferation Security Initiative.

Finally, King reports that "Others argue that the U.S. is already losing out in what promises to be a multibillion-dollar opportunity: the undersea mining of copper, zinc, cobalt and even diamonds. John Norton Moore, a top legal expert on the law of the sea at the University of Virginia, said Russian and Chinese firms have already laid claim to some of the biggest undersea mines in the world. Without joining the treaty, the U.S. has no forum in which to stake a claim."

Consider the statement, provided as a matter of fact, that "Without joining the treaty, the U.S. has no forum in which

to stake a claim." This is absolutely false.

The U.S. doesn't need a "forum," certainly not one under the auspices of the U.N., to make such a claim. U.S. claims have already been made to oil and gas and minerals in the Arctic and Pacific Oceans by U.S. companies. I discuss them in my report. In addition, American explorers staked a claim to the North Pole itself, long before the Russians got there. In fact, ratification of the treaty could easily backfire in this regard, giving the U.N. the opportunity to turn over what is rightfully ours to the Russians and others. In that case, we would be stuck, after having ratified a treaty that many conservatives have been consistently warning would work against our interests. Billions of dollars of arctic riches are at stake.

The American people need to catch on fast to what's going on. The Wall Street Journal has become a mouthpiece for the special interests pushing the treaty. There isn't much time left for the American people to register their opinions on this matter.

Cliff Kincaid is the Editor of the Accuracy In Media Report and can be reached at cliff.kincaid@aim.org. Visit www.aim.org for more information.



SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY

WALL STREET JOURNAL LIES ABOUT SEA TREATY

By Cliff Kincaid

If and when Rupert Murdoch starts cleaning house at the Wall Street Journal, he ought to take a hard look at Neil King Jr., who has an article in the August 22 issue that completely misleads readers of the paper about the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), coming before the Senate next month. The thrust of the article is that the treaty is one of the most wonderful things in the world and that everybody is backing it except for a few conservatives.

This article, unfortunately, is typical of the liberal media treatment of the issue. It reflects everything that is wrong with the media today, including bias and laziness. King offers no facts about where the treaty came from. For example, how many people know that one of the brains behind the treaty was a Harvard Law Professor, Louis Sohn, who believed in world government? And that Sohn favored a world government with hundreds of thousands of troops, nuclear weapons, and military bases around the world? And that Sohn was a major influence on the current Yale Law School Dean who could become President Hillary Clinton's first nomination to the Supreme Court?

The hard facts about Louis Sohn's drafting of the treaty can be found in a new report entitled "Will the Senate Be Told the Truth About the Law of the Sea Treaty?" Not surprisingly, my report notes that Sohn and communist spy Alger Hiss were major figures behind the creation of the United Nations itself. Both Sohn and Hiss worked for the U.S. State Department. Sohn died in 2006 but he can safely be counted among the current and former "diplomats" cited in the King article who have been promoting Senate ratification of the pact for many years. They are the ones, King says, who pressured President Bush to endorse it.

There are several major inaccuracies in King's article. He states that "Policy makers in Washington have generally been slow to champion the treaty. President Reagan opposed the original pact's undersea-mining rules as biased against U.S. interests, a position that still carries much weight with many conservatives. President Clinton signed the treaty after those rules were amended, but the Republican-controlled Senate refused to go along. In 2004, the measure withered again on Capitol Hill."

The claim that the "rules were amended" is false. While a separate side agreement was made in 1994, supposedly

to mollify some American concerns, the treaty does not recognize its validity.

King writes that "The treaty is now the world's primary legal blueprint for what constitutes international waters and airspace." This is false, too. As long as the U.S. refuses to be a party to it, the treaty can't affect or restrict the activities of the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard or those U.S. corporations which stake claims to oil and gas and minerals in international waters.

So why are the Navy and Coast Guard backing the measure? Simply put, the number of U.S. ships has declined to such an extent that their current leaders apparently think a piece of paper with a U.N. stamp of approval on it will offer some sort of protection for U.S. interests around the world. My report notes that a top international lawyer in the Defense Department was one of those paying tribute to Louis Sohn at a special academic event.

Sadly, the policy of "peace through strength" pursued by President Reagan has now become one of reliance on the U.N. when it comes to oceans policy. Our Navy and Coast Guard officers, under the influence of international lawyers in their Judge Advocate General offices, have thrown their lot in with that long-time foe of American national interests, the United Nations.

This can be seen in a quotation that King attributes to Rear Adm. Bruce MacDonald, the Navy's judge advocate general. "We need this treaty to lock in the rights we already have," he says. This statement speaks volumes. How low have we sunk that we need a treaty to "lock in" the rights that our ships used to assert on the high seas? How does a piece of paper "lock in" our rights anyway when the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea is dominated by members of the U.N. opposed to our interests? Whatever happened to the ability of U.S. Navy and Coast Guard ships to protect our interests?

Rather than ratify this treaty, many conservatives believe we ought to embark on a massive shipbuilding program. The number of U.S. ships has declined to 276, from a high of 594 under Reagan. Do we really want to depend on international lawyers and foreign judges to protect American interests?

King writes that "Administration officials also argue that Washington's failure to sign on to the treaty

(Cont'd on Pg. 7)