

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.AMERICANPOLICY.ORG

ANTI-NAU WARRIORS BEGINNING TO MOVE THE ROCK UPHILL!

By Tom DeWeese

Just a year ago most would have predicted there was no way to stop the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) which many believe will become a North American Union (NAU). The proponents are rich, powerful and determined. From the White House to huge, wealthy international corporations, these proponents of the SPP are used to getting their way. The little people back in their grassroots are just silly pawns to be manipulated or ignored.

But there are signs that the huge rock at the bottom of the hill that is the unmovable NAU is beginning to budge uphill as heroes are emerging in the fight. Some close to the movers and shakers are beginning to hint at a concern that they just might not be able to implement the SPP – that darned opposition just won't go

away. At the same time, anti-NAU forces are beginning to see signs of progress as the movement is getting energized. Victory is certainly not in sight, but now there is hope.

ONE MAN WRECKING CREW

Of course the Paul Revere of the anti-NAU forces is Jerome Corsi. Just over a year ago Corsi began to dig up details of an effort to “harmonize” the three nations of the North American continent. The more he found, the more concerned he became. Corsi began to write about his findings. The first articles appeared on the pages of Human Events and then the Internet news site World Net Daily picked up on the issue. That's when the news flashed across the Internet that the Bush Administration was putting together the beginnings of a North American Union.

To travel with Jerome Corsi, as I've had the privilege to do in recent months, is a revelation. The man is a human dynamo. He has been on more than 500 radio shows in just the last few months. He sometimes spends as much as 5 – 8 hours a day on the radio in interview after interview.

Last January, during the organizing meeting of the Coalition to Stop the North American Union, on Capitol Hill, I sat next to Corsi at the head table. Three times during that meeting Corsi left the room to do yet

another radio interview. In August, while we were in Ottawa, Canada to protest the President's participation in yet another SPP Summit, Corsi couldn't even wait for the restaurant to prepare lunch. He was off to another interview. I had to bring it to him in his room as he talked on the phone. And most recently I witnessed the most remarkable feat. As he and I waited to board a plane for a meeting in Tulsa, Corsi received a call from a Gannet news reporter. As we passed by the ticket taker, he talked, attacking Bush for his treachery; as we walked out on the tarmac, his voice was nearly drowned out by the jet engines; ascending the stairs to the plane, I heard him quoting Greek philosophers mixed with American history as he made his point to the reporter. He kept talking until the flight crew shut the door of the plane and made him put the phone away.

In between interviews he conducts a furious schedule of speeches, while pouring out article after article on new details about the SPP. Each new article flashes around the Internet, fueling the grassroots with more ammunition.

Somewhere in the midst of all of this he found time to write a book about the whole issue, entitled “The Late Great USA.” The book details how the NAU is being created, step by step. Despite the fact that there has been virtually no national media

IN THIS ISSUE:

3. RESISTANCE TO REASON

What the Mexicans are Telling Us
/ Mush from The White House

4. ABSOLUTES:

NCLB Welcomes Children
to 1984 and the Village ;
Playing for Big Money

8. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:

Senator Vitter Leads Assault
on UN's Sea Treaty

reporting on the NAU issue, Corsi's book has become an instant national best seller. It is now in its fourth printing. Americans are beginning to get the message. Corsi is a one man wrecking ball and the undisputed field general in the war to preserve American sovereignty and independence.

EXPOSING THE HAND OF TxDOT

Some of the very best information on how the Trans Texas Corridor is being forced on the people of that state comes from an organization called Corridor Watch. Their revelations and early call to arms was instrumental in forcing the Texas Legislature to finally recognize there was really an effort to create a NAFTA Super Corridor straight through Texas.

Here are just a few of the details Corridor Watch has exposed on their web site www.corridorwatch.org:

The Trans Texas Corridor (TTC) will be a quarter of a mile wide. It will travel straight up the center of Texas. It will take by Eminent Domain more than 580 million acres of private land, much of it prime Texas farmland. It will displace more than one million Texans.

The full plan for the TTC by the Texas Transportation Commission (TxDot) outlines 4,000 miles of corridors that crisscross the state. The corridor is so wide that it will literally divide the state in two. There are very few plans for overpasses to cross it, yet it will be impossible to cross without them. The TxDOT has basically told local communities that if they want overpasses, then the communities will have to supply them – at an estimated cost of about \$2.5 million each. Without the overpasses fire, police and ambulances will not be able to serve their communities. Property owners may find it cuts down the middle of their land. To get from one side to the other they may have to travel many miles to an overpass.

The TTC is not highway improvement for Texas. There are few exit ramps planned for the TTC. Car lanes will be in the center of the corridor. There will be few opportunities to get on and off the TTC. Communities that how depend on traffic from existing highways for such

services as restaurants and gas stations will lose that business. Instead, the Spanish company Cintra, which has the 50-year lease to build and operate the TTC will establish facilities down the center of the corridor and control that business.

The key to the lease with Cintra is a legal document called a "Comprehensive Development Agreement" (CDA). These contracts often include equity guarantees, debt guarantees, exchange rate guarantees, subordinated loans, shadow toll payments, and minimum revenue guarantees. In other words, the state has signed a 50-year lease with Cintra, giving it absolute guarantees of a specific rate of return on its investment. TxDoT is turning over assets paid for by the taxpayers of Texas and guaranteeing that no highway will compete in any way with the TTC. To achieve these revenue guarantees, there is no way for the Texas government to control what Cintra charges for tolls and there will be no alternative route for drivers to take if the tolls are too high.

The TTC is being built for one reason and only one reason – massive profits for corporations who want the highway to run goods as cheaply as possible. Once built there will be no chance for anyone or any community in its path to obtain justice for taken property or reduce toll rates. Local courts will have no say in the matter. All disputes will be handled by an International court system either through NAFTA or the SPP.

These are just some of the facts Corridor Watch has been able to expose to the people of Texas. Revelation of these facts has caused an uproar in the grassroots and in the Texas Legislature.

FORCING THE STATE TO DEAL WITH THE PEOPLE

Desperate people are forced to get creative when dealing with a government which refuses to protect people's rights or to even engage in dialog. Such has been the case in Texas, where Governor Rick Perry and his administration have not only vetoed any legislation aimed at slowing down the TTC process, but have refused to even discuss it.

(Cont'd on Page 3)

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 13, No. 11 November 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.

ANTI-NAU... (Cont'd from Pg 2)

However, Governor Perry and his legions hadn't counted on the creativity and determination of Attorney Fred Kelly Grant and his group Stewards of the Range. Grant, Stewards' president, has been a leader in the nation-wide property rights battle, using his extensive knowledge of the law, Grant has successfully developed a unique process to force State and Federal governments to deal with local communities. He teaches the process in seminars across the country. Now Grant has employed the technique against the TTC to stop the Corridor.

Here's a brief run down on how his system works. The process takes advantage of little known wording placed in federal and state land management policy which, in some states, gives locally-elected entities, like communities and school boards, the right to demand that federal and state agencies "coordinate" with them to assure local interests and property are protected.

The first step was to coordinate the mayors of four small cities in Texas to form a commission. These include the cities of Bartlett, Holland, Little River-Academy and Rogers, all located in Bell County, Texas. They have now been joined by two school board districts as well.

Under Texas state law, TxDoT will be required to work with the commission and coordinate their plans with the local group before any land is taken or any construction begins. Officially the commission is working through Texas Local Government Code, Chapter 391.

"TXDoT must coordinate with us before they can implement their plans (for the TTC) in our regions," said, Ronnie White, vice president of the commission and Mayor of Academy, Texas. "If not, they are in violation of the state statute and we are prepared to take them to court if
(Cont'd on Page 6)



RESISTANCE TO REASON

REVEALING FACTS OF THOSE WHO HAVE DECLARED WAR ON LOGIC

WHAT THE MEXICANS ARE TELLING US

"You are Mexicans. Mexicans who live near the border."

Former Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo, 1995, to Dallas, TX audience of U.S. citizens of Mexican decent.

"I have proudly affirmed that the Mexican nation extends beyond the territory enclosed by its borders."

Former Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo, 1997 to a loudly applauding Chicago meeting of La RAZA.

"We are Mexicans that live in our territories and we are Mexicans that live in other territories. In reality, there are 120 million that live together and are working together to construct a nation."

Former Mexican President Vicente Fox, June 2004, speech to the Mexican/American community in Chicago.

"The Mexican nation goes beyond the borders of Mexico."

Carlos Gutierrez, head of the Institute of Mexicans abroad, 2005.

"Mexico does not end at its borders...Where there is a Mexican, there is Mexico."

Current Mexican President Felipe Calderon, state of the union address, 2007.

"Eventually our long-range objective is to establish with the United States...an ensemble of connections and institutions similar to those created by the European Union, with the goal of attending to future themes as important as... the freedom of movement of capital, goods, services and persons. The new framework we wish to construct is inspired in the example of the European Union."

Former Mexican President Vicente Fox, Madrid 2002.

MUSH FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

"I've not heard of such legislation (HCR 40), but I think we are very comfortable believing that there can be Mexico, the United States and Canada as three separate countries all working together."

Dana Perino, White House spokeswoman, September 2007.



ABSOLUTES....!

NCLB Welcomes Children to 1984 and the Village

Karen R. Effrem, MD EdWatch Board of Directors

Democrat and Republican liberals on the US House Education and Labor Committee have released their discussion draft for the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Both Hillary Clinton, as the “mayor” of the government “village” which wants to raise our children, and the ghost of George Orwell, author of 1984, are well represented in this draft. What began in 1965, ostensibly as an effort to help poor children improve academic achievement has grown and spread like a monstrous cancer that is destroying academic achievement and freedom, parental autonomy, privacy, and the ability to maintain our republic for ALL public school children.

Here is a small sample of the many dangerous, freedom-robbing provisions present in this bill, in addition to the continued tyranny of adequate yearly progress requirements that will never be met and the international education that undermines our American principles of freedom:

“Big Brother is Watching” - National Education Database: Within four years of the reauthorization of NCLB, states must develop a comprehensive dossier of every aspect of your child’s academic life starting from preschool onward through college or risk losing 25% of their Title I funds. Title I is the largest source of federal education funds for states and individual schools. This system is supposed to be put together by a council of teachers, administrators, union representatives, big business, and researchers that will all have access to your child’s data. Among the many required data elements are:

- o Unique individual student and teacher identification numbers that track every aspect of a student’s performance and hold teachers accountable for teaching the national standards that masquerade as locally derived standards;
- o Enrollment and demographic data on every student including the NCLB category into which they fall, attendance, and program participation data;
- o Individual statewide assessment scores required by NCLB;
- o The reason a student may not have taken the state NCLB assessment;
- o Transcript data, including grades and courses taken;
- o Graduation and dropout rates, college entrance test data.

We’ve seen this type of invasive federal medical data collection system before. For example, through HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act), drug companies and all manner of other researchers and government agencies

have access to your private medical data without your permission, while spouses and family members have trouble accessing that same data without going through complicated bureaucratic hoops. Far from improving educational achievement, this data collection system will give government bureaucrats, especially those of the federal variety, further reason to meddle in and control the education, family life, and raising of our children.

“Hillary’s Village” - Full Service Community Schools:

In order to conform to the utopian plan of 100% proficiency for ALL students and to comply with the Education for All international agreements, the Committee has also expanded the 21st Century Schools current grant program. These schools will offer programs in early childhood including Head Start, mental health (despite skyrocketing rates of diagnosis and drugging of even young children), careers, parenting education and oversight by government-defined outcomes, and other “services consistent with this part.” Among the purposes of 21st Century Schools are:

- o “Enabling families to participate in the education of their children” - This language sets up the legal foundation for advancing a deceptive and perverse power grab by government authorities. Presuming to “enable” parents to participate in the education of their children is to assume government as a higher authority over children than parents. It will entail major meddling in the private lives of families as well as collecting massive amounts of private data on individual families.
- o Enabling “principals and teachers to complement and enrich efforts to help all children reach proficiency in reading and math by 2014” - Universal proficiency is utopian. Attempts to comply forces outcomes to a meaninglessly low level and a teaching to the test. Political mandates are not magic wands. Numerous national experts and several state evaluations have admitted that 100% of schools will fail to make AYP by 2014.
- o “Ensuring that children come to school ready to learn every day” - Sadly, “ready to learn” in the federal government’s eyes means that young children are ready to accept all sorts of non-academic indoctrination dealing with gender issues, mental health, careers, and environmentalism that have nothing to do with reading and math or closing the achievement gap. Back in 1946, Edwin Broome, a disciple of government education architect John Dewey,

...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

said in the Montgomery County (MD) blueprint for schools, "The end results are that the school makes itself indispensable to all phases of community life. In the future development of school programs, the service program will receive increasing emphasis until the school becomes in fact the agency to which all people in the community turn for assistance." And mental health advocate and author Edna Copeland said in a 1995 book, "I truly believe that schools will become our mental health agencies of the future, especially for children." Both predictions are coming to pass with this proposal. Is this what we want for our children's future and our nations freedom?


"The Sky is Falling" - Environmental Education:

While vigorously, but ludicrously, claiming that they are not interfering in local curriculum or standards development, the feds now want to subsidize K-12 environmental standards that will, among other things:

- o Promote and develop curriculum aligned to these standards:
- o Use environmental education as an "integrating theme" for all other academic subjects, so that our children may be indoctrinated and scared with all sorts of controversial, if not downright false, pseudo-science about global warming, over-population, people being a curse upon the earth, and more.
- o Reduce "nature-deficit disorder in students" by having students spend time in nature to increase achievement, self-esteem, personal responsibility, community involvement, and child obesity. "Nature-deficit disorder" is a euphemism coined by author Richard

Louv in his 2005 book "Last Child in the Woods: Saving Our Children from Nature-Deficit Disorder." The phrase masquerades as a scientific "disorder." Will this be another dubious "disorder" to be treated with drugs?

- o Support "the national effort to enable all students to demonstrate competence in environmental learning." With Al Gore refusing to debate credible scientists with data that is inconvenient to him, with the recent admission in a June, 2007 study funded by the Department of Energy that man-made carbon dioxide is largely irrelevant to the earth's temperature, with the admission by Swedish environmentalists that recycling is "a waste of time and money," and with the poor performance of American students on international tests, the last thing American students need is a takeover of every academic subject by Chicken Little - that man-is-evil radicalism masked as concern for the environment.

"Better Achievement Through Chemistry" - NO Protection from Coerced Drugging: The Committee refuses to protect children from coercive drugging in schools, despite the fact that the House passed that measure by over 400 votes during two consecutive sessions of Congress. Chief authors Rep. John Kline (R-MN) and Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) continue their great efforts on this measure. The facts are that two million children are on the most potent and dangerous antipsychotic medications. The unscientific diagnosis of bipolar disorder in children has increased 40-fold in ten years, and the FDA has placed ADHD drugs like Ritalin under warnings for increased psychosis and sudden death in children. 


Playing for Big Money

Wood chip surfaces installed in school playgrounds to prevent injury discriminate against wheelchair-bound disabled students, a federal district court judge in Oakland, California ruled on May 5. The suit was brought by a group called Disability Rights Advocates, alleging the surfaces prevent children from wheeling themselves to swings and slides.

"Our experts and people with disabilities tell us that wood chip surfaces are not accessible," said a spokesman for the group. "They constantly form mounds and gullies... and they're impossible to maintain. Little kids in wheelchairs are already struggling to get around, they have less muscular strength, and it's important that play structures be easily accessible for them so they can be mainstreamed (with other children) as much as possible."

The district is exploring installing rubber mats in their playgrounds at an estimated cost of \$2.7 million.

No one wants to see discriminatory treatment of the disabled, but at the risk of being politically incorrect, there are some obvious questions here: Should little kids in wheelchairs be allowed to wheel themselves over to the swings and slides and play on them in the first place? Wouldn't that subject the school to a negligence suit?

Source: Bob Egelko, "Wood chips ruled unfriendly to disabled kids," [Contra Costa County] Chronicle, May 5, 2007 - Lawsuit Abuse Fortnightly, The Heartland Institute (www.heartland.org). 

ANTI-NAU... (*Cont'd from Page 3*)
 necessary," said Mae Smith, president of the commission and Mayor of Holland, Texas.

The Mayors have created a legal entity which the State must deal with before any plans for the TTC can go through. It is much more effective than rallies, phone calls and petitions to uncaring state officials. For the first time, it is forcing their hand through possible court action. "TxDot has never asked us if we even wanted the quarter-mile highway through our area and they definitely never discussed the human, environmental, economic or cumulative effect it would have on our community, as required by state and federal law," said Smith. Now the state is scrambling to comply with the Mayors' commission.

Even more important, though laws do vary from state to state, the tactic Fred Kelly Grant has designed is basically available in every single state and may be employed in some manner by local communities over every inch of the planned NAFTA Superhighway from Texas to Minnesota. It's a vital new toll in the battle to retain Constitutional freedoms.

FIGHTING FROM INSIDE THE LEGISLATURE

One state north of Texas, and the next stop on the TTC dragon is Oklahoma. Activists there led by a determined band called Oklahomans for Sovereignty and Free Enterprise (OKSAFE), are already organizing to assure the TTC does not come over their border. The group stands squarely against the NAFTA Superhighway and North American Union.

At a recent conference attended by 300 activists, news media and several Oklahoma state legislators, speakers included Jerome Corsi, Tom DeWeese and Dave Stall of Corridor Watch.

The conference received White House attention due to the remarks made by Oklahoma State Senator Randy Brogdon when he said, "The NAFTA Superhighway stops here."

Senator Brogdon has been a fierce opponent of the highway and the SPP. He has led several successful efforts to block the enactment of any enabling legislation that would allow efforts to begin in Oklahoma to build the TTC.

Brogdon was instrumental in stopping a bill brought before the Oklahoma legislature (HB1917) that would have pre-authorized the TTC north into Oklahoma. In fact, Brogdon discovered that the bill would have required the state to waive its 11th Amendment rights which protect states from foreign law suits.

Brogdon is now leading efforts to withdraw Oklahoma's membership in North America's SuperCorridor Coalition, Inc. (NASCO), saving the state a \$25,000 annual membership fee. NASCO's mission statement says its goal is to create the world's first international, intermodal superhighway system. NASCO is the chief lobbying arm for implementation of the NAFTA Superhighway in state legislatures along the proposed corridor

route. For Oklahoma to drop its NASCO membership would send shock waves throughout the nation and would certainly lead other states to follow leaving huge holes in NASCO's influence.

Meanwhile, as OKSAFE continues to organize its opposition efforts in Oklahoma, it is also reaching out to other states, helping them to prepare for the fight as well. Grassroots America is mobilizing.

INFORMING THE AVERAGE CITIZENS

Not to be outdone, the American Policy Center has now mailed over 2.5 million copies of its North American Union Fact Sheet across the nation, with a full 2 million being "carpet bombed" to towns and neighborhoods all along the planned Super Highway route, from Texas to Minnesota. Included with the Fact Sheets is a survey which asks American citizens if they have heard of the Security and Prosperity Partnership and if they want a North American Union. Early returns indicate a strong opposition to the idea. The survey, results of which will be released shortly, clearly show a strong opposition when Americans are informed.

ONE MILLION TEAMSTERS

Now add to the mix of growing opposition the million-member strong International Brotherhood of Teamsters. They have led the fight to stop the Mexican trucks from coming over the border. However, the Teamsters' opposition goes much deeper than just stopping competitive trucks.

"I think the Bush Administration has a master plan to erase all borders and to have a super-government in North America," said Teamster President James Hoffa. "I am convinced that the plan to create a North American Union is what is going on," he said. The Teamsters Union can hardly be labeled a right wing, fanatical fringe group. More importantly, other trucking associations and unions, such as the Longshoremen are beginning to express concern of the NAFTA Superhighway and North American Union.

WE CAN WIN

These are just a few of the heroes who are beginning to emerge in the fight to stop the North American Union. No longer is this simply a skirmish with a few, unheralded individuals and groups over the Internet. War has broken out and it's being fought in the courts, in the state legislatures and across the nation in the grassroots. Without question the White House and its allies are starting to feel the heat as they exchange nervous glances, uncertain that they can now carry out their plans.

Slowly, but surely the rock is starting to move uphill as outraged Americans are beginning to push back against the forces who seek to eliminate our sovereign nation. When I spoke to the OKSAFE audience in Tulsa, I began by saying, "I'm here today because I'm an American and I want MY country." Let's make that our battle cry.

The fact is, we can stop the North American Union – if we all push together.



SENATOR VITTER... (*Cont'd from Page 8*)

leading to inevitable disputes about what the U.S. could do.

Exhibiting an arrogant streak, Bellinger told Senator Bob Corker that the U.S. had “effective lawyers” and were likely to win most of the disputes. He said each side picked arbitrators in a dispute but neglected to mention that the U.N. Secretary-General can pick some, too. Most of the members of the U.N. Sea Treaty organization, like members of the U.N. itself, come from the anti-American bloc. Despite Bellinger’s confidence in the ability of the legal profession, it is political power and anti-Americanism that will decide these outcomes. That is why, except on the U.N. Security Council, where the U.S. has a veto, U.N. decisions almost always go against America and our economic and security interests.

Bellinger told the Senate that the U.S. has a seat on the Council of the International Seabed Authority (ISA) and has a “veto” over its decisions. This is a body that collects taxes-dubbed “fees” or “royalties” by Bellinger and Negroponte - and then decides how to distribute them. Later, however, Bellinger conceded that the decisions of the Council will be made through “consensus,” which makes our so-called vote subservient to the dictates of the rest of the members. Of course, a liberal U.S. President such as Hillary Clinton, whose executive branch will determine the American vote on the Council, would most likely go along with the “consensus” anyway. Once it gets its hands on profits from the exploitation of oil, gas and minerals, the ISA could give billions of dollars to the anti-American Third World. With this kind of money changing hands, it seems inevitable that another oil-for-food-type scandal could develop. There are no provisions in the treaty for monitoring the ethical behavior of Law of the Sea treaty bureaucrats and employees.

Administration officials falsely and repeatedly claimed that the international bodies set up by the treaty have no official involvement with the United Nations. In fact, the International Seabed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea have written and formalized agreements with the U.N. Their employees even belong to the U.N. pension fund. The treaty itself has numerous references to the authority of the U.N., emphasizing how the pact is to be implemented in accordance with the U.N. Charter.

Lugar and the One-Worlders

Senator Richard Lugar, the top Republican on the Senate committee and long-time advocate of the treaty, turned in an embarrassing performance as well. Lugar, who has accepted campaign contributions from the Citizens for Global Solutions, a pro-world government lobby, attacked critics of the pact as conspiracy theorists who were exaggerating the dangers of the pact. He attacked an ad that my group, America’s Survival, had put in the Washington Times on Wednesday, saying it was misleading. In fact, the claims were based on the text of the treaty and official U.N. documents. I have been denied the opportunity to testify to set the record straight, which is another indication that the treaty is being rushed through before the American people can understand its ominous implications.

Noting the outrage over the attempt to pass the Senate illegal alien amnesty bill, which also involved the issue of national sovereignty, Senator Jim DeMint said this was the wrong time to be trying to push the U.N.’s Law of the Sea Treaty through.

DeMint asked some tough questions of administration witnesses, focusing on the fact that while the U.S. would follow the treaty if ratified, other nations would not. On the question of using the treaty to enforce international environmental accords, DeMint noted that Britain had been taken to court under the treaty for operating a nuclear plant on its own soil. The South Carolina senator also rebutted the claim, mentioned often at the hearing, that President Reagan had rejected the treaty only because of its seabed mining provisions. He read from the new book on Reagan’s diaries in which the former president says he would not have signed the treaty even without those provisions.

Senator Joe Biden, chairman of the committee, did not even show up, probably because he was campaigning for the presidency somewhere. Indeed, only one Democrat, Senator Jim Webb of Virginia, came to the hearing. He became acting chairman in Biden’s absence. Senators were restricted to only one round of questions, lasting about seven minutes each. Considering the deficient answers to Vitter’s questions, one can now understand why. They did not want the holes and traps in the treaty to be exposed to public view.

Other Republican senators in attendance were Lisa Murkowski, who was preoccupied with the Russian claim to Arctic oil, gas and mineral deposits near her home state of Alaska, and Johnny Isakson of Georgia.

The Russian Power Play

In response to a Murkowski question, Negroponte said the U.S. could not dispute the Russian claim without ratifying the treaty. But this was another false assertion. The U.S. provided information to the U.N. Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf several years ago rebutting a previous Russian claim to the area. Negroponte did not explain what would happen if the U.N. body, once we had ratified the treaty, decided to turn Arctic riches over to the Russians. The answer, of course, is that we would abide by such a disastrous decision, which would cost us access to billions of dollars worth of oil, gas and minerals. That is the precise point I made in my ad.

Another hearing is scheduled for next Thursday, October 4, with seven scheduled witnesses, only two of them critics of the treaty. That will mean, when all of the hearings are concluded, the line-up will be 8-2 in favor of the treaty.

It is apparent that this treaty is being rushed through the Senate, despite the abundant evidence that it will backfire against America and undermine our sovereignty and security. But Senator Vitter has served notice that they are not going to run over him. Americans concerned about their sovereignty and security should thank him profusely.

Cliff Kincaid is the Editor of the AIM Report and can be reached at cliff.kincaid@aim.org



SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY

SENATOR VITTER LEADS ASSAULT ON UN'S SEA TREATY

By Cliff Kincaid

The media have been pummeling conservative Republican Senator David Vitter of Louisiana for apologizing for sexual indiscretions. But America should be grateful he stayed in the Senate and did not resign in the wake of the media assault. The senator demonstrated on Thursday, during a hearing into the U.N.'s Law of the Sea Treaty, that he is going to continue to do the job he was elected to do. Vitter's performance was so effective that he left State and Defense Department officials either speechless or caught up in embarrassing contradictions about the impact of this international agreement on America's security and sovereignty. It should now be perfectly obvious that Bush Administration officials, in collusion with liberal Senators, are trying to bamboozle the Senate into quickly ratifying a very dangerous pact.

One area of concern is how other nations and international lawyers could use the treaty against the U.S. in a back-door effort to implement the (unratified) global warming treaty, with the result being higher gas prices for the American people and perhaps even energy rationing. The Law of the Sea treaty creates a tribunal and various bodies, including dispute resolution or arbitral panels, to resolve conflicts which may arise. Major parts of the treaty mandate international regulation of U.S. economic and industrial activities on land. Greenhouse gases, for example, could be viewed under the terms of the treaty as contributing to pollution of the oceans.

Negroponte Caught in Falsehood

Deputy Secretary of State John Negroponte told the Senate committee that the U.N. body established by the treaty has "no jurisdiction over marine pollution disputes involving land-based sources." He said, "that's just not covered by the treaty." Negroponte's sidekick, State Department Legal Adviser John B. Bellinger III, said, "It clearly does not allow regulation over land-based pollution sources. That would stop at the water's edge." But Vitter shot back, "...why is there a section entitled pollution from land-based sources?" Not only is there a section by that name, Vitter pointed out, but there is a section on enforcement. The section is Article 207, "Pollution from land-based sources." Anybody can look it up. But apparently our top officials and lawyers have not. Either that or they are trying to mislead the people about the ramifications of this treaty. In either case, we are sunk if this treaty goes through.

It was absolutely clear to anyone paying attention that Negroponte and Bellinger either had no real understanding of what was in the treaty or didn't want to tell the American people what was really in it. In the end, under withering fire from Vitter, Bellinger insisted that the controversy was too "technical" to

discuss at the hearing and that he would submit something in writing. Senator Jim Webb, chairing the hearing, suggested he do so, attempting to save Bellinger from further embarrassment. Our liberal media favoring this treaty will, of course, not bother to point out that one of the top brains in the State Department had been caught in the act of trying to mislead the U.S. Senate.

This wasn't the only exchange in which Vitter caught Bush Administration officials saying things that were untrue. He caught them in evasions and obfuscations over the claim that U.S. military and intelligence activities on the high seas cannot be restricted by the treaty. U.S. officials are making that claim in a declaration in the Senate resolution of ratification. It is one of 24 declarations or understandings being made by the U.S. for a treaty that administration witnesses repeatedly claimed would provide "legal certainty" about what nations can and cannot do on the high seas.

If the treaty is so definitive and clear, then why is there a need for 24 declarations and understandings? To make matters worse, these declarations and understandings have no legal validity under the treaty.

DoD Official Admits Error

Here's some of the exchange on this point:

Vitter: "Who decides what is and what is not a military activity?"

Negroponte: "We will decide that. We consider that within our sovereign prerogative."

Vitter: "Where does the treaty say that we decide that and an arbitral body does not decide that?"

Deputy Secretary of Defense Gordon England: "My understanding - and I'll ask my lawyer behind me - that that's in the treaty that we make that determination and that's not subject to review by anyone else."

Vitter: "It's not in the treaty because I point to Article 298 1b where it simply says disputes concerning military activities are not subject to dispute resolution. But it doesn't say who decides what is and what is not a military activity."

England: "You're right."

Once again, an administration witness had been caught saying something that was not true.

When Vitter asked whether the U.S. considered intelligence activities to be military activities, England said he thought so but quickly motioned for his lawyer to come forward. But his lawyer didn't seem to be in any rush to come to the microphone. Bellinger piped in that it would be "up to us." Vitter countered that other signatories to the treaty will disagree, *(Cont'd on Pg. 7)*