

Henry Lamb Columns in 2009

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Why freedom won't die in the 21 st Century..... | 4 |
| Preparing for Obama..... | 6 |
| Recognizing this moment in history | 8 |
| Beyond pomp and circumstance | 10 |
| The three laws of nature..... | 12 |
| Will the U.S. embrace global socialism? | 14 |
| Stimulus package misses the problem | 16 |
| Marching toward the 'ideal' society | 18 |
| Meet the D.C. Hypocrites | 21 |
| New State Sovereignty movement mobilizing | 23 |
| World citizens welcome world government (Part 1) | 25 |
| World citizens welcome world government (Part 2) | 27 |
| Lawmakers trash the Constitution | 30 |
| Let's have a constitutional showdown..... | 32 |
| Playing President | 34 |
| Sovereignty stolen..... | 36 |
| It's all about control | 39 |
| How to save America..... | 41 |
| By their fruits ye shall know them | 44 |
| What about a water-board? | 46 |
| Obama's bootlicking backfires | 49 |
| Killing the golden goose | 51 |
| Sovereignty surrendered | 53 |
| Safe in the arms of government | 55 |
| Warning to Washington: Here comes the freedom movement!..... | 57 |
| A litmus test for leadership..... | 59 |
| Control your government, or it will control you! | 61 |
| Barack H. Obama: Administrator | 63 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| USDA: Can you hear me now?..... | 65 |
| Thank the Democratic Socialist Party..... | 67 |
| Independence in jeopardy | 69 |
| New meaning for “Road Tax” | 72 |
| Big Brother writ large | 74 |
| There’s a great day coming! | 76 |
| The problem with Obama is..... | 78 |
| It must be in their genes | 80 |
| Hey Nancy, their anger is real! | 83 |
| Snake-oil salesmen always lie | 85 |
| Why can’t we win? | 88 |
| Democrats’ despicable duplicity..... | 91 |
| Save our Constitution..... | 93 |
| After the Tea Parties, what’s next? | 96 |
| Welcome global governance..... | 99 |
| All the king’s men...and women | 102 |
| Is “profit” a dirty word? | 104 |
| A tidal wave is brewing | 106 |
| Get ready for the deluge..... | 109 |
| How to save America..... | 111 |
| Choosing America’s Future | 114 |
| Responding to modern Marxism..... | 116 |
| They’re still after you water..... | 118 |
| Senator Christopher Dodd: U.N. Facilitator | 121 |
| Copenhagen confusion..... | 124 |
| Freedom doesn’t have to ask the government for permission | 126 |
| ‘Tis the week before Christmas... .. | 128 |
| America’s lowest moment | 130 |
| It’s not just a Sagebrush Rebellion anymore | 132 |

Why freedom won't die in the 21st Century

By Henry Lamb

When Bill Clinton assumed the presidency in 1993, few people had ever heard the term “sustainable development.” When Barack Obama assumes the presidency on January 20, sustainable development will guide the formulation of public policy in city councils, county commissions, state legislatures, the U.S. Congress, and the U.N. General Assembly.

Sustainable development is the reorganization of society around a body of principles and recommendations set forth in a document called [Agenda 21](#), endorsed by 179 nations in 1992 at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro.

[Sustainable development](#) has permeated government at every level because its sponsors have executed a magnificent marketing campaign and provided extensive funding incentives for the agencies and governments that implement *Agenda 21* recommendations.

Sustainable development is government management of all development to achieve environmental protection, economic and social equity. Neither free markets nor private property rights can exist in a sustainable society managed by government.

It didn't take long for the pain of sustainable development to be felt. The federal government provided states with model legislation and generous funding incentives to enact laws that require counties to adopt a “comprehensive plan” that includes the principles of *Agenda 21*.

It didn't take long for freedom lovers to respond with the creation of [Freedom21](#), pledged to “advance the [principles of freedom](#) in the 21st century.” The group held its [first national conference in 2000](#), attracting leaders of dozens of grassroots organizations from across the nation, and developed its own [policy Alternative to Agenda 21](#).

Now, hundreds of groups have taken up the challenge to “advance the principles of freedom in the 21st century,” by educating their neighbors, and their local elected officials, and showing how federal and state mandated sustainable development policies are destroying private property rights and transforming the function of local government into what the U.N. calls “governance.”

Alabama's [Alliance for Citizens Rights](#) conducts regular seminars throughout the state, educating both elected officials and private citizens about the source and consequences of sustainable development and “smart growth” policies. Chairman, Ken Freeman, and Vice Chairman, Don Casey, have led the group to recognize and resist policies that infringe private property rights.

The Alliance for Citizens Rights is typical of hundreds of organizations working in the Freedom21 movement - to advance the principles of freedom. These organizations are not funded by government, or by large foundations. They consist of hard-working individuals who make time after work to see that freedom is preserved for their children and grandchildren.

To help the people and organizations that are involved in the Freedom movement, the Freedom21 Federal Credit Union was created in 2006. Only members of Freedom21 can participate in the credit union. But because the Alliance for Citizens Rights is a member of Freedom21, and has opened an “Endowment Account” with the Freedom21 Federal Credit Union, the members of the Alliance for Citizens Rights are eligible to join Freedom21 and the credit union. Moreover, one-third of the membership fee is deposited into the Endowment Account of the Alliance for Citizens Rights.

This is the first and only credit union ever created expressly for people who are involved in the freedom movement. The credit union is a not-for-profit organization, owned by the depositors. Every penny of profit must be returned to the members. And Freedom21 actively works to promote funding for the Endowment Account of its member organizations.

Organizations that participate in the Freedom21 movement work together, to share information and assist with legislative initiatives at the local, state, and federal levels. EdWatch.org in Minnesota is the point of the spear in matters related to education. Their work informs all Freedom21 organizations, and all Freedom21 organizations respond when a legislative initiative needs action,

[Freedom Advocates](#) specializes in sustainable development policies and provides educational materials for other Freedom21 organizations as well as for elected officials.

[Take Back Kentucky](#) has developed an extremely effective state-wide organization that has sweeping influence in the state legislature. Their organization plan has been an example followed by several other states that have seen similar results in their legislatures.

[The American Policy Center](#) is one of the federal watchdogs, keeping all the organizations informed about activities in Washington that need a coordinated response.

These are but a few of the hundreds of organizations working to “advance the principles of freedom in the 21st century.” In several communities, their work has already brought reversal of policies that deny property rights, and blocked government’s plans to manage local markets.

Freedom21 does not have the power of government behind it, as does *Agenda 21*. It does, however, have the power of people who are devoted to the principles of freedom. These are the people who have always defended freedom, despite government’s tireless efforts to destroy it. These are the people who won’t let freedom die.

Preparing for Obama

By Henry Lamb

Washington is abuzz preparing for the anointing of Obama and a rerun of the Clinton era. Several nominees for key cabinet positions did their undergraduate work for Bill Clinton; they are now well-prepared to do the heavy lifting for Obama. Aside from the highly publicized cabinet appointments, Obama will name nearly 7,000 people to management positions in the various federal agencies. Resource and land management agencies will, once again, become extension offices of environmental organizations. Nearly 30 environmental organizations have already prepared [Obama's "green" agenda](#). And, with expanded majorities in both houses of Congress, Obama expects his left-leaning vision of social organization to unfold uncontested in his version of 'a new deal for a new century'.

Maybe not.

[Gun Owners of America](#) has been tracking Obama's anti-gun voting record, and preparing its membership for quick and effective response when new anti-gun legislation is introduced. Organization such as GOA and [Keep and Bear Arms](#) concentrate on Second Amendment issues. When there is a threat to the Constitutional right to own guns, they inform their members, and the members of other [Freedom21](#) organizations. Because of their work, hundreds of organizations are now aware of, and working to defeat the latest Second Amendment threat.

It's called the "Ammunition Accountability Act." It is model legislation designed to force ammunition manufacturers to identify every bullet with a serial number that is then registered to a purchaser, and recorded in a federal database. Theoretically, if a shell-casing is found at a crime scene, law enforcement officers could trace the purchaser of the bullet.

In reality, it is another intimidation system, designed to identify, log and track gun/ammunition owners. The model legislation also calls for a five-cent-per-bullet tax to cover the cost of the system. The system would provide the government with the name and location of gun owners and an inventory of the ammunition held. The model legislation would outlaw any and all unregistered ammunition within a year after the legislation is adopted.

[Ammunition Accountability legislation](#) has been introduced in 12 states. Thanks to organizations such as GOA and KABA, this law will not be enacted without serious opposition, open debate, and public awareness.

With Obama soon to be in the White House, Senate Democrats are lining up land acquisition bills. More than 150 separate bills that seek to lock up land in one way or another were dumped into HR5151 "Omnibus Federal Lands Act" at the end of the 110th Congress. This bill is about to be resurrected and, amid all the pomp and circumstance of the inauguration, passed by Congress with little opposition.

Too late! The [American Land Rights Association](#) has alerted organizations across the country, and provides detailed information on their website about the bill and its impact.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture expected to simply mandate a National Animal Identification System which would be fully implemented by 2009. In fact, an Agriculture Department official told an audience in Utah in 2006 that NAIS is coming “like a freight train; there’s nothing that can stop it.”

That official had not met the [Liberty Ark Coalition](#), or the dozens of other grassroots groups that sprang up to educate and activate the people who do not want the federal government to register their premises, electronically tag their animals, and maintain a national database tracking the movement of every animal.

The USDA had to back off its mandatory plans, and announce that the program would be voluntary. Every time the USDA tries to advance the program through some coercive rule, these organizations issue an alert and flood the phone lines of elected officials.

When USDA turned to the states and provided funds for state agencies to implement the program, state and local organizations such as the [Ozark Property Rights Congress](#) rallied their troops who educated and urged their state representatives to enact legislation that prohibits mandatory NAIS in their state. More than a dozen states responded in the same way.

Obama and the Democrats may reign in Washington, but across the land there is a network of grassroots organizations in place that did not exist when Clinton came to power. Advances in technology make it possible to inform and activate hundreds of thousands of people in a matter of minutes. All of the organizations described here are affiliated with the [Freedom21 movement](#). They are autonomous organizations, working within their own areas of interest and expertise, but joined together by a common desire to advance the principles of freedom in the 21st century.

The coffers of all these organizations combined would not match the budget of The Nature Conservancy, or the Sierra Club. But these organizations are armed with members who are informed, active, and determined to let no power – domestic or foreign – extinguish the freedom fashioned by our founders.

Recognizing this moment in history

By Henry Lamb

Most of the world is giddy about the inauguration of the first black president of the United States. The media has invested unprecedented air time to transform this man into a modern messiah. The celebration is not because he is black. Far better qualified black candidates, such as [Condoleezza Rice](#), [Walter Williams](#) or [Thomas Sowell](#) would not be celebrated, nor even welcomed as president. In fact, Condoleezza Rice and Colin Powell, both black Secretaries of State, were ridiculed as “Uncle Tom” and “Aunt Jemima” by many of the same people who celebrate Obama.

Obama’s color may be a bonus, but it is his philosophy that much of the world celebrates.

Much of the world sees Obama not simply as the first black president, but as the first president to accept global governance to be more important than U.S. governance. His [Berlin speech](#) last July promised “a new global partnership” and a new “global commitment” to “save the planet.”

To implement his commitment to global governance, Obama has nominated Hillary Clinton to be Secretary of State. In addition to her book, “It takes a village,” Hillary is on record in support of the World Federalist Association’s efforts to establish a world government, and publically applauded Walter Cronkite’s receipt of the [WFA “Global Governance” award](#).

Obama has named [Carol Browner](#) to the new position of Energy Czar. This woman, until last week, was a Commissioner for the [Socialist International Commission for a Sustainable World Society](#). Browner’s new position requires no confirmation and is beyond Congressional oversight. She will be empowered to administratively implement Obama’s philosophy across all federal agencies.

Obama chose [Erick Schwartz](#) to coordinate his transition team’s interface with agencies that deal with the United Nations. Schwartz is, among other things, the person in the Clinton administration who “managed the White House review that resulted in the U.S. signature of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.” In an effort to influence the Obama administration’s global governance agenda, [Citizens for Global Solutions](#) set up a conference call with the transition team. These organizations are advocates of global governance and are deeply embedded throughout the Obama administration.

Obama’s inauguration is a major, historic event. Many black people – and some whites - will weep because they have lived to see a black man elected president. Many white people – and some blacks - will weep because they have lived to see an American president who apparently puts global interests above the interests of the United States of America.

Expect Obama’s global agenda to embrace the U.N.’s global warming program. The world is giddy about his inauguration because the world expects Obama to sign and support whatever the U.N. designs as a replacement for the Kyoto Protocol. The U.N.’s answer to global warming is

substantial reduction in the use of fossil fuel in developed nations while allowing developing nations to do whatever they wish. Expect new energy taxes at the international, national, and state levels. Expect new tax-paid subsidies for alternative energy operations and new, punitive tax-increases for fossil fuel users. Expect Obama's U.N.-inspired energy policy to be a ball-and-chain on the American economy.

Expect Obama to re-sign the U.N.'s International Criminal Court Statute to demonstrate to the world that the United States is, indeed, a new member in the world community. Never mind that the document gives the ICC the power to prosecute U.S. military and private citizens for whatever the Court defines to be "crimes against humanity." For years, U.N. delegates have accused the United States of "crimes against humanity" for refusing to ratify the Kyoto Protocol.

With Obama's support, expect to see John Kerry, the new Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, introduce a line of U.N. treaties that have been stalled for years. The Convention on the Law of the Sea will be a high priority. This treaty declares that: "*Sovereignty over the territorial sea is exercised subject to this Convention and to other rules of international law*" (Article II(3)). Advocates of this treaty willingly surrender national sovereignty over territorial seas to the U.N.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child, another treaty waiting in the wings for U.S. ratification, will effectively remove authority for raising children from parents and bestow that authority upon government.

Watch for CEDAW, the Convention to Eliminate all forms of Discrimination Against Women. [Phyllis Schlafly](#) says this treaty would require a rewrite of U.S. laws to conform to the fantasies of international feminists.

There are many more U.N. treaties waiting to be ratified, and still more under construction. This is the essence of global governance championed by Barack Obama and those he brings to power. His inauguration is far more than the celebration of the first black president. It should be recognized as the last step on the journey to global governance.

Beyond pomp and circumstance

By Henry Lamb

Hidden well behind the spectacular pomp and historic circumstance of inauguration week, the wheels of government continued the relentless grind, oblivious to the party in power at the moment. From deep within the bureaucracy, the USDA moved closer to taking control over every livestock animal and the land on which they roam. With a callousness hardened by expanded majorities, Congress moved closer to taking control over another two million acres of land and the resources it contains.

To accommodate a request of the National Institute of Animal Agriculture, a trade association of agri-business and livestock associations, the USDA set out in 2002 to create an electronic tracking system for every cow, horse, chicken, turkey, goat, sheep, pig – 29 species in all – that could pinpoint the location of every animal in the country, and, within 48 hours, trace its every movement since birth. This massive project would bring the United States into compliance with the requirements of a little-known sub-agency of the World Trade Organization. Compliance with these requirements opens export markets coveted by the members of the National Institute of Animal Agriculture.

Initially, the USDA announced that the program would be implemented in three phases: premises identification; animal identification; and reporting of animal movement within 24 hours. The entire program was supposed to be fully implemented and operational by 2009.

Ranchers, farmers, and animal owners raised such a fuss that the USDA was forced to back off its implementation plan and announce instead, that the National Animal Identification System would be a voluntary program. Animal owners were appreciative, but skeptical.

While claiming that the program was voluntary, the USDA paid hundreds of millions of dollars to trade associations and state departments of agriculture to coerce animal owners into signing up for the NAIS. Idaho signed up more than 15,000 animal owners without their knowledge. Several states required animal owners to have a NAIS identification number as a condition for participating in the state fair. This is what the USA called a “voluntary” program.

Still claiming that the program is voluntary, and while the nation’s attention is focused on the inauguration, the USDA published a proposed rule that will essentially transform the voluntary program into a mandatory program. While claiming the program is voluntary, the new rule would require animal owners who receive certain vaccination services for their animals to be signed up into the NAIS. The rule says that the NAIS is voluntary, unless you want your animals vaccinated. Of course, vaccination is necessary for almost all marking.

Animal owners have spoken loud and clear: they do not want the NAIS. The USDA couldn’t care less what the animal owners want. The USDA – government – is forcing its will upon the people it is supposed to serve.

Congress is no better; in fact, it's worse. During the last Congress, more than 150 bills were introduced to take land out of productive use in the name of wilderness, heritage areas, scenic rivers, and the like. Some of this land contains badly need resources; some of this land is privately owned. Nevertheless, to avoid a battle on each of these bills, the last Congress bundled them into an "omnibus" bill that contained all 150 bills. Even with the cover of the financial collapse during the last days of the 2008, congressional leaders were afraid to risk an open vote on the omnibus land bill.

But the new Congress, with its expanded majority in both houses, waited until the last moment before the inauguration overwhelmed Washington to vote on the omnibus land-grab bill (S22). Only 21 Republican Senators voted against it. All Democrats and 19 Republicans voted for it.

Aside from the wisdom (or lack thereof) of taking two-million more acres, including privately owned property, out of productive use, is the issue of deceit displayed by Congressional leaders who chose not to allow debate on the merits of each bill. Instead, by bundling more than 150 bills into the single omnibus bill, pork could not be identified and deleted, nor could the strings to special interest groups be exposed.

The euphoria of this historic inauguration settled over millions of people who heard the new President promise post-partisan accountability and transparency in a government truly at work for the people. He, no doubt, was sincere in his intentions.

Before the crowds have departed from the National Mall, the porta-potties been removed, and the jumbo-trons disassembled, the USDA will still be pushing the NAIS down the throat of animal owners, and Congress will be finding new ways to hide pork and pamper special interest groups in legislation that few representatives have even read.

Government can never be better than the people who govern. Government is not parades and parties and spectacular pomp. Government is the entire set of restrictions imposed by the people who govern - upon the people who don't.

The three laws of nature

By Henry Lamb

Pundits and politicians are regurgitating phrases such as: “the worst since the great depression...; highest unemployment rate since...; largest deficit since...” Few acknowledge that government is the most significant cause of the current dilemma, or that its determined efforts to solve the problem can only make the problem worse.

The underlying cause of the current crisis is government’s efforts to repeal the laws of nature.

The first law of nature is: everything changes. The second law of nature is: change forces adaptation or extinction. The third law of nature is: whenever government sets out to repeal these laws, it only makes things worse.

These three laws of nature are validated by history. All the progress made by society since the beginning of time is the result of individual effort and creativity. Government has produced nothing. Government can produce nothing. Government can only limit, restrict, redirect, and generally impede the progress of individuals.

The current mess, for example, is largely the result of government trying to force society to do something that society should be deciding to do – or not do – on its own. Specifically, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a significant number of people believed that all people had a “right” to housing. These people were successful in electing a president and a sufficient number of congressmen to enact the Community Reinvestment Act in an effort to provide housing to all.

Consequently, the government forced banks to make loans to people who would not otherwise qualify. To make sure that the banks would extend credit to unqualified borrowers, the government agreed to buy the risky loans from private lenders through special, government-funded agencies, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which were created expressly for the purpose of guaranteeing risky loans.

In a free market society, these loans would never be made. But government, in its wisdom, guaranteed the loans by providing the money to special agencies. These government-funded agencies then created a thing called a “mortgage-backed security.” This “MBS” is a piece of paper that identifies a group of these risky loans and conveys an agreed percentage of the value of the loans to a private investor, at a guaranteed rate of interest, for a specified period of time, for a cash payment of a specified amount. The government-funded agency then repays the investor at the specified rate of interest over the specified period of time from the payments made by the original borrowers.

For years, these risky, but government-insured loans have been repackaged and resold by the government-funded agencies. When the original, unqualified borrowers began to default on their payments, and the government-funded agencies began to default on their payments to secondary investors, the government-funded agencies, as well as the private investors who relied on the

credibility of the government-funded agencies, had to descend on the government for unprecedented bailout appropriations to make good the government- guaranteed loans.

This is a classic example of how government's effort to do something it thinks should be done, only makes things worse. Government may have the power to grant a "right" of housing to every person, but it does not have the resources to enforce it.

The Creator granted to every living creature the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; not a "right" to a house. Government's efforts to outdo the Creator will end in disaster every time.

But government doesn't seem to ever learn. The near collapse of the entire economy brought about by government's interference with the free market society is ignored by government. Congressional leaders are quick to blame greedy capitalists for the problem, and ignore or deny that it is the government that must bear the brunt of the blame.

This crisis, however, is pocket-change, compared to the collapse that will inevitably result from implementation of the current government plan to manage energy use. Government believes that it knows better than a free society how people should meet their energy requirements.

In a free market society, entrepreneurs would invest private dollars in the least expensive, most efficient energy source and make it available to consumers at the lowest possible price. As those energy sources decrease, new sources would be developed by private investors in pursuit of profit. This is how a free market society works.

The same ideology that demanded a "right" to housing from government is now demanding that government prohibit private investors from using the least expensive, most efficient energy source. Led by this too-dumb-to-learn ideology, government is setting out to force private investors to use more expensive, less efficient energy sources, and to force consumers to spend more to get less.

There are several names that describe societies in which government dictates what the market must produce and what consumers must buy; free market society is not among them. America's, founders respected both the Creator and the laws of nature. The government they created was designed to obey both. Instead, this government wants to deny the one, and repeal the other.

Will the U.S. embrace global socialism?

By Henry Lamb

Reports from the recent World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, suggest that most of the world's leaders are convinced that the current crisis is the result of inherent flaws in capitalism, and are eager to impose new international rules to save the world.

Australian Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, is calling on President Obama to join him in creating a new economic system. "Simply tweaking the old system won't do," he says. He wants "A system of open markets, unambiguously regulated by an activist state, and one in which the state intervenes to reduce the greater inequalities that competitive markets will inevitably generate."

World leaders will meet again in April, hosted by Britain's Gordon Brown. This meeting of the so-called G-20 is a follow-up of the November meeting hosted by President Bush. The growing consensus among these leaders is that capitalism must be brought under control. More importantly, it must be brought under the control of an international authority.

This new system seeks to utilize the creative power of the profit motive while using the authority of government to direct production and distribute profits.

This is not a new idea. Bill Clinton referred to it as "The Third Way," a combination of capitalism and socialism. Advocates of this government-controlled capitalism often point to China as an example of its success. China's economy began to expand dramatically when the government began to allow private entrepreneurs to profit from their own energy and investment.

China's economic growth is the result of loosening government control; tightening government controls on the global economy will inevitably diminish growth. If the controls are held by an international authority, growth can be suppressed in developed nations, and expanded in developing nations. This has long been a primary goal of international socialism and of the United Nations.

As the President and Congress work to enact legislation to cure the current crisis, it's hard to miss the giant steps toward socialism. A major portion of the banking industry has been nationalized by the exchange of stock for infusions of public funds. With the infusions of public funds across private industry, comes the inevitable "strings" that put government in control of the recipient industry.

President Obama and the Democrat-led Congress appear eager to apply this socialist principle by taking control of private industry in exchange for the public funds they are redistributing.

Acquiescence to Kevin Rudd's call for a new global system of democratic socialism will destroy America's prosperity, and relegate the United States to a position inferior to the new global economic authority. The international community first proposed its New International Economic Order in the 1970s, and never abandoned its dream of controlling the global economy. Advocates now appear to be on the brink of realizing this goal.

Until now, the United States has been the primary obstacle by refusing to participate, or even recognize a new socialist global economic authority. The new Obama administration, however, is sending many signals that it will look more favorably at socialist policies, both domestically and internationally.

For example, President Obama has emphatically endorsed the [Employee Free Choice Act of 2007](#). This legislation does away with secret-ballot elections for employees to choose whether to be represented by a union. This legislation authorizes the imposition of a union upon any business in which the majority of employees simply sign a union card.

By removing supervised, secret-ballot elections from the process, this bill paves the way for union thugs to show up at an employee's home, or en route to work, or at the local pub, and demand a signature to prevent a broken leg – or worse. Those who imagine any other scenario simply have no experience with labor unions.

This election-less process for unionization has long been a dream of the Socialist Party.

Democrats in Congress have long threatened to take over management of the oil industry, or impose "windfall profit" taxes, and impose a variety of other socialist measures on U.S. industries.

President Obama has gone out of his way to assure the rest of the world that America's position in the world will change with him in office. He apologized for America in Berlin, and in his first televised interview with the Arabian press. He has promised to rejoin U.N. initiatives that the U.S. has previously avoided. He has consistently blamed "greedy capitalists" for the current economic crisis rather than acknowledge government's market intrusion as the cause.

With its current leadership, America may be ready to embrace global socialism.

Stimulus package misses the problem

By Henry Lamb

Everyone in America wants the government to end the economic tailspin – quickly. The problem, of course, is that there is little agreement on what the government should do. Democrats, generally speaking, want to put a trillion dollars in purchases on a new credit card. The new purchases will provide the goods and services the government wants the people to have. Republicans, generally speaking, want to reduce taxes sufficiently to leave a trillion dollars in the pockets of the people so they can purchase the goods and services they want.

The proposed solution is an awkward combination of the goals of the Democrats and the Republicans. At best, it is little more than a band-aid on a cancer that has been growing in America for half a century.

It took Pearl Harbor to convince Americans of the threats to freedom that gathered in the 1930s. When called upon, Americans focused like a laser beam on doing whatever it took to defeat the enemies of freedom. Congress borrowed the money necessary to stoke the nation's manufacturing capacity to produce the goods needed to defeat the enemy. Men went to war; and women went to work.

The war was won, and the millions of people who lost their war-time jobs in the months after victory soon found new jobs in the factories primed and ready to churn out an array of new products for a nation ready and able to buy. New homes, new cars, new clothes, new everything – most of which was produced in America. America's productivity soon retired the war debt.

After the war, most Americans praised the creation of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and didn't even notice the regulatory costs that were added to every consumer product. Most Americans praised the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, and didn't associate the rising prices of consumer goods with the regulatory compliance costs imposed on the producers of consumer goods. Consumers did not know the rising prices they had to pay were often the result of labor union contracts that forced producers to pay for non-productive time. Consumers were not even aware of the multiple layers of suffocating taxes producers and manufacturers had to pass on to consumers.

The manufacturers noticed that taxes were lower and regulatory costs were lower in Mexico and China and India, and in some countries, there were no labor unions at all. America did not notice that during the last half of the 20th century, its social justice and environmental agendas imposed costs on production that did not exist in other countries. Consequently, two forces operated in

concert: trade agreements allowed products made in other countries to arrive in America at prices lower than similar products made in America, and American manufacturers began to move their operations to other countries.

Now, at the dawn of the 21st century, American manufacturing capacity is almost completely gone. America's ability to respond to the current economic crisis is greatly impaired by the labyrinth of regulatory compliance costs and procedures. California's governor and other government officials are calling for the suspension of EPA regulations in order to get so-called "stimulus" projects underway quickly. Government officials don't want to comply with the same rules they forced upon private industry.

Some in government refuse to recognize the social justice and environmental agendas and labor union demands as the underlying reason America has become less competitive than other nations. Their solution is to require that recipients of money made available from the new credit card be forced to "Buy American," irrespective of the cost or the trade agreements the government approved. Generally speaking, this view comes primarily from Democrats. They blame the dilemma on greedy capitalists whose pursuit of profit overwhelmed their patriotism when they moved their operations off-shore.

There's no hope of solving the nation's economic problem if the problem is not recognized. The new trillion-dollar charge card piles another load of debt on the debt-wagon already too heavy for the American economy to pull.

The economic problem is the production environment in American, which has become so overgrown with environmental and social justice fantasies, labor union abuses, corporate and governmental corruption, that the nation can no longer respond effectively to the gathering threats to freedom.

An obvious threat is the determined will of the Islamist extremists who are hell-bent on forcing the entire world to worship their god only, as they see fit. And they are eager to kill anyone and everyone who refuses to surrender to their will.

Less obvious, is the threat from people who believe that government is the omnipotent power that can grant – or deny – rights to its citizens.

In recent years, these people have outnumbered those who believe that citizens are omnipotent, and the government they chose to create is empowered only by their consent, and limited by the Constitution they wrote.

In recent years, both Democrats and Republicans have joined the omnipotent government crowd. As this crowd grows, freedom diminishes – as does America.

Marching toward the 'ideal' society

By Henry lamb

Since Franklin Roosevelt's election expelled Republicans from control of government in 1932, Democrats have controlled the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives for 31 years; Republicans controlled all three centers of government for only four years during this period. Democrats controlled Congress for 53 years; Republicans held the majority for only 12 years. ([Link](#)) In view of this reality, Democrats are primarily responsible for public policies that have resulted in:

- [Loss of manufacturing capacity](#);
- [Decline in education ranking](#);
- [Exploding illegal immigration](#);
- Growth of [regulatory compliance costs](#);
- [Growth of government](#).

It is neither fair nor accurate to blame all the nation's woes on Democrats; Republicans provided considerable assistance over the years. But there can be no doubt, that since Franklin Roosevelt's election, the nation's public policies have been shaped by Democrats.

Regardless of the label policy makers may wear, what they believed is quite clear from the policies they adopted. Those who have made policy believe;

- The federal government is not limited by the U.S. Constitution. This belief predates Roosevelt, but abuse of the enumerated powers expanded rapidly during and after his administration.
- Government, not the governed, is the source of power, and has the inherent authority to grant or deny rights to the governed, and to take and redistribute the property of the governed.
- Government should manage markets with tax penalties, incentives and permits. A classic example: gasoline is heavily taxed, while ethanol is subsidized.

- Government should manage society by regulating the use of property. In some areas, government limits home building to one per 40 acres, while allowing dozens of homes per acre in other areas.
- Individual rights are subservient to the government-defined collective rights. Private homes are often taken by government so government can give, or sell, the property to another private owner who may pay higher taxes – which benefits the collective.

People who believe these are legitimate government activities are more likely to be Democrats, although some Republicans share these views. More importantly, whether Democrat or Republican, people who believe these are legitimate government activities are not capitalists. They are collectivists.

Capitalists believe that the means of producing wealth should be owned and controlled by private individuals or privately owned corporations. Collectivists believe that government must own or control the means of producing wealth in order to assure that society (the collective) shares resources equitably.

John Adams summed up the capitalists' value system when he said:

"The moment the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the laws of God, and that there is no force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence. Property must be secured or liberty cannot exist."

The opposite value system is expressed pretty well by [Karl Marx, who said](#):

"The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."

"Collectivism" includes communism, socialism, and other "isms" that put the government in charge of people and in control of their property. Capitalism celebrates the fact the people create government, and are, therefore, its master.

For nearly 150 years, the government created by John Adams and his cohorts was very much the servant of its creators, but this has changed over the last century. Now, government is in charge of the people, and controls nearly every facet of life. Most of this change has occurred over the last 76 years, since Roosevelt was elected. The rate of change quickened during the Carter years, slowed to some extent during the Reagan years, and shifted into high gear during the Clinton years.

Once again, Democrats control the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives and government's control of people is rapidly expanding again. The so-called stimulus bill seeks to put all [medical records into a federal database](#), and to set up the mechanism for determining which patients are allowed to get treatment on a cost-effective basis.

Way beyond the enumerated powers granted to the federal government by the Constitution is the [National Animal Identification System](#) (NAIS). Government is gearing up to register every property that contains even a single livestock animal in a federal database, force owners to identify and tag each animal with a Radio Frequency identification Device (RFID), and report within 24 hours the movement off the property of any animal.

When government controls a person's most private information, medical records, without regard for the 4th Amendment guarantee of privacy, and when government controls even the movement of animals a person may own, any semblance of capitalism – private ownership of property – is gone.

This is no longer the government created by our founders – of, for, and by the people. It is a government hijacked by the collectivists, for the collectivists, and to hell with the people who still cling to their guns, their Bibles and their capitalist ideas. This collectivist government is continuing the march toward Marx's ideal society – absolute control by government.

Meet the D.C. Hypocrites

By Henry Lamb

Democrats, and three RINOs, just spent nearly \$800 billion to: (1) stimulate the economy; (2) create or save 2.5 million jobs; and (3) reduce dependence on foreign oil, according to President Obama, Senate Majority Leader, Harry Reid, and Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi.

Neither Wall Street nor Main Street believes the massive expenditure will achieve the goals.

These goals could be achieved, however, with no new spending at all. In fact, a very simple policy change could achieve these desired goals and produce \$2 trillion in new tax revenue as well.

Democrats could easily repeal the ban on domestic oil production and achieve all their stated goals with no new expenditures. A [detailed study](#) shows that by simply allowing access to off-shore resources the economy could realize an \$8 trillion shot in the arm. The economic stimulus that would come from opening the [Arctic National Wildlife Refuge](#) has long been known. Democrats have blocked every effort to utilize these domestic resources.

The Democratic leadership says we must reduce our dependence on foreign oil, now nearly 70% of our supply. But, at the same time, they prohibit the use of domestic oil resources. Is this hypocrisy, or what?

Congress could vote tomorrow to open domestic oil reserves, and the next day, private dollars would begin to flow into the economy, and continue to flow, producing new tax revenue for governments, and new jobs. In three years, or less, dependence on foreign oil would begin to decline, as would the dollar amount flowing to foreign governments. Even if no new reserves were ever found, the known supply of domestic oil would last for at least 70 more years.

Instead, Democrats, and three RINOs, chose to pile another \$800 billion on top of the last \$700 billion borrowed to create Roosevelt-type government jobs and to subsidize wind and solar research. Incidentally, not all the borrowed bucks are to stimulate the economy. Depending upon what the meaning of “earmark” is, quite a few of the bucks are being spent to benefit the Democratic leadership. For example, Nancy Pelosi’s district will get a bunch of bucks to buy up wetlands. These landowners are happy to get rid of their unusable swampland for a tidy profit, and will remember the source of profit at election time.

Harry Reid’s earmark amounts to multiple billions to build a mag-lev rail system between California’s Disneyland and Nevada’s dizzyland in the center of Las Vegas. A free market could

never support such a scheme, but they who proclaim that there is not a single “earmark” in the stimulus bill, have borrowed billions to benefit Harry Reid. Is this hypocrisy, or what?

Economists are in general agreement that Roosevelt’s make-work government jobs extended the depression for years. When government money stopped flowing, the government jobs vanished. It was the war that created the need for products that the free market produced.

The make-work jobs created by the Democrats’ stimulus bill will end when the money stops. Democrats like to say that “we cannot drill our way out of the energy problem.” But they do not seem to understand that we cannot borrow our way out of the economic problem.

The fact is that we can, and we must, drill our way out of both our energy and our economic problems. We can do both by simply removing the ridiculous bans on the use of our domestic resources.

Before anyone hides behind Al Gore’s global warming scenario as an excuse for not using domestic oil resources, [get a clue](#). Study [these \(free\) videos](#). Catch up with the facts. Next week’s [International Conference on Climate Change](#) will present the latest scientific findings from some of the world’s leading climatologists, many of whom have been participants in the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

By prohibiting the use of domestic oil, Democrats will not reduce the domestic use of oil. Their unreasonable ban on domestic resource use will just force Americans to continue to use foreign oil and send hundreds of billions of dollars to our enemies each year. Democrats say that by prohibiting the use of domestic oil, and subsidizing alternative energy research, Americans will be forced to abandon traditional energy sources and move to much more expensive wind and solar energy sources, and toy cars that get rewound by an overnight plug-in.

This Democratic fantasy is scientific heresy fraught with incredible hypocrisy. Wind and solar power should be pursued as a free market demands it, not by government decree. All potential energy sources should be explored as a free market chooses, not as directed by government. Climate science should inform public policy, not Al Gore’s hysterical, self-serving public pronouncements which are negated by his personal choices in private life.

The Democratic majority, including Al Gore - and three RINOs - are making a mockery of leadership. If they really wanted to end the economic downturn and reduce dependence on foreign oil, they would remove the ban on domestic oil resources. Anything less is hypocrisy.

New State Sovereignty movement mobilizing

By Henry Lamb

The Tenth Amendment is not all that hard to understand:

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

Since even Harvard graduates can easily understand this simple language, the fact that it is so blatantly ignored must mean that the President, and the majority of Congress, rejects this portion of the Constitution they swore to defend.

Nowhere among the enumerated powers is there authority for the federal government to be in the mortgage loan business – as in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Nowhere is there authority for the federal government to be in the banking, or insurance business – as in Citibank, and AIG. Nowhere is there authority for the federal government to be in the [health care](#) business, or the [animal identification](#) business, or in the [energy](#) business, or in most of the places where the federal government is now flexing its regulatory muscles.

Ron Paul and a few others in Washington have raised their voices in opposition to this trend. Now, there are new rumblings across the land that gives new hope to those who still believe that the U.S. Constitution must not be ignored.

Oklahoma Representative Charles Key introduced a resolution in the state legislature last year calling on the federal government to “cease and desist” issuing federal mandates beyond the scope of the enumerated powers of the Constitution. The House passed the resolution, but it died in the Senate.

This year, State [Senator Randy Brogdon](#) joined the effort and the resolution passed in the Oklahoma Senate 25 - 17. The [resolution is quite clear](#):

“...the State of Oklahoma hereby claims sovereignty under the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States over all powers not otherwise enumerated and granted to the federal government by the Constitution of the United States.”

This should be clear enough, even for Harvard graduates, especially those who claim to be Constitutional scholars.

[Fifteen other states](#) have similar resolutions under consideration. It may be safe to conclude that the several states have had enough of their constitutional rights usurped by the feds. It’s about

time. Of course, it will take a lot of backbone for the states to make these resolutions meaningful. The feds hold the purse-strings which puts the states at a disadvantage. The feds can simply refuse to send money to the states that refuse to cooperate with their unconstitutional mandates.

The Democrat bail-out bill, for example, mandates that states remove the time limit on welfare checks as a condition of receiving a portion of the bail-out monies. It will be hard for politicians to refuse the funds, unless they know that their constituents want them to refuse the funds. The states that do accept these conditions, and the funds, will have to find new funds to continue the limitless welfare payments when the fed funds run dry.

Voters have to get involved. Voters should let their state representatives know that they appreciate efforts to rein in unconstitutional federal power. And they need to let their congressional delegation know that they expect their Washington representatives to support their state. Activists in every state should require every candidate for Congress in 2010 to sign a pledge to support the state's 10th Amendment resolution. It's high time that Congress and the President realize that the voters want the Constitution to be honored.

[Freedom21 organizations](#) are supporting this 10th Amendment, "State Sovereignty" movement. [Local meetings](#) are being held in several states to raise public awareness of this 10th Amendment initiative. Washington must realize that voters are serious about this issue.

Both Congress and the President act as if the federal government were king and the states nothing more than feudal allocations that operate at the pleasure of the king. They have forgotten that the states existed long before there was a federal government. The federal government was created by the states to serve the states – not the other way around.

Both Congress and the President would do well to remember another king, another government that made feudal allocations to operate at the pleasure of the king. They should also remember that when the king's pleasure became too onerous to bear, the subjects found a way to create a new government.

Flash to Washington: American subjects have not forgotten who created the federal government. Americans are now experienced in getting rid of an onerous government and creating another. Listen well, Washington, to these 10th Amendment rumblings and amend your ways. Remember, Americans can now create a new government without firing a shot. America has had about all of the king's pleasure it intends to tolerate.

World citizens welcome world government (Part 1)

By Henry Lamb

For more than a century, the idea of a world government has persisted. From Cecil Rhodes' vision of a global British Empire, to Woodrow Wilson's vision of a League of Nations, to Franklin Roosevelt's creation of the United Nations, this dream of a world government has advanced. In Berlin, Barack Obama announced that he is a "citizen of the world." He and his administration are about to pay homage to that global citizenship.

The people who created the League of Nations for Woodrow Wilson were behind-the-scenes advisors. In the United States, Wilson's advisors were known as Edward Mandell House's "Inquiry." In England, the government was advised by Alfred Milner's group called the "Chatham House Gang," created by Cecil Rhodes in 1891. These two groups drafted the Treaty of Versailles which ended the First World War – and [created the League of Nations](#).

During the final days of treaty negotiations these two groups met at the Majestic Hotel in Paris and decided to formalize their organizations. The European group became the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and House's group became the Council on Foreign Relations. These two groups have been the sustaining power behind the idea of world government throughout the 20th century.

Franklin Roosevelt served in Wilson's administration and knew well Mandell's House's Inquiry, and the Council on Foreign Relations. Roosevelt's administration was filled with members of the CFR. In fact, Roosevelt's "New Deal," was a product of the CFR.

Roosevelt's son-in-law wrote:

"For a long time I felt that FDR had developed many thoughts and ideas that were his own to benefit this country, the USA. But he didn't. Most of his thoughts, his political ammunition,' as it were, was carefully manufactured for him in advance by the CFR-One World Money Group." (Curtis Dall, *FDR: My exploited Father-in-law*, 1967)

The majority of Roosevelt's committee that drafted the United Nations Charter were members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Every administration since Roosevelt's has been dominated by members of the CFR. During Bill Clinton's administration, *Washington Post* writer, Richard Harwood reported that the Council on Foreign Relations is "...the closest thing we have to a ruling Establishment in the United States," and went on to identify dozens of CFR members in the White House. (*Washington Post*, Oct. 30, 1993, p. A-21)

CFR members dominated both of the Bush administrations. Richard Haass served in both. Until June, 2003 he was Director of Planning at the State Department. He resigned to become the President of the Council on Foreign Relations in July, 2003.

Haass continues to push the idea of world government. In an article for the *Taipei Times*, Haass said: "...states must be prepared to cede some sovereignty to world bodies if the international system is to function." (*Taipei Times*, February 21, 2006)

Here is the crux of the matter: national sovereignty and global governance are mutually exclusive. Both cannot exist at the same time. A nation is either sovereign, or it is not.

The League of Nations failed because the United States was unwilling to cede its sovereignty to an international system. The United Nations has not failed because nations, including the United States, continue to cede sovereignty, as Haass says, to "world bodies."

The Council on Foreign Relations, and much of official Europe, are convinced that the only way the world can survive is through some form of global governance. They contend that: "Governance is not government – it is the framework of rules, institutions, and practices that set limits on the behavior of individuals, organizations and companies." (U.N. Human Development Report, 1999, page 34.) Any authority that can "...limit...the behavior of individuals, organizations and companies" – is a government.

For such a system of "governance" to work there must be a procedure for making laws and rules, an independent revenue stream, and a mechanism for enforcement. The rule-making procedure is well established. The International Criminal Court provides the basis for enforcement. But the absence, so far, of an independent revenue stream has prevented the United Nations from becoming the world government so many have envisioned for so long. The current economic crisis is the excuse needed to create a global mechanism to control the global economy and siphon off an independent revenue stream for the world government.

World citizens welcome world government (Part 2)

By Henry Lamb

The United Nations first adopted a “New International Economic Order” in 1974 (A/RES/S-6/3201). It called for a global socialist economic system under the auspices of the United Nations. Fortunately, the United States ignored the idea and it faded away, but it did not die.

In 1995, The U.N.-funded Commission on Global Governance released its final report called, “[Our Global Neighborhood](#).” Among the many recommendations made to effect global governance was a call to create a new Economic Security Council. Its jurisdiction would include:

“...long-term threats to security in its widest sense, such as shared ecological crises, economic instability, rising unemployment...mass poverty...and the promotion of sustainable development.”

The U.S. representative on the Commission on Global Governance was Adele Simmons, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Before he left office, President Bush called a meeting of the G20 to set the agenda for an April meeting in London. They hope to create a global system to finally control the global economy. Whatever the structure that comes out of the meeting, it will likely be empowered to control the global economy and to connect economic actions with ecological and social justice issues as well – just as prescribed by the Commission on Global Governance.

The creation of the World Trade Organization went a long way toward giving a “world body” power to regulate trade. The United States ceded significant sovereignty when it agreed to conform its rules and laws to the dictates of this U.N. agency.

The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Bank of International Settlements are not yet run by the consensus of boards arbitrarily appointed by the U.N. And so far, the U.N. has not been able to find a way to siphon off a revenue stream from international currency exchange. But this could change beginning with the April 2 meeting in London.

Already, European leaders are making noises about tighter international control over the global economy. Among the ideas advanced in the past are things such as U.N. licensing and even tighter regulation of international trade; U.N. representation in the board rooms of international corporations; and international taxation for the privilege of doing business globally.

Whoever controls the flow of money controls the activity of those who have money, as well as those who want it. For example, whatever international economic structure may arise can insist that a nation adopt U.N.-prescribed global warming goals as a condition for participating in economic flows. This new international economic structure could dictate tax rates, interest rates, and credit terms.

This proposed international economic structure could sap the last vestige of sovereignty from the United States. Aside from Ron Paul and Glenn Beck on the FOX News Channel, there is very little concern being expressed by the media or by politicians.

Global Governance is at the world's doorstep. Gustav Speth, who served on Bill Clinton's transition team before being appointed to head the U.N. Development program told a 1997 global conference that:

“Global governance is here, here to stay, and, driven by economic and environmental globalization, global governance will inevitably expand.”

Strobe Talbott, Bill Clinton's Deputy Secretary of State, said in Time magazine:

“...within the next hundred years...nationhood as we know it will be obsolete; all states will recognize a single, global authority.”

Both Speth and Talbott are members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Timothy Geithner, Secretary of the Treasury, and Lawrence Summers, the President's Chief Economic Advisor, will represent the United States at the G20 meeting in April. Both are members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State, publicly [endorsed world government](#) when she praised Walter Cronkite for his work that earned him the World Federalist Association's "Global Governance" award.

Throughout the Clinton years, and the Bush years, members of the Council on Foreign Relations have pushed to advance global governance. Opposition in the House and Senate, and sometimes, an obstinate President Bush, blocked U.S. participation in the Kyoto Protocol, the International Criminal Court, the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the [imposition of a U.N. tax on international currency exchange](#).

Opposition to global governance has diminished in Congress and has vanished from the White House. With eyes wide open, the United States is welcoming global governance. This administration, with approval of the majority of Congress, will cede our sovereignty to an international system that is beyond accountability and devoid of morality. The U.N. is eager to fund its nefarious adventures with money placed under its care by those who bought the promise of hope and blindly voted for change.

Once the U.N. has an independent revenue stream to fund its "peacekeepers," forces which can enforce treaties and the decrees of the International Criminal Court, there will be no force on

earth with the power to overthrow it. When the United States realizes the true cost global governance, it will be much too late. The U.N. will control the flow of both money and energy available to the United States.

Obama and the current Congressional majority will be long gone, leaving the next generation to curse their parent's stupidity – and only wonder what freedom was.

Lawmakers trash the Constitution

By Henry Lamb

It appears that the lawmakers who assemble in Washington have no idea what the Constitution says, or worse, they simply don't care. The 4th Amendment says quite clearly, that:

“The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated....”

Connecticut Democrat Rosa DeLauro has introduced the [Food Safety and Modernization Act of 2009 \(HR875\)](#). Her bill will create a new Food Safety Administration and give its administrator the authority to “*conduct monitoring and surveillance of animals, plants, products or the environment,*” on every family farm, ranch, vineyard, and fishing hole in the country. Moreover, the administrator can visit and inspect the property and demand that the owner present “papers and effects,” and all records relating to food production.

There is nothing in this bill that requires that the administrator show probable cause or that evidence be presented to a judge to secure a warrant for entry into the property. The 4th Amendment explicitly prohibits government from entering private property without a warrant, “describing the place to be searched, and the persons or thing to be seized.”

DeLauro, and the 39 Democrat co-sponsors of this bill, must have missed this very clear language when she wrote into the law authorization for the administrator to seize up to \$1 million each day a violation exists. Section 405 of the bill says that “the validity and appropriateness of the order of the Administrator assessing the civil penalty shall not be subject to judicial review.”

If there were no other problem with this bill, this gross violation of the 4th Amendment should be sufficient reason for the bill to be killed and buried by the first committee that hears it.

Food safety is a legitimate governmental pursuit; the invasion of private property is not. This bill redefines the concept of “due process” to mean that government dictates the process and private citizens must pay whatever government says is due.

This bill gives the proposed “Food Safety Administration” broad, “brown-shirt” authority to regulate and manage every facet of the food industry. The administrator can require every backyard gardener: to register his property, submit a written production plan, admit unannounced inspectors, present copies of production records, and payment of fines for any infraction declared by the brown-shirts.

HR875 would include the [National Animal Identification System](#) that the USDA has been trying to impose for several years. At a five-hour congressional hearing Wednesday, not one word was said about constitutional authority for government to mandate the registration of private property and surrender private information to the government.

Dr. John Clifford, representing the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Service, a strong advocate for the program, spoke for more than an hour. He did admit that the animal identification program was required by the World Organization for Animal Health as a prerequisite for international trade. Opponents of the measure were allowed on 10 minutes, divided between two speakers.

Witnesses and Congressmen spoke about the need to mandate a program to register every premises, tag every animal, and track the movement of every animal - to protect food safety. Dr. Max Thornberry, representing R-CALF USA, one of the opponents, told the committee that existing systems fully protected food safety all the way to the slaughter house, and that from the slaughter house to the grocery store is where food safety should be improved.

Agriculture Committee Chairman, Collin Peterson, said that a major outbreak of a disease such as hoof and mouth disease could cost from \$30 billion to \$300 billion. He said that the cost of implementing a mandatory national identification system was nothing compared to the potential loss in the event of a disease outbreak. He did not mention, however, that the last outbreak of hoof and mouth disease occurred in 1929, caused by an animal imported from Argentina, and that the outbreak was contained in less than a month without NAIS, at a time when not even telephones were in common use.

Scenarios that use food safety, and potential cost of a disease outbreak, are smoke screens to distract attention away from the fact that for nearly 80 years that has been no major disease outbreak because existing systems make American food the safest in the world. The system proposed by the NAIS, and by HR875 would not improve food safety, but would give the federal government absolute control over the food supply of every individual and would bring the United States into compliance with the requirements of United Nation's agencies that administer global governance.

USDA officials and congressmen complain that only about one-third of the nation's livestock owners are enrolled in the NAIS (many of whom were enrolled without their knowledge), despite nearly \$150 million spent over the last five years. This should be strong evidence that the people most affected by the proposed program simply do not want it. In view of this evidence, it would appear that legislators who claim to represent the people, would trash the NAIS, and HR875, and move on to another issue.

Instead, they continue to ignore the expressed will of the people, ignore the 4th Amendment, and prepare to make the NAIS mandatory through HR875 or a similar bill. This is how lawmakers trash the Constitution.

Let's have a constitutional showdown

By Henry Lamb

Every Congressman swears an oath to "...preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." To a casual observer, these words could be interpreted to mean that laws enacted by Congress should be consistent with the requirements of the Constitution. To the majority of Congress, these words mean something else, or have no meaning at all, because much of the legislation produced in Washington has no relationship at all with the Constitution.

If we are a nation founded upon the U.S. Constitution, then our laws should be constrained by the Constitution. If we no longer wish to be constrained by our Constitution, we should abandon it, and fly by the seat of our congressional pants.

Let's have a [constitutional showdown](#).

Arizona Representative John Shadegg has introduced the "Enumerated Powers Act" (HR450) which requires that:

"Each Act of Congress shall contain a concise and definite statement of the constitutional authority relied upon for the enactment of each portion of that Act."

What a great idea! Every congressman who has sworn to "...preserve, protect and defend the Constitution," should eagerly endorse this concept - or be exposed as a blatant hypocrite.

The bill was introduced on January 9; it has 18 co-sponsors. This means that 417 representatives are not co-sponsoring the bill – yet. This number could, and should, change. It will not change, however, unless voters force their individual representative to co-sponsor the bill, or publicly explain why he will not.

This is how to have a constitutional showdown. Every person should call his or her representative and ask directly if the representative will co-sponsor and vote for HR450, the Enumerated Powers Act, or to explain why not – in writing.

Keep a diary. The staff person who takes your call (get their name) will tell you that someone will get back to you. When you haven't heard from the staffer in two days, call again. And again. And again, if necessary. If you haven't gotten a reply in two weeks, after four or more calls, write a letter to every newspaper in your district explaining your request, and the response from your representative.

If you get a positive response, and a promise to co-sponsor the bill, check with the [Library of Congress](#) to make sure he has actually signed the bill. When he does, write a letter to every newspaper in the district thanking the representative for living up to his oath.

Every representative should be hounded by many callers until each representative either co-sponsors the bill or declares why not. But this may not be enough.

The bill was referred to the Rules Committee, and to the Judiciary Committee. Even if the bill had 435 co-sponsors, the chairman of either committee could simply refuse to move the bill from the committee to the floor for a vote.

Sadly, this is what has happened to similar bills in the past. They simply die in committee and the public never even knows such a bill was proposed.

Not this time.

HR450 should become the theme song of all the “[Tea Parties](#)” that are taking place around the country. Glenn Beck’s “[We surround them](#)” movement should surround Congress with HR450 and the request to sign it, or explain why not. [Freedom21 organizations](#), and Ron Paul’s [Campaign for Liberty](#) should join the campaign to force a constitutional showdown. Callers to Rush Limbaugh and Sean Hannity should urge their listeners to focus on HR450, and soon, congressmen will have to sign the bill, or explain why they won’t.

[Representative Louise Slaughter](#) chairs the House Rules Committee, and [Representative John Conyers](#) chairs the House Judiciary Committee. Both of these committee chairs should be bombarded with phone calls and emails asking that HR450 be brought to the House floor for a recorded vote. Every constituent and every reporter who has an opportunity to ask a representative a question in public should ask whether he supports the Enumerated Powers Act, and if not, why not.

Nothing short of massive public pressure will force congressmen to take a position on this important bill. Nothing short of a return to the Constitution can save this great nation.

This is an easy assignment. Simply enter your zip code in the appropriate box on [this web site](#). Contact information for all your elected officials will be immediately available. It wouldn’t hurt to print this information and keep it handy. You may discover that you like taking an active part in influencing your government. Be polite when you call, or write, but be firm, determined, persistent, and loud. Make sure that your neighbors know what your representative has to say.

Forcing Congress to return to the U.S. Constitution may be the [most important service](#) we can perform for our country.

Playing President

By Henry Lamb

Obama's performance as POTUS is pretty convincing, if not Oscar-worthy. From the moment CNN called the election, Obama's rehearsed swagger emerged. He won; he is entitled to gloat. What's pitiful is that he really thinks he is in charge.

Well before Obama seriously considered a run for President, others evaluated his potential. Khalid Al-Mansour, associate of Saudi prince Alwaleed bin Talal, one of the world's richest men, [helped get Obama into and through Harvard](#).

After Harvard, Chicago's notorious political machine saw Obama's potential to become the nation's first black president. This view was shared by rich liberal power brokers, black liberation preachers, and the un-scrubbed street gangs in desperate need of a new hero. This unlikely collection of political forces delivered a well-scrubbed performer to the national stage.

The Obama campaign promised "Hope" and "Change," but delivered neither. Instead, the same, old socialist-democrat agenda put on a new costume and a face. Eleven of the 12 members of Obama's advisory board came from the Clinton administration, as did 31 of the 47 members of his transition team. Obama's administration is almost a repeat of the Clinton team. And there's a good reason.

A thorough [analysis of Obama's administration](#) reveals that those recalled from the Clinton years have much in common: they share membership in the same organizations that have guided public policy since Roosevelt. The Council on Foreign Relations and, since 1973, the Trilateral Commission, have produced the people who have shaped public policy. These are the people who tell Obama's teleprompter what to say.

Members of these organizations assemble at least annually with members of England's Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs, and affiliated organizations from around the world. It is not accurate to say that these organizations "run" the world's governments. It is absolutely accurate to say that the people who do run the world's governments are members of these organizations.

Attention is too often diverted from this reality by members of the media, who incidentally, are also members of these same organizations. They quickly open the "conspiracy theory" bucket and paint with lavish strokes all who dare to focus the spotlight of truth on the real source of public policy initiatives.

There is nothing conspiratorial about it. These organizations have a common agenda – global governance. A solid history of the development of this agenda is [available here](#). What is important now is the next step toward realization of this goal.

The next step is the April 2 meeting of the G20 in London. No one will be allowed to ask, but were it possible to identify the people in this meeting who are members of the Council on foreign Relations; the Royal Institute of International Affairs; the Trilateral Commission, or one of their international affiliated organizations, we'd find that the meeting is dominated by members of these groups. Perhaps after the meeting, a participants list can be secured to see exactly to what extent they dominated the meetings.

Another way to test this allegation is to compare the recommendations that come out of the meetings to the proposals that have been advanced by the various organizations whose members participate in the meetings.

The most important goal of the global governance advocates is an independent income stream for the United Nations. Another very important goal is to gain international control of the global economy through the regulation of capital flows, currency, and trade. If the recommendations that come out of the G20 meetings move toward these goals, it will be a pretty good indication of who dominated the meetings.

By surrounding himself with advocates of global governance, his campaign speech in Berlin, and with his public pronouncements, Obama has sent a strong signal to the world that he is ready to lead the United States into the United Nations' slaughter house. The gateway will be the mechanism to control the global economy produced by the G20 meeting.

The recommendation to come out of this meeting will most likely call for a new mechanism to control the global economy, and a mechanism for collecting taxes on fossil fuel energy. It will not be a full-blown proposal. That's not how the United Nations works. There will be a policy document agreed by all that sets forth the goals to be achieved over a period of time. The document will also define the working group(s) that will be charged with producing the proposal for the final structure.

The people who populate the working groups will be work-horses of the organizations which designed the agenda in the first place. The news media will report a successful meeting. All parties will go home encouraged, and the members of the behind-the-scenes policy-making groups will continue to shape public policy, now with the approval of the G20.

And Obama will think he did something, while all along he is simply playing the role of President while others use him to advance their own agenda.

Sovereignty stolen

By Henry Lamb

Sovereignty means “supreme, independent authority...” National sovereignty means “supreme, independent authority in government.” The United States bought its sovereignty with the blood of sovereign individuals who laid down their lives so this nation could be free from the dictates and demands of another nation.

The United States joined the community of nations as a sovereign nation. Over time, however, little by little, this sovereignty has been stolen.

Article two of the [Convention on the Law of the Sea](#) declares: *"The sovereignty over the territorial sea is exercised subject to this Convention and to other rules of international law."* This treaty, if ratified, will steal a little sovereignty from the United States.

A little sovereignty was stolen by the [North American Free Trade Agreement](#), by Article 511, which requires that each member nation conform its laws to NAFTA's uniform regulations within 180 days of the issuance of regulations. These NAFTA regulations are issued by non-elected bureaucrats. Their power to compel the United States to change its laws is the usurpation – or theft - of national sovereignty.

The U.N.-funded [Commission on Global Governance](#) declared in 1995, that national *"sovereignty has to be exercised collectively."*

There is no such thing as “collective” sovereignty. Sovereignty is “supreme and independent authority,” or it is not sovereignty. A nation that exercises its sovereignty “collectively” is not a sovereign nation, but a member of a collective government that exercises authority over the members of the collective.

The Brookings Institution has issued a new [Plan for Action](#) which claims that:

“International cooperation today must be built on the principle of responsible sovereignty, or the notion that sovereignty entails obligations and duties toward other states as well as to one's own citizens.”

Brookings' “responsible sovereignty” sounds very much like the U.N.'s “collective sovereignty” - neither is the “supreme and independent authority” for which our forefathers died.

It is little wonder that the Brookings Action Plan is a reflection of the plan offered by the Commission on Global Governance. Of the 16-member group that produced the document, 13

are members of the Council on Foreign Relations, the organization created in 1921 expressly to prepare the United States to accept the United Nations and the idea of global governance.

The European counterpart to the CFR is the Royal Institute of International Affairs, also known as the “Chatham House Gang.” They have been far more successful in preparing Europe for the notion of “collective” sovereignty. It took decades to create the European Union, but it is now firmly in place, and is exercising considerable power in the United Nations and in the G20 meetings.

The people who exercise this power hold the common belief that an international government should regulate the affairs of individuals, organizations, companies, and the governments of subsidiary nations.

The Obama administration appears to share this belief. Obama has publicly committed to support an international system of regulations on energy use. As a Senator, Obama’s Global Poverty Act attempted to force the U.S. into compliance with the U.N. directive to increase payment to international aid to 0.7% of GDP, at an estimated cost of nearly \$845 billion over 10 years. Obama has demonstrated his determination to ignore free-market principles by bailing out private industries and then exercising management-by-government.

Obama – by his actions – believes that government is the solution to all problems caused by the failure of capitalism. The truth is that government intervention in free-market capitalism is the cause of the problems.

The massive intervention proposed by the Obama administration can only worsen the domestic situation in the long run. And Obama’s propensity to submit to the international community’s regulatory regime is sure to redistribute America’s wealth to achieve a more equitable global poverty for all.

This situation is not simply a possibility for some future generation. It is a real and present danger. It is happening now with every deficit-laden bill passed by Congress and with every new international entanglement that steals a little more of our national sovereignty.

There is only one remedy: throw the bums out!

Start looking, now, for a replacement for your representative and your senators. A good, simple yardstick to measure your representative’s dedication to the Constitution is to ask him/her to co-sponsor the [Enumerated Powers Act \(HR450\)](#) – or to explain in writing why not. If you get a mealy-mouthed non-responsive reply, tell the editor of every newspaper and every talk show host in your district. Voters must hold their representatives accountable.

This current batch of people who populate the government appear to have little regard for the principles of freedom founded on the national sovereignty won at Valley Forge. They appear eager to watch that sovereignty be stolen, little by little, through more and more international

entanglement. They seem hell-bent on stripping sovereignty from every individual and doling out instead, limited freedoms to those who conform to government-prescribed values.

The Sovereignty of individuals and of our nation is in great jeopardy. Now is the time for individuals to stand up and be counted.

It's all about control

By Henry Lamb

The people who created the government were absolutely convinced that the people had to control the government. The people who now run the government are absolutely convinced that the government has control the people. This transformation of the function of government is the primary reason why America's manufacturing industry has moved offshore; it has created an "entitlement" society; and it has made America's educational system devolve into an embarrassment.

And it is getting worse.

Every day, the Obama administration announces some new way to expand the power of government to control the people in new ways. It was bad enough to see the government disregard the enumerated powers set forth in the Constitution when it poured billions of dollars into the banking and auto industries. It was mind-boggling to see the government fire the CEO of a private corporation and set salary limits on others. Government has no legitimate reason to be involved in the affairs of these corporations.

The "too-big-to-fail" claim offered an excuse to pour tax dollars into AIG is bogus; the bankruptcy laws were designed to handle this kind of situation. AIG could have been reorganized, or dismantled in an orderly fashion, with a judge overseeing the proceedings and protecting the rights of those involved. But no, the new, transformed, omnipotent government that thinks it knows best rushed in to control the situation. As usual, when the government rushes in, the situation got worse.

This new crowd in Washington, supported by an expanded majority in Congress, can't wait to expand its control over the people. The Secretary of the Treasury has asked Congress for authority to manage all non-bank financial institutions. Imagine, this government that has a horrible track record of managing its own affairs, now wants to manage the affairs of private businesses.

This new crowd in Washington has announced to the world its intention to control the kind of automobiles that the people may buy, and the type of energy that the people may use. Government – not a free market – will dictate what the people may have. There is no authority in the Constitution for the U.S. government to usurp this power from the people.

Neither Obama, nor his congressional majority, care about the limits the Constitution imposes on the federal government. What they do care about is forcing their values and procedures on everyone else.

Neither Obama, nor his congressional majority care about the rock-solid evidence which proves that increased atmospheric carbon increases the productivity of all plant life, and has little, if any, impact on climate change. Instead, Obama, and his congressional majority, are hell-bent on forcing people to stop using fossil fuels by raising the price beyond affordability, and using the revenue to subsidize higher-priced energy from wind and solar.

Obama, and his congressional majority, couldn't care less about the free market, or what the people may want – they think they know best what the people need, and they intend to shove it down the throat of society, one way or the other.

This new crowd in Washington is licking its chops over the possibility of limiting free speech by reinstating some form of the so-called “fairness doctrine.” They have several bills floating around in congress that seek to control what food may be produced, by whom, and only with the permission of government. The National Animal Identification System, and the Food Safety Modernization Act (HR875), and other similar initiatives destroy individual freedom and give government control over even the production of food for family use.

This new crowd in Washington has already reinstated some of the environmental controls relaxed by the Bush administration. Private property rights appear to be less of a concern to the current crowd in Washington than to previous administrations. In the first few weeks, this crowd expanded wilderness designations by two-million acres and imposed land use restrictions on dozens of new locations across the country, in one enormous “[Omnibus](#)” [land bill](#).

As flagrantly as this crowd expands government control over people, it is less frightening than Obama's apparent willingness to submit the United States to the control of an international government. At the recent G20 meeting, there was consensus on creating a [Financial Stability Board](#), a new international mechanism to “coordinate” global finance. The word “coordinate” is a compromise with France and Germany who demand that the mechanism regulate global finance. Obama has already declared his intent to join the international regulatory regime to control energy use. And his apologies to the world for what he termed America's “arrogance” by George Bush, strongly suggests that he is ready to subject the U.S. to the world bankers as well.

To Obama, and his congressional majority, individual freedom is not endowed by the Creator; it is whatever is left over after all the government regulations have been met.

How to save America

By Henry Lamb

There is only one way to save this great nation: by returning to the principles of freedom set forth in the U.S. Constitution. This week, hundreds of thousands of people expressed their frustration with government-gone-wild by gathering in more than 300 cities across the nation in modern-day “Tea Parties.” That is T-E-A - as in Taxed Enough Already – parties. The common theme among all these people is – “we’ve had enough of big government!”

The U.S. Constitution limits the power of government, but government has consistently ignored those limitations. The only way to reverse the trend of ever-expanding government is to return to the Constitution.

All the energy on display this week cannot simply fade away. It must be channeled into a constructive focus that will make a difference. One way to help restore the U.S. Constitution is to require that every new legislative proposal specify the chapter and verse of the Constitution that authorizes the proposal. If every Congressman had to specify exactly where the Constitution authorizes his proposed legislation, there would be much less legislation proposed.

Arizona Representative John Shadegg has been trying to get Congress to enact such a law since 1994. Every Congress since 1994 has killed the bill in committee.

If all this Tea Party energy were focused on getting every Congressman to co-sponsor Representative Shadegg’s bill, Judicial Committee Chairman John Conyers could not kill the bill. He would be forced to allow the bill to go to the House floor for a recorded vote.

Co-sponsorship of this bill - [HR450 – The Enumerated Powers Act](#) - should become the litmus test that qualifies every candidate in every election. If your Representative and Senators will not co-sponsor this bill, or provide an acceptable written reason why they will not, those elected officials should be targeted for replacement.

A constituent of Tennessee Representative John Tanner called his elected official with a request that Representative Tanner co-sponsor HR450, and to confirm by e-mail that he would co-sponsor the bill or explain why he would not. To be sure the Congressman got the message the constituent sent the same question via e-mail through an e-mail form on the Congressman’s web site.

The reply from the Congressman thanked the constituent for the letter and offered the usual mealy-mouthed reply that the Congressman would keep the constituent's concerns in mind if the bill came to a vote.

The constituent tried to reply to the Congressman's e-mail, but the Congressman's system blocked all replies. Another phone call to the Congressman's office produced a staffer who said the Congressman would "probably not" co-sponsor the bill, and that he would not explain why.

Hundreds of people around the country had a similar experience with their congressman. This kind of arrogant indifference to the wishes of the people who pay the salaries of these representatives is what brought the throngs of people into the streets this week. Finally, there may be enough outrage growing to really make a difference.

What better litmus test could there be? If a congressman is not willing to support the Constitution that he swore an oath to defend, he or she has no business in Washington. Every congressman who refuses to co-sponsor HR450 – or provide an acceptable, written reason why not – should be identified and made a target for replacement.

What a great campaign issue for another candidate who can campaign on the fact that, for example, John Tanner refuses to support the U.S. Constitution by refusing to co-sponsor the Enumerated Powers Act, and furthermore, he refuses to explain why he will not.

It is high time to get rid of all these Democrats and Republicans who care so little about the Constitution – and their constituents – that they routinely allow the Enumerated Powers Act to die in committee year after year.

Now is the time to find out where your congressman stands on this issue. Now is the time to be finding an alternative candidate. In less than a year, incumbents will be sending out their fund-raising literature and making their token appearances back in the district. If they will not co-sponsor the Enumerated Powers Act, show up at their meetings carrying signs for their opponent.

The energy generated by the Tea Parties this week cannot be allowed to dissipate. The Tea Parties were just the first round of a world championship fight. The second-round should be flooding Washington with multiple requests for every Congressman to co-sponsor the Enumerated Powers Act. The third round should be identifying those Congressmen who will not support the Constitution by co-sponsoring and voting for the Enumerated Powers Act, and targeting them for replacement. The fourth round should be finding a viable alternative candidate – as quickly as possible. And the fifth round is to begin now to build support for the new candidate throughout the district.

The sixth round, of course, begins the rest of the fight, by replacing the bums who won't support the Constitution with new legislators who will. Election time will be here before you know it; now is the time to start saving America by returning to our roots – the U.S Constitution

By their fruits ye shall know them

By Henry Lamb

Candidate Obama ridiculed his critics by telling his campaign crowds that he was labeled a socialist because when he was a kid, he shared his toys. President Obama is now labeled a socialist, by some, and a fascist by others and still others see a communist in the White House - not because he shares his toys, but because he is expanding the power of government way beyond the powers enumerated by the Constitution.

But what's in a name? The media seem to enjoy painting the "right-wing extremist" target on anyone who dares use such names. If the purpose of the label is to identify a politician who believes that government has inherent power and authority to grant or deny freedom to people within its jurisdiction; to control virtually every facet of human life; to take whatever resources it requires from whomever may have it; to reward supporters and penalize opponents; to ignore the U.S. Constitution at will; to invade and control the marketplace; to impose its vision of social justice upon its citizens; then there is one label that fits the bill. That label is – "Progressive."

Literally, a "Progressive" is one who advocates "change" or progress toward some perceived improvement. The key word here is – "perceived." Senator Bernie Sanders, an avowed socialist, organized the [Progressive Caucus](#) in 1991. Until the late 1990s, the Progressive Caucus partnered with, and its members were listed on the [website of the Democratic Socialists of America](#).

Socialists are quite proud of their [political goals](#) and are not at all embarrassed by them:

"We are socialists because we share a vision of a humane international social order based both on democratic planning and market mechanisms to achieve equitable distribution of resources, meaningful work, a healthy environment, sustainable growth, gender and racial equality, and non-oppressive relationships".

"By their fruits ye shall know them," certainly applies to [Progressives](#). Their caucus has adopted an [agenda](#) to achieve the goals of the Democratic Socialists of America.

At the recent G-20 meeting, President Obama embraced the new [Financial Stability Board](#), a major step toward creating the "market mechanisms to achieve equitable distribution of resources."

The Progressives now in control of government intend to reward their supporters and penalize their opponents by forcing private businesses to unionize. The deliberately misnamed [Free Choice Act](#), introduced by Progressive Caucus member, George Miller, authorizes union bosses to visit employees at home, or stop them anywhere, and intimidate them into signing a card in support of a union. When a majority of the employees have signed a card, the business must unionize. Gone is the idea of a secret ballot, supervised by government, to insure a real “free choice” in the union process.

The Progressives now in control of government have announced their intention to [force the price of energy to “skyrocket”](#). In their infinite wisdom, the Progressives intend to take control of the energy market, force people to pay a heavy new tax on energy, and then redistribute that money to the people government chooses to reward for adopting the lifestyle government thinks is best.

Obama’s Constitutional studies must have skipped over the part about [enumerated powers](#), because he has essentially used tax money to invade and control private industries. Progressive Caucus member, Maxine Waters, has declared her intention to [take control of the oil industry](#). All of these policy changes fit within the socialist-fascist-communist-progressive belief that government must provide central planning for, and control over the people.

A growing number of people agree with the Progressives. A recent [Rasmussen Poll](#) reveals that among the under-30 crowd, only 37% prefer capitalism, while 33% prefer socialism. Thirty-percent don’t know which they prefer. This reality is strong evidence that Progressives control public education as well as the government.

The socialist-fascist-communist-progressive agenda is being advanced by a highly organized, well-funded machine; there is no counter-balancing highly organized, well-funded machine working to advance free enterprise capitalism. Politics is now all about the Party; no longer about ideas. Progressives have taken over the Democratic Party, and are making significant inroads into the Republican Party.

Advocates for free market capitalism are scattered across the landscape in hundreds of small organizations, often fighting against incredible odds, and gasping for financial survival. A generation of Americans has no idea why capitalism is superior to “Progressive” government control. A generation of Americans has come to expect government to control every situation, and to provide affordable housing, a livable wage, health care, cradle-to-grave education – and to punish the wealthy for their success by continually taxing the rich.

Moreover, a generation of Americans has come to loathe America’s independence and prosperity and wants its government to join the global neighborhood of obedient nations subject to the progressive ideals of global governance. This is the generation that chants “yes we can” to Obama’s Progressive agenda, with little knowledge or understanding of its inevitable consequences.

What about a water-board?

By Henry Lamb

Your daughter is a member of a 12-person supply team whose job it is to carry supplies to the front lines in Afghanistan. Watching the news, you learn that an Improvised Explosive Device killed six Americans and six were taken hostage. You pray that it was not your daughter's unit.

It was.

The phone call from the Department of Defense informed you that your daughter had been captured, but that three of the culprits who planted the IED had been captured and were currently being interrogated in hopes of discovering the location of their base of operations.

You are assured that the three captured ~~terrorists~~, uh, assailants will not be tortured, that they will be treated humanely, that they will have three square meals each day, a clean cell, and a defense attorney appointed and paid for by the generosity of the American tax payers.

You ask if your daughter's captors follow the same guidelines for the people they capture.

Well, no.

You are informed that this particular group of assailants has been known to gang-rape both women and men, incarcerate in 2x4x4-foot cages, and cut off appendages – including the head.

“What are you doing to find my daughter?” you ask

“We're hoping the captured assailants will tell us the location of their base camp.”

“And if they do not?”

“We'll provide them with a Koran, a prayer rug, show them the direction of Mecca, and assure them that they will be comfortable and well-fed during their stay with us. This will make them more cooperative,” you are told.

This policy will certainly put to rest any anxieties that parents and spouses of our fighting men and women may have. It is, after all, the enlightened policy of the new majority following the lead of the new Apologizer-in-Chief.

Here's a question on the common-sense test: This policy will cause our adversaries to think America is:

1. A compassionate nation
2. An enlightened nation
3. A stupid bunch of weaklings

The correct answer depends upon your political affiliation.

In similar scenarios in the past where terrorists – not assailants – were captured, we scared the hell – and information – out of them by pretending to drown them. There was no danger of them actually drowning, but the process, known as water-boarding, made the terrorists think they were going to drown, and it made them give up valuable information.

This procedure was called “Enhanced Interrogation Technique” (EIT). Now, this technique is called torture by the enlightened majority in Washington. This new majority appears to be convinced that by providing three squares a day, comfortable accommodations, and a defense attorney, the captured “assailants” will spill the beans better than those captured terrorists who thought they were drowning.

This politically-correct policy sees no terrorists, only minorities misguided by their poverty. This perception is not simply stupid, it is dangerous. These people live to kill Americans and America’s allies. They teach their children from birth that Jews are pigs and Americans are worse. They have no respect for persuasion unless it is administered with bombs and bullets.

The current push to investigate the Bush administration officials who authorized water-boarding is nothing more than a mindless, vindictive witch hunt to heap a little more hurt on the people liberals most like to hate. If done, the reward will be a few moments of “I guess that’ll show them who’s boss.” The damage, however, will be ongoing and disastrous. Our enemies will know they need not fear that their troops will divulge important information. They will know that their troops, if caught, will be treated with kid gloves, and eventually released, probably in America. Our enemies will be emboldened, seeing America as a nation of weaklings who will fight back with words and kind deeds, while terrorists work even harder to destroy us.

It may be easy to oppose water-boarding as an interrogation technique when it is used against people we don’t know, who appear to be ignorant and unaware of what they are doing. But when a person is caught in the act of trying to kill your daughter, son, spouse, or loved one, who is not killed, but captured and hauled away to an unimaginable hell, water-boarding may be seen from a different perspective.

When a terrorist or enemy combatant is captured in the act of aggression against America or America’s allies, anything short of death should be seen as a generous gift to the enemy. If there is reason to believe that the captive has information that may save the life of your loved one - or American forces, or prevent capture of Americans - then haul out the water-board, snow-board, skate-board, or baseball bat.

Any parent, husband or wife, who would not do the same - were it their loved one in the hands of the enemy - is foolish beyond belief. An administration that would not do the same – were it their soldiers in the hands of the enemy – is unworthy of the power it holds.

Obama's bootlicking backfires

By Henry Lamb

Did anyone squirm or feel embarrassed when President Obama allowed Dictator Chavez to give him a book about the evils of the United States? The initial diplomatic handshake could be overlooked, but it was definitely embarrassing to watch Obama accepting, with a smile, a gift from this guy who had previously [called him an "ignoramus,"](#) and had called another U.S. President "el Diablo" at the United Nations.

This blunder, on the heels of his European fiasco [where he apologized for the United States' policies before he took office,](#) raises serious questions about his vision and understanding of what America is all about. Some critics attribute this ineptitude to naivety, but when viewed in the context of such additional actions as [deliberately overriding his CIA advisors](#) and releasing memos about interrogation methods, Obama's agenda has to be seriously questioned.

The Obama news consortium justifies these missteps as necessary to the "restart" process through which Obama will re-establish the United States as a respected partner in the international community. This is, after all, what he promised during the campaign, when he said he would engage in direct discussions with Iran without preconditions.

The idiocy of this policy was revealed when Obama's bootlicking backfired in Geneva during the U.N. Conference on Racism. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad must not have been impressed by Obama's apologies and promises. This Iranian President didn't turn down the volume one bit on his vicious, racist attacks on Israel or the United States. Incidentally, he didn't slow his quest to process uranium either. In fact, despite Obama's promises and groveling, Ahmadinejad spit in Obama's face, earlier this month, by announcing Iran's first nuclear [Fuel Manufacturing Plant.](#)

Obama continues to look more and more like a [Neville Chamberlain](#) in his foreign policy attitude. This posture produced nothing recently when he asked NATO partners to send more troops to Afghanistan. They yawned, promised a few "support" personnel, but flatly refused to provide fighting forces to do the heavy lifting.

This NATO posture also allows [captured pirates to be set free.](#) Critics of this "turn 'em loose" policy say that when pirates are caught red-handed attacking a vessel in international waters, that the thing to do is to "shoot the bastards and feed the sharks." It wouldn't take long to solve the piracy problems off the coast of Africa were this policy adopted. But it is not the politically correct way to handle the situation. The one captured pirate who escaped the more effective method of pirate-disposal, has been brought to the United States, given three squares a day, a

defense attorney, and all the rights provided to law-abiding Americans. This policy will surely deter piracy almost as effectively as the NATO policy.

Whatever Obama's vision of America is, it is certainly different from the vision we've strived to achieve over the last two centuries. Until now, America has been the place where individual freedom encourages people to accomplish the impossible, to produce prosperity, to defend the helpless, and to help the needy. America's might was developed to defend freedom and has been used only to liberate people from abuse by dictatorial governments.

This practice and posture needs no apology - to anyone!

Obama's vision appears to be integration of the United States into the community of nations under the rule of [global governance administered by the United Nations](#). His willingness to readily accept the G20's call for a global Financial Stability Board and his eagerness to embrace the United Nation's global warming remedy – whatever it may turn out to be - and his continuing apologies for America's failure to do these things in the past - are all evidence of an Obama vision of America that is not American.

America is not perfect by any stretch of the imagination, but we do not need an “international community” to tell us how to perfect it. A free people, in pursuit of individual happiness, served by a government whose first responsibility is to protect the rights endowed by the Creator to all its citizens constitute a self-correcting society.

A society shackled by a domineering government that seeks to manage the affairs of individuals and markets is not self-correcting. It is self-condemning and its only hope of survival is the goodwill of its international neighbors.

This nation has been successful, and can be again, following the same formula that brings success to individuals: righteousness, individual responsibility, self-sufficiency, charity, curiosity, and industry. A nation full of people following this formula must succeed.

A nation whose individuals are denigrated for their belief in God; whose government discourages individual responsibility by progressive taxation and government handouts; who prefer the proceeds of another's wealth, rather than working to achieve self-sufficiency; who confuse lust with love; and who are as lazy intellectually as they are physically; cannot succeed.

Killing the golden goose

By Henry Lamb

When the President announced last week that he would “cut out the middle man” and make direct government loans to students, he laid bare his contempt for free enterprise. He is fulfilling a [campaign promise](#) by overhauling the system through which he claims “Private lenders are costing America’s taxpayers more than 15-million dollars every day and provide no additional value except to the banks themselves.”

Consider the philosophy behind his statement. If government cuts out the middle man and performs the service instead, it will be cheaper and more efficient, he reasons. Apply this same reasoning to, say, the entire banking industry. Government’s direct involvement in the banking industry can eliminate all those bonuses paid to greedy executives, and profits earned by greedy share holders, and make sure that loans are extended to low-income borrowers whether they qualify or not. Direct government control of the banking business will surely make it fairer, and more efficient.

What a fantastic idea! Someone should have thought of this before.

Apply this reasoning to, say, the auto industry. Government’s direct involvement can force the auto industry to dump the management that failed to produce the toy-cars that the government said would abate global warming. Government control of the auto industry can eliminate those nasty, unnecessary monster cars, such as the Pontiac, and more. Direct government control of the auto industry would certainly be more efficient, and would operate the industry in a more environmentally-friendly way.

Direct government control of the auto industry could eliminate the wasteful duplication of products and services. Why should there be three major auto manufacturers? The status quo requires three design departments, three different manufacturing operations, three different, but duplicative sales networks, and three different repair and maintenance systems. Imagine all the savings that can be achieved by simply combining the auto industry into a single operation managed by government.

This principle, applied to all industry, could result in enormous savings, ensure social justice in the workplace, and avoid unsafe operations that jeopardize the environment. Wow, who can object to this change? This new direction by this new administration sounds great to a generation who can’t remember, or never knew, why America became the strongest, most prosperous nation on earth.

America's greatness is due to the absence of government control.

Now this was truly a fantastic idea formulated by the founders who wrote the U.S. Constitution. In two short centuries, America achieved what the rest of the world could not achieve in two millennia. When people are free to pursue their own happiness, there are no limits on what can be achieved. When government controls what people may pursue, achievement is limited to whatever government permits.

Imagine direct government funding of education; students will attend the school chosen by government, and study the courses approved by government.

Imagine direct government control of the banking industry; investors will earn no more than the government thinks is fair, and borrowers will be rewarded with loans only for purposes the government thinks is necessary.

Imagine direct government control of the auto industry; everyone will drive the car the government decides is environmentally sound, and only those who meet the government's criteria for ownership will be able to get an automobile.

Come to think of it, someone did have this idea before. It was the rage of the 1920s and 1930s. It really took hold in the Soviet Union and throughout Eastern Europe. Ignorant American rednecks rejected the League of Nations, and much of Roosevelt's efforts to have government take control of industry and the market place.

President Obama, and others who subscribe to this philosophy of direct government control, have persisted through the years. By dramatically changing the public school curriculum over the years, and by manufacturing environmental crises to justify stringent government regulations, a majority of the people – who elected Obama – have apparently come to accept the idea that government control is better than freedom and individual responsibility.

The old adage is true about the people who forget history; as surely as the Soviet Union collapsed, the Obama-initiated system of government control will also collapse – sooner or later. Those who forgot, or never knew why America prospered for two centuries, cannot grasp the idea that America's current economic problems are caused directly by our government's prior intervention.

Government's insistence that housing be made available to people who could not afford the loans the government guaranteed is the root cause of the housing bubble and the subsequent collapse of the sub-prime financial market. Government's insistence on "protecting" mud-holes and spotted owls – that don't need protecting – have stripped private property rights and free market opportunities from a generation.

Obama's insistence on "direct government control" over the market and over individual lives is killing the golden goose – the freedom – that is the engine of America's greatness.

Sovereignty surrendered

By Henry Lamb

Five international treaties stand poised, ready for ratification by the new nearly filibuster-proof Senate, pushed by the new, nearly-giddy administration. Each of these treaties surrenders a little more of our national sovereignty to an international body governed by a majority of nations that despise the United States.

Treaties are voluntary agreements among nations to prohibit certain actions, or to accomplish certain objectives. They are typically not enforceable – at this time - except through economic sanctions or nasty tirades at the United Nations or through the international media. Since 1998, however, a new dimension has entered the world – the International Criminal Court. The ICC has not been ratified by the United States, but clearly could be added to the list of treaties that are ready for ratification.

The ICC was created to prosecute genocide, war crimes, aggression, and – crimes against humanity. Who decides when a national activity falls within the jurisdiction of the ICC? The ICC, of course. So far, the ICC doesn't have the clout to exercise the authority it has on paper, but the mechanism is there. All it needs is the cooperation and funding of the United States and it will begin to spread its wings.

It is worth noting that at nearly every U.N. Climate Change Meeting, a delegate from one or more nations will take the podium to bad-mouth the United States for its refusal to ratify the Kyoto Protocol and label the refusal as a “crime against humanity.” The course this administration is charting will empower the ICC to prosecute individuals and companies within sovereign nations for treaty violations that they label “crimes against humanity.”

The Convention on Biological Diversity

This treaty provides for government control of virtually all land use. The [16-page treaty](#) is accompanied by an 1140-page instruction book called the [Global Biodiversity Assessment](#), which, on page 993, identifies the [Wildlands Project](#) as the “central theme” of the treaty's land use management scheme.

The Convention on the Law of the Sea

Three times, this treaty has been presented to the Senate for ratification, and three times, it did not garner enough support to warrant a vote. This Senate is different; it can, and likely will ratify this thrice-rejected abomination. The [Convention on the law of the Sea](#) explicitly says that the

exercise on national sovereignty within our territorial seas must conform to the terms of this treaty and other international law. Ratification of this treaty is absolutely the surrender of national sovereignty. It also designates the global commons to be the “heritage of all mankind” under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. And it creates an International Seabed Authority with the power to levy taxes in the form of permit fees and royalties.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child

This treaty contains 54 Articles and conveys nearly as many new rights to children. The “right” to receive information” from any source – despite what the parents may have to say about the source – is one example. Essentially, [this treaty takes the authority to make decisions about children from the parents](#) and gives the authority to the government.

The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women

This is [another U.N. treaty](#) that seeks to “equalize” everyone by bestowing rights on some people and penalizing others. A CEDAW compliance committee could require 50/50 employment of men and women, regardless of the task or employer’s desire, and, fully implemented, could require that men and women divide housework equally - regardless of which spouse might work outside the home. It is a ridiculous treaty that should not be ratified just to curry favor from the international community.

Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials

A good way to ignore the Second Amendment is to [ratify this treaty](#), as 30 of the 34 American states (countries) have done. A product of the Clinton era, and now resurrected by President Obama, this treaty would give treaty authority to the regulation of all firearms. Claiming that the Mexican drug problem is worsened by the flow of guns from the United States, the president has announced his intention to push for the treaty’s ratification.

There are more international treaties, agreements, and resolutions in the wings, waiting in turn to crash down upon unsuspecting Americans, all in the name of “resetting” our image with the international community. These five treaties are at the front of the line and already designated for quick Senate action. Each treaty surrenders a little more national sovereignty, but to the current administration, national sovereignty doesn’t appear to be nearly as important as international approval.

Safe in the arms of government

By Henry Lamb

They don't sit around and plot ways to destroy freedom; they really think that what they are doing is good for the people, and for the nation. But they are wrong. Freedom restricted is freedom lost, and he who holds the authority to restrict freedom wields tyranny with each new restriction.

“They” are the new power brokers in Washington. Their answer to every problem is more government control. As government control expands, freedom is restricted. Government control is expanding at warp speed, and the loss of freedom is not even a consideration.

While the president stands before TV cameras to tell the people that he has no desire to run the banks or the car companies, his lieutenants take control of the banks and the car companies. A free market would squeeze out banks and car companies that cannot compete and replace them with product and service providers that are approved by the consumers. But “they” have no faith in a free market. They believe a free market produces greed and widens the gap between the haves and the have-nots. Government control eliminates excessive salaries and dictates the kind of cars that people should be driving. Therefore, government control, they contend, is better than freedom in the market place.

The free market has allowed greedy corporations to let contaminated food reach consumers. Therefore, government must tighten control over the food market. The [TRACE Act of 2009](#) [Tracing and Recalling Agricultural Contamination Everywhere Act of 2009](#) is one of several bills that seek to put government in complete control of food production, processing, and distribution.

These bills will likely be merged into a single bill, and no one yet knows what the final bill will require, but it is clear that sponsors of the bills have no regard for the Constitution's privacy guarantees when they require that every livestock owner and the owners of every backyard garden register with the government. One bill would even require the submission to the government of a written plan for the production of food before food could be produced.

This lunacy is justified by the claim of improved food safety. But it destroys individual freedom, makes a mockery of private property rights, bloats government bureaucracy, swells the tax requirements and does nothing to improve food safety.

Government is already responsible for food safety. Every recall of beef or peanut butter is like a neon sign flashing government's inspection ineptitude. More law is not the answer; better

enforcement of existing law is what is required. Government already has the authority, and the responsibility, to see that food is safe before it enters the distribution system. Forcing every private citizen who owns a livestock animal or plants a backyard garden to register and report to the government would be a massive loss of freedom while providing little or no improvement in food safety.

They – this new crowd in Washington – are taking steps to control the banks, auto manufacturers, food producers, processors, and distributors, and many other facets of what was once a free society. Control over all water, which will result from the enactment of HR787 – [The Clean Water Restoration Act](#), will give the government more control over the private lives of individuals, especially food producers. Neither gardens nor farm fields can grow without water. This bill will give government total control over all water.

Government control over land use is also expanding dramatically. The federal government already owns about one-third of all the land in the United States. State and local governments own an additional ten percent. And all governments are on a binge to purchase, or gain control over even more land. This new crowd in Washington wrapped more than 150 separate land bills into a [single “Omnibus” bill](#) that added millions of acres to the government inventory.

Even this is not enough. HR980 – [The Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act](#) – will take another 15 million acres of public land out of public use in order to expand “wilderness corridors.” This wilderness corridor concept arises from the Wildlands Project and is specified in the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) – which the Senate has not yet ratified.

The government is rapidly expanding control over every facet of life. Government control over the use of energy is on the horizon, as is government control over access to health care.

It matters not that the perpetrators of these attacks on freedom may sincerely believe that government is a better manager of society than are free people in pursuit of personal happiness. History has proven time and time again that government management of society enslaves people as it empowers government. They who devise these new schemes for expanded government control may not realize it, or they may not care, but they are strangling freedom from the society they seek to protect.

Freedom, with all its injustice, is far superior to enslavement by any government

Warning to Washington: Here comes the freedom movement!

By Henry Lamb

You've probably never heard of the Freedom21 Federal Credit Union. It wasn't among the "big" financial institutions getting bailouts from the federal government. It was not in the news because its managers got million-dollar bonuses. In fact, it is a relatively new financial institution created by, and for, the organizations and individuals who believe the federal government has gone way beyond the authority granted to it by the U.S. Constitution. It is a part of a new awakening, a mobilization in preparation to stop what is perceived as a march toward socialism.

All across the country, people are joining organizations and creating new organizations, all aimed at reining in government power and returning to the principles of freedom set forth in the Constitution.

Glenn Beck's arrival at the Fox news network has energized the freedom movement. His [912 Project](#) has attracted more than a half-million people who are organizing into local study groups and learning how to become more effective in their efforts to get government under control. His support and promotion of the April 15 nationwide [Tea Parties](#) contributed to the success of the events.

Ron Paul's presidential campaign morphed into the [Campaign for Liberty](#). This nationwide network is busy teaching people at the precinct level about the fundamentals of freedom and about how to win local and state elections. They are urging people to support HR1207, the [Federal Reserve Transparency Act](#), which will, for the very first time, require the Federal Reserve to submit to an annual audit.

Ironically, 99 years ago this week, a train left Newark, New Jersey for Jessup Station, Georgia, carrying some of the wealthiest, most powerful people the world. They met in secret at the Jekyll Island Club and laid the plans to create the Federal Reserve System.

Another group of people took a train this past week from Newark, New Jersey to Jessup Station, Georgia en route to the same Jekyll Island Club. The people in this group are not among the wealthiest people in the world, but they are among the most powerful; they are some of the leaders of the growing freedom movement. Nearly a hundred years ago, a meeting at Jekyll Island produced the Federal Reserve, which now controls our economic destiny. The current meeting at Jekyll Island, organized by the [We the People Foundation](#), seeks to produce a plan to control the Federal Reserve and restore our economic freedom.

All across the country, organizations such as [Take Back Kentucky](#) and Alabama's [Alliance for Citizens Rights](#), [New Mexico Cattle Growers Association](#), and dozens of others are meeting to educate and organize their communities to be even more effective in the freedom movement.

Nationally, organizations such as [Gun Owners of America](#), [EdWatch](#), [Eagle Forum](#), [Stewards of the Range](#) and dozens of other organizations are preparing to hold their [10th Annual Freedom21 National Conference](#). The freedom movement is gaining momentum.

State, local, and national organizations are beginning to coordinate their efforts. While each organization works toward its own goals, they also alert their members to respond when there is a national alert. Currently, there is a flurry of activity in response to the [Great Water Heist](#), and the [Enumerated Powers Act](#), and the [National Animal Identification System](#).

Each organization has its own special area of expertise, and when any participating organization needs help, all the Freedom21 organizations do what they can to help. What is different about the freedom movement is the entire effort is completely voluntary. There is no hierarchy of command; people and organizations are bound together only by the principles of freedom and the determination to defend those principles against all enemies, both domestic and foreign.

What's really unique about this movement is that they have created their own [Freedom21 Federal Credit Union](#). This credit union serves only the individuals and organizations that are members of Freedom21. They are building their own financial institution so their members – not Wall Street fat cats – will get whatever dividends may be generated. Freedom21 members are the shareholders of the credit union. Because the credit union is a not-for-profit organization, all revenues beyond the cost of operation must be returned to the members.

Another unique feature is the “Endowment Accounts” organization members can establish. When individual members of participating organizations join the credit union, one-third of the membership fee goes to the member organization. Although the institution is young, it is solid, needs no federal bail-out and its deposits are guaranteed to \$250,000 by the federal government. Currently, the credit union offers its members share deposits, time certificates, and loans. As the membership grows, the institution will offer checking, credit/debit cards and a full range of financial services. This institution was created expressly to serve the freedom movement.

This freedom movement is not a flash-in-the-pan. These individuals and organizations know the score and they know how to do what needs to be done. They are gearing up for the long haul. They are issuing a stern warning to all those in Washington who want to turn America into a tyrannical socialist state: Here comes the freedom movement!

A litmus test for leadership

By Henry Lamb

The media appear to delight in exploiting the plight of the Republican Party, particularly the flap between Dick Cheney and Colin Powell. Cheney's comment that he thought Powell had left the Republican Party because he endorsed Obama, provided a perfect opportunity for Powell to take the TV podium to tell Republicans they must become more moderate to reverse the flight from their ranks.

What America needs cannot be found in either major party at the moment, nor in any of the dozens of other parties hoping to become a "third party." The litmus test for leadership is quite simple. Voters should find candidates – regardless of party – who pass this leadership test.

Defend the Constitution

Every candidate for national elective office swears an oath to "...preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." For many of these elected officials, this is the last time they utter the word, or even think about the U.S. Constitution.

In order to "...preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution..." every law produced by Congress must be grounded in, and authorized by the Constitution. Few are. Where in the Constitution, for example, is there authority for the federal government to declare that [all the water in the United States](#) is the "Waters of the United States?" Where, exactly, does the Constitution authorize the federal government to strip private property owners of the right to use their property because a particular kind of bug or plant happens to be on the property? Constitution-loving congressmen have been trying to get a law enacted that requires every proposed law to cite Constitutional authority for the law. Every congress since 1994 has rejected this legislation.

Before voting for another congressional candidate, every voter should require his candidate to pledge to co-sponsor and vote for [The Enumerated Powers Act](#) (HR450).

Reject Global Governance

It is impossible to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," and vote to surrender sovereignty over territorial seas to the United Nations. Both Senators John Kerry, and Richard Lugar, chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, advocate doing just that. Both are on record supporting the [Convention on the Law of the Sea](#), which clearly requires that: "...sovereignty over the territorial seas is exercised subject to this Convention and to other rules of international law (Article 2(3)).

This treaty also requires submission to the International Seabed Authority, which has global authority for exploiting the seabed – and regulating waters that flow into the sea as well as the adjacent lands that may affect the waters that eventually get into the seas. This treaty is global governance.

Several other treaties pending ratification also [surrender sovereignty to the United Nations](#). The Obama administration, aided by a Democratic majority and far too many willing Republicans, intends to ratify all of them.

The Obama administration is also a willing participant in the development of a global mechanism to regulate the flow of currency, which undoubtedly would have to [skim a small administrative fee](#), and thereby gain an independent revenue stream - and regulate global trade. This has been a major goal of the United Nations since the publication of the [final report of the Commission on Global Governance](#).

In Washington, and across the country, there is a growing willingness to accept further international entanglement and a willingness to reject constitutional principles. This is because the advocates of collectivism have been far more aggressive than the advocates of freedom have been. In the past, freedom has reigned, and its advocates have been complacent.

In the past, the threat of tyranny has been sufficient to mobilize the complacent advocates of freedom to respond with whatever it took to defeat the would-be conquerors. The time has come once again to respond to freedom's call.

It is still early enough in the unfolding threat to reverse the gains of the collectivist usurpers. Every voter should hold every candidate accountable to at least these two tests of American values: Co-sponsor and vote for the Enumerated Powers act; and to reject global governance by rejecting entangling international treaties.

Regardless of party affiliation, a candidate who will not pledge to stand for these two values does not deserve to be in Congress, or in government at any other level. Conversely, office holders who fail this litmus test should be turned out of office at the very next election.

Rather than expend energy building a particular political party, voters would do well by expending energy to find candidates who pass the litmus test and advance the values it represents.

If we cannot stop the current threat by imposing this kind of litmus test on the people we elect to office, the next battle will be much more difficult, and will require much more effort, treasure, and, perhaps, blood.

Control your government, or it will control you!

By Henry Lamb

Few people know that there is currently legislation pending in Congress that, if enacted, would allow President Obama to run for a third term. House Joint Resolution 5 would repeal the 22nd Amendment which limits the president to two terms in office. This is not new legislation. Congressman Jose Serrano, a Democrat who represents New York City, has introduced similar legislation in every Congress since 1997. No one has paid much attention – until now.

This legislation would require approval by two-thirds of both houses, and ratification by 38 states within seven years to become law. This is a very high hurdle for Obama worshipers to jump. They have launched a [website](#) to help persuade people to get busy now so Obama can be re-elected in 2016.

Never happen? Perhaps. But one year ago, who could have imagined that President Obama could fire the CEO of General Motors and put [31-year-old Brian Deese, a campaign advisor](#) with no auto industry experience, in charge of reorganizing the corporation. Who would have believed, one year ago, that President Obama would plunge the nation into debt to the tune of [nearly \\$9 trillion](#) – during his first 100 days? Who could have imagined that the U.S. Congress would even consider taxing and rationing energy, as prescribed by The American Clean Energy and Security Act (ACES - HR2454). Who would have believed, a year ago, that the nation today would be at the brink of accepting socialized health care. No one thought that the nation could move from moderate, center-right political policies, to left-wing command-and-control policies in a matter of months.

No one dares scoff at HJ Res 5. With a strong Democrat majority in both houses of congress, and with a fawning national and international media singing his praises, and with his new-found love affair with Obama-almighty, the president can impose all manner of evil on the nation.

There was a time when the term “social engineering” was a political obscenity. It applied to any government meddling into the market place, or into the decisions that free people might make in the pursuit of their own happiness.

Social engineering is now the primary function of the Obama administration, cheered on by a Democratically-controlled congress. This administration intends to force Americans to drive toy-car-death-traps, or travel by government-subsidized rail, or ride bicycles, or walk. This administration intends to tax the use of fossil fuel energy so heavily that it makes solar and wind appear to be a bargain. This administration has abandoned the free market, and is spitting in the face of individual freedom.

It is now clear that Obama and his buds believe that they know best how everyone else should live, and they have no reluctance to enact laws and policies to enforce their vision. They have convinced themselves that their vision of a government-planned, government-run, government-enforced future is better than anything free people could possibly create by accident.

They are wrong, of course, but they are way beyond redemption. They are so in love with their political power that they not only refuse to listen to alternative ideas, they criticize and ridicule ideas that differ from their own.

It matters little how the semantics are parsed; whether Obama and his crowd are moving toward what may be called socialism or fascism is of little consequence. They are moving America toward a government-controlled dictatorship. And they are proud of it.

Tragically, the people who elected this crowd apparently want a government-controlled dictatorship. A [coalition of left-wing organizations](#) is planning to spend \$82 million to support Obama's take-over of the healthcare industry.

Anyone who thinks that a government-controlled anything is better than a free market alternative is living in a dream world. Government intervention into the market place is always costly, inefficient, and often, disastrous. The housing crisis that caused the current financial collapse is directly the result of government's intervention through the creation of federal guarantees for loans issued to people who would not qualify in a free market.

Government's intervention in the auto industry with arbitrary mileage requirements and other regulations, contributed directly to the fall of the U.S. auto industry.

Government's take-over of the energy market will increase the cost of energy dramatically, as much as \$3,000 per year per household, plus the increased cost of all products and services that require energy.

Government's take-over of the health-care industry will not only increase the overall cost, but will incentivize waste, fraud and abuse, while rationing health care to people who fit the government's profile.

Not everyone in America is an Obama worshiper. There are still freedom advocates scattered across the land, though many stayed home during the last election. The consequence is Obama and the Democrat majority in congress. Reclaiming the Senate should be the highest priority for 2010. Candidates who embrace [The Enumerated Powers Act \(HR450\)](#), and publicly reject global governance should be given first consideration; those who will not endorse these two principles should be kicked out of the Senate and sent to the showers.

The only way to avoid government control is to control the government.

Barack H. Obama: Administrator

By Henry Lamb

Barack H. Obama will forever be known as the first black president of the United States. This fact will likely be the least impressive item about him in tomorrow's history books. The first four months of his administration strongly suggest that he will most likely be known as the president who transformed America's system of government.

The U.S. Constitution provides for a system of representative government with a degree of checks and balances. This system has been tested, twisted, and tormented over the years, but has always survived the abuses inflicted upon it. Obama brings a new threat, in a new era, to a new generation.

Obama is creating a system of government that is beginning to look much like an "Administrator" form of government that will ultimately have no checks and balances, and little need for legislators.

This form of government was the fantasy of [Colonel Edward Mandell House](#), the "alter-ego" of President Woodrow Wilson, a designer of the League of Nations, and author of "[Philip Dru: Administrator](#)."

House fantasized about a system of government in which a single administrator held all executive power to appoint underlings without interference from elected bodies, and to design, and enforce, rules of behavior for individuals, and organizations – including states and local administrative units. In House's world, his administrator was a part of a global system of administrative governance whose purpose was "...to pursue socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx."

Obama's actions during these first few months are very much like those of Philip Dru: Administrator. He has found a way to design, and enforce, rules of behavior on much of the banking system, and on General Motors and Chrysler – private industries not subject to governmental management under previous presidents.

Obama has found a way to force state and local governments to yield to his rules in order to get federal dollars, even when states don't want the dollars that come with federal strings attached.

Obama is creating a new form of government with a [growing network of "Czars"](#) that do not have to be approved by the Senate, nor are they subject to the oversight of Congress. So far, 21 Czars have been appointed, with assignments and salaries set by Obama, and accountable only to

Obama. This network of White House officers bypasses the traditional executive organizational structure that relies on Cabinet Secretaries to administer laws and promulgate rules subject to congressional oversight and supervision.

Obama the Administrator is building his enforcement organization to avoid the obstacles that Congress often constructs. These congressional obstructions are also known as checks and balances.

These dramatic changes in the structure and form of government have drawn hardly a whimper from the American people, the media, or from congressional opponents. These changes are just the beginning. Obama is determined to impose a national healthcare system, and a national energy-rationing system on the nation. He has already demonstrated his contempt for the Constitution by reaching deep inside private industry to inflict and enforce his managerial dictates.

He has announced that he has no reluctance to destroy the private healthcare system in order to impose a government-run system that sounds much like "...socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx." He has announced that he fully intends to force the use of alternative energy sources, regardless of market forces, and regardless of cost. He is determined to impose his will, and his judgment, precisely as Philip Dru imposed his power on Colonel House's fictional society. The society that is subject to Obama's will, judgment, and administration, is not fictional, however; it is we the people of the United States.

Obama has also demonstrated his eagerness to align his administration with the directives of the international community. He has pledged to join the U.N.'s plan to use carbon fuel as the basis for confiscating and redistributing enormous wealth through cap-and-trade programs and other direct taxation schemes. He has welcomed the creation of an international mechanism for the control of the global economy. He has announced his support and his intention to ratify several U.N. treaties that have been rejected by previous presidents.

Obama's legacy will not be just the first black presidency. His will be remembered in history as the administration that relegated the U.S. Constitution to irrelevance, streamlined the structure of government to minimize or eliminate checks and balances, and consolidated executive power into a position to be envied by kings, dictators, potentates - and even by Philip Dru.

Philip Dru believed that "Our Constitution and our laws served us well for the first 100 years of our existence, but under conditions of today, they are not only obsolete, but even grotesque (p.222)."

There is an unsettling similarity between Obama's actions and Phillip Dru's belief.

USDA: Can you hear me now?

By Henry Lamb

For the last several weeks, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been conducting “listening sessions” in a dozen cities across the country. The purpose of these sessions was to find ways to make the proposed [National Animal Identification System](#) acceptable to the people who own livestock.

NAIS, as the program is widely known, was announced in 2005. The announced schedule required all livestock owners to register their premises with the USDA before 2007; tag every livestock animal with an electronic tag (or implant) by 2008; and, by January 2009, report within 24 hours, to the federal government, every time a tagged animal moved off the birth premises. Within a year, it was clear that the people were simply not going to comply, so, in 2006, the USDA announced that the program would, henceforth, be voluntary.

As of January, 2009, USDA reported that only about 35% of livestock owners have registered their premises. But this number is measured against those premises where at least \$1000 profit is reported from farm activities. It does not include the hundreds of thousands of small family operations that house a few chickens, a cow, or hog, or goat, or sheep, or any of the 29 species named in the NAIS. When these people are considered, an incredibly small percentage of the people affected by the program have registered.

The listening sessions were designed to force animal owners to listen to a one-hour presentation about the benefits of NAIS. Then, two hours were to be devoted to three-minute speeches from attendees whose tickets were drawn at random. Then, after a lunch break, attendees were to be divided into groups where a trained facilitator was supposed to develop “consensus” around seven specific questions.

The best-laid plans of mice and the USDA often go awry. The people were having none of it. After the first meeting in Pennsylvania, the opening presentation was forgotten. The people wanted to speak, and speak they did. In South Dakota, hundreds of people showed up. Of those chosen to speak, the people who supported NAIS could be counted on one hand; all the rest spoke strongly against the program. Bill Bullard, CEO of R-CALF-USA told the USDA that the NAIS “is the culmination of over ten years of aggressive efforts by the USDA to destroy the very foundation of U.S. livestock.”

In [Missouri](#), Rhonda Perry, representing the Missouri Rural Crisis Center, said that NAIS was a proposed solution in search of a problem. If the USDA were really interested in livestock

producers, consumers and animal health, she said, they would look where problems are known to exist. She said the millions of pounds of meat recalled from processing plants – is not the fault of independent producers. She said the USDA continues to allow imports from countries with known disease problems. “This is not the fault of small family farmers,” she said. “The large industrial feeding operations that cause health and environmental concerns are not the fault of independent livestock producers,” she told the applauding crowd.

The NAIS allows industrial chicken producers, for example, to tag a “batch” of chickens with a single number, regardless of the number of chickens in the batch. The family farmer, on the other hand, must catch and tag each chicken, and report to the government –within 24 hours - should the chicken escape from the yard or get eaten by a fox – or by the family.

In [Texas](#), Judith McGeary, Director of the Farm and Ranch Freedom Alliance, told the USDA that their recently released cost-benefit study had “more holes than a block of Swiss cheese.” She also delivered a box containing more than 2000 pages of signatures from livestock producers who say “NO!” to NAIS.

From one end of the country to the other, the message was clear and unmistakable: NO NAIS! The afternoon break-out sessions designed to build consensus around seven questions, turned into a non-stop barrage of reasons why NAIS will never be accepted. Doreen Hannes, a small farmer in Missouri, drew wild applause when she vowed that she would never comply. “I’ll die before I comply,” she declared before the cheering Missouri crowd.

By every count, more than 90% of the people who were allowed to speak at the listening sessions, spoke against the NAIS.

It is abundantly clear that the people who will be governed by the NAIS, do not consent to the proposed law. Legitimate government is empowered by the consent of the governed; power imposed by the government without the consent of the governed is tyranny.

The only question that remains is what the USDA will do next. Funding for NAIS has been removed from the agriculture appropriation bill because NAIS has not been implemented. The USDA can either abandon its NAIS aspirations, or, in order to get funding, it can disregard the loudly expressed will of the people and mandate participation in the NAIS.

Galen Borntrager, a young Iowa farmer put it quite well when he told the USDA in Missouri, “Let this message go out from this meeting: no NAIS, no way, no how, not in this country, not under any circumstance, not today, not tomorrow, not ever!”

USDA: Can you hear me now?

Thank the Democratic Socialist Party

By Henry Lamb

For all practical purposes, the Democratic Party in the United States has become the Democratic Socialist Party of the United States. With Barack H. Obama at its helm, the Democrats have launched an agenda the socialists have pursued for a century. While employing just the right rhetorical tone, Obama ridicules those who call him a socialist, while he is advancing his unprecedented socialist agenda.

Obama is a better salesman than his socialist predecessors, but the result is the same: government control must trump individual freedom in order to achieve economic balance, environmental protection, and social equity. Obama and his socialist Democrat congressional majority are transforming America more dramatically, and faster, than anyone could have imagined.

The Americans who created the government of the United States, accepted by the majority of Americans when the U.S. Constitution was ratified, expressly limited the power of the federal government, and reserved all power not granted to the federal government for the states, and for the people. The purpose of the government was to protect the freedom of its citizens from all enemies, whether foreign or domestic.

The Democratic socialists in Washington reject this purpose, and are rapidly constructing a government in which the expression of individual freedom – as in peaceful assemblies such as the recent Tea Parties - is labeled a threat, or potential threat, or “low-level terrorism.”

Instead of defending individual freedom and protecting free enterprise, this government is extinguishing both as fast as possible – while completely ignoring the Constitution’s limitation on its power.

Where, exactly, does the Constitution authorize:

- The government’s majority ownership of General Motors;
- The bailout of private banks and insurance companies;
- Federal jurisdiction over all water – and activity that may affect water - as proposed by The [Clean Water Restoration Act](#) (S787);
- Federal jurisdiction over the production of all food as proposed by the [Food Safety Enhancement Act](#) (HR2749);
- Federal take-over of the entire healthcare industry; and
- Federal control over the use of energy.

These are only a few of the major ways the Democratic socialists in Washington are transforming America from the land of the free, to the home of the government-controlled.

Obama is far too smart to impose this agenda by brute force; instead, he is exercising his Chicago-style political skills. For example, Obama, and the Democratic socialist majority, are pushing “Card-Check,” otherwise known as the [Employee Free Choice Act](#) (HR1409). This bill will allow union thugs to unionize any business without a secret ballot vote. This is payback for union support of the Democratic socialists.

As if this were not enough, Obama and his Democratic socialist majority are considering exempting unions from a new tax on medical benefits paid by insurance companies. That’s right, one of the methods under consideration to pay for the new socialized medicine scheme, is to tax every employee who is not a union member for any and all benefits received from private insurance companies. This would immediately force non-union businesses to become unionized, or force their employees to pay taxes on insurance benefits that employees of unionized businesses don’t pay. Slick trick; this is Chicago politics at its best.

The most destructive goal of the Democratic socialists is the sweeping energy policy now under construction. Regardless of what it is called or the final shape it may take, the goal is to not only increase the price of energy beyond affordability, but to ration its use as well.

“Cap-and-trade” is a euphemism for limiting the quantity of energy an entity may use. If government controls what comes out of the pipe, it automatically controls what goes into the pipe. By setting an arbitrary limit on emissions at a level known to be less than is required by the business, and then arbitrarily setting a price for excess emissions, a business must either reduce its operations, or pay the government-mandated extra costs. Regardless of how it may be described, any government-mandated cost - *is a tax*. Therefore, any “cap-and-trade” program is, in reality, a cap-and-tax program.

This program is designed to give government the power and the mechanism to increase the cost of energy produced by fossil fuel to a price higher than the cost of energy produced by wind and solar sources. This agenda item will give government the power to essentially control the economy, by controlling the supply and price of energy that runs the economy. It will also give government the appearance of protecting the environment, which is a sop to environmental organizations and to the international community. And it will extract windfall taxes to allow government to redistribute America’s wealth to achieve the social equity goals of the Democratic socialist majority.

This is, indeed, the agenda that will make the rest of the world love America, because it will transform America into a democratic socialist country, and reduce America to the same level of government control – and poverty – that is the international norm.

For this, we can thank the new Democratic socialist party that we sent to Washington.

Independence in jeopardy

By Henry Lamb

Every July 4th, we retreat to fireworks, feast, and festival, in celebration of an independence that is rapidly becoming little more than a memory. Our ancestors declared their independence in 1776 from a tyrannical, overbearing government. The independence claimed by the authors of the U.S. Constitution helped them create a government expressly prohibited from becoming tyrannical and overbearing, by limiting its power to certain enumerated responsibilities. Those limitations have long been ignored, and the current government makes no apology for its overbearing tyranny.

Just as American independence was foreshadowed by a tea party in Boston, America's new independence is foreshadowed by tea parties across the nation. There is more evidence that a new declaration is being drafted. Currently, [36 states have approved](#), or are considering, some form of state sovereignty resolution. Several states are following Montana's example, enacting [laws that defy federal intervention](#). More than a dozen states [have enacted, or are considering legislation](#), that prohibits the federal government from imposing a mandatory National Animal Identification System. These are symptoms of a society that is dissatisfied with the long train of abuses that government continues to inflict upon it.

As the modern-day freedom-fighters begin to organize and strategize, the government chooses not to reform, but to entrench and expand its control over the people.

The similarity is remarkable, between the rise of the Democratic Socialist Party now in control of Washington, and the rise of the National Socialist Workers Party of Germany in the 1930s.

Led by an articulate orator, the German government set out to nationalize healthcare, transportation, manufacturing, and law enforcement. The Obama government has set out to nationalize manufacturing of autos, and the finance industry. The Obama-backed "cap and trade" legislation will effectively nationalize the energy and transportation industries. And Obama's nationalized healthcare program is on the front burner.

Now here's another similarity: nationalization of law enforcement. [HR675](#), sponsored by Democrat Rep. Bob Filner, was introduced to:

"Provide police officers, criminal investigators, and game law enforcement officers of the *Department of Defense* with the authority to execute warrants, make arrests, and carry firearms." (Emphasis added.)

Why do employees of the Department of Defense need the authority to execute warrants, make arrests and carry firearms? When the bill was introduced, Filner said: “We need to ensure that federal, state, and local law enforcement are able to work together to apprehend criminals and to prevent and solve crimes.”

The 1878 Posse Comitatus Act explicitly prohibits the Department of Defense from involvement in state and local law enforcement activities. The feds have the FBI to investigate federal crimes and the Justice Department to prosecute federal crimes. Waco and Ruby Ridge are good examples of federal law enforcement. And the land management agencies have [‘gun-totin’ enforcement officers](#) to prevent tourists from picking up arrowheads on federal property. Why do we need to authorize the Secretary of Defense to arm another domestic police force?

Take a clue from the authorities granted by the bill:

- To execute and serve warrants;
- To make arrests without warrants;
- To carry firearms;
- To enforce federal laws enacted to protect persons or property;
- To prevent breaches of the peace and suppress affrays or unlawful assemblies....

There are other authorities, but let’s focus on this last one: “To prevent breaches of the peace and suppress affrays or unlawful assemblies.” What is an unlawful assembly? Any assembly that is not authorized by government is unlawful. Should an irate society decide to hold a tea party even if government refused to authorize it, then there must be a reliable federal law enforcement army to “suppress” the unlawful assembly. Local police cannot be trusted to “suppress” an assembly of their neighbors.

In Germany, this police force was called the Gestapo. In Germany, the people who resisted the nationalization of anything were immediately branded as “right wing extremist” and denounced and ridiculed by government officials and by the press. Watch the government and press [response to the April tea parties](#).

These people who assemble peacefully to protest government policies are described as “Astroturf” pawns of corporate interests, by Speaker Pelosi, and as “ignorant rednecks” by Janeane Garofalo. Assemblies such as these were outlawed in 1930s Germany. They can be outlawed, and are being outlawed or otherwise prevented, in this country today.

The July 4th Atlanta tea party scheduled since March [was abruptly cancelled](#) on June 18 when a major donor to the Democrat Socialist Party now in control of Washington, exerted sufficient influence to have permission to use the property withdrawn.

Americans can't comprehend the possibility that the federal government could ever become as oppressive as Germany in the 1930s. Think again. How many bills are now floating around that seek to either register guns, or outlaw them completely? This was one of the first objectives of the 1930s German Government. Once the guns were registered, the Gestapo knew exactly where to go to confiscate them.

Is this why the Democrats in Washington now want to create a federal domestic police force?

Independence and individual freedom are not virtues to Democratic Socialists; but government control is.

New meaning for “Road Tax”

By Henry Lamb

Sara was late for work. The alarm clock didn't alarm, the kids were unusually slow getting ready for school, and nothing went right. She finally got to her car – a brand new 2020 Chevy Adventure. She touched the finger-print secured start button. Nothing. It wouldn't start. She touched it again. Nothing. Furious, she banged the steering wheel with her fist. Then she noticed the paper hanging from the receipt printer on the dash.

“Your designated visa account rejected your Road Use Tax in the amount of \$87.32 for the month of June, 2020. You must insert a valid account card to activate your automobile.”

[It's coming.](#) With a \$16 million grant from the federal government, the University of Iowa is developing a Global Positioning Satellite system that can measure the mileage, apply a variable tax rate that will increase during rush hours, and in high-traffic areas, calculate the total, charge a designated account card, and shut down your automobile if unpaid when due. Some 2700 automobiles in five states will be used in the test.

The system has been under development for more than a decade. The concept was proven in a similar, but smaller test in Oregon two years ago. The new tax system is being designed to replace the outdated by-the-gallon tax. Government mandated higher mileage requirements results in less tax revenue for all governments. Hybrid and all-electric cars contribute little or nothing to road tax revenues.

The new by-the-mile tax system will give government much more than a new tax collection mechanism; it will give government much greater control over everyone.

The new GM – Government Motors – can install this new system in all of its vehicles. All that's needed is an instruction from the car-czar. Auto makers that have not yet been taken over by the government can be required to install the system quite easily, by regulation or legislation. With such a system in every vehicle, the government can have virtual control over the population.

Purchase of a vehicle will give the government a database containing the name and residence location of every automobile owner. Since the system has the ability to record and track the geographic location of the vehicle at every moment of the day or night – only for the purpose of applying the correct tax rate, of course – government can know where your vehicle is at any moment.

Frightened yet? This is not hocus-pocus conspiracy-theory nonsense. The National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission has unanimously endorsed the scheme. A past president of the Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials says that several states have considered not waiting for the federal government, and implementing this system within their states. It is on the horizon, and currently targeted for implementation by 2020.

This system will give the government the power to know your every movement. Where does the Constitution authorize the government to exercise this power? How does the exercise of this power square with the Constitution's 4th Amendment guarantee of a right to privacy? Does anybody care?

Privacy concerns have kept the project out of the public spotlight, but not out of the lab. As the project matures, there will be the obligatory lip-service to "prohibiting" the government from using the capability to invade individual privacy. "Assurances" will be mouthed from both the administration and the Congress, that the rights of individuals will be protected. And the program will move forward.

Imagine this scenario: a police station in Podunk, New Jersey gets a silent alarm that a bank robbery is in progress at the corner of 4th Avenue and Main Street. The chief radios the regional Road Tax Monitoring Center, and immediately, every vehicle in the vicinity is disabled. The police arrive at the scene to find the robbers sitting in their vehicle banging on the steering wheel of an automobile that won't start. The press lauds this wonderful new technology.

Now imagine this scenario: A detective knocks on your door. "Your vehicle was parked on 2nd Avenue Saturday evening between 10:32 and 11:15 pm. Why?"

"It's none of your business," you protest.

You are informed that there was a crime committed in the neighborhood, and until you can explain why you were there, you are a suspect. You are in the position of having to prove your innocence rather than the state having to prove your guilt.

There is no end to the mischief that government can impose upon the people with this system. Government could control when and where people go simply by adjusting the tax rate. Government could force people to use public transportation, by adjusting the tax rate. Government could deactivate vehicles as a form of punishment for unpaid speeding or parking tickets. Government could easily dictate the type of vehicle you drive, simply by adjusting the tax rate on GM vehicles.

Those who think these scenarios are far-fetched have not been watching what the federal government has been doing, especially since the new Democratic Socialists have taken control of Washington. It's going to take more than Tea Parties to prevent this "change" that is being imposed. It's going to take a determined electorate to throw the bums out!

Big Brother writ large

By Henry Lamb

[Last week's column](#) about the coming shift to tax-by-the-mile devices in automobiles brought many interesting letters. One writer says he was working on this project way back in the 1980s when he was building special Buicks that would run on methanol for the Department of Energy, with on-board computers to control the car's operation. By 1993, test cars in Colorado were controlled from Pontiac, Michigan. The popular "OnStar," system, promoted by Government Motors, is an outgrowth of this work.

Another writer listed 15 different possible applications, such as shutting down the vehicle when its allotted emissions cap had been reached. Why not? The current cap-and-trade bill would limit industrial emissions and force each business to pay an extra tax for the privilege of emitting additional carbon dioxide. Why not arbitrarily assign a weekly or monthly cap on auto emissions, and shut down the vehicle when that limit is reached? The new Global Positioning Satellite device would have that capability.

Every American ought to be outraged that such a system is even contemplated. This system is the tool that makes slaves of every person who depends upon a vehicle. Every person should consider just how his life would be changed if he were required to get approval from the federal government to start his car.

Another writer argues that the government has the authority and the right to impose whatever conditions it wishes, since driving on public roads is a privilege, not an individual right. His argument says the government may impose any condition it wishes on the license to use public roads.

This argument completely ignores the 4th Amendment guarantee of the right to be secure from government intrusion without probable cause and due process. Does the government's right to tax trump the constitutional right to individual privacy?

The proposed GPS road tax system could easily be programmed to listen to and record conversations inside any vehicle. It could stop a vehicle, lock the occupants inside, and notify the "jack boots" that the occupants were en route to a "Tea Party."

We would hope that the federal government would never sink to the level of paranoia that gripped Nazi Germany. But then, we also hoped that the federal government would never sink to the level of labeling legal, peaceful assemblies, such as the recent "Tea Parties," as gatherings of potential terrorists.

Who would have believed, even five years ago, that the federal government would take over GM, much of the banking industry, and appoint more than 30 “Czars” to administer government without congressional oversight? Who would have believed that Congress could be bullied into adopting a cap-and-trade program that deliberately increases the cost of energy for every American, with absolutely no offsetting benefit – except increased government control over the life of every citizen?

Who would have believed that Congress would even consider allowing the government to take over the health care industry and create a system that allows government to ration health care and make life-and-death decisions for individual citizens?

The Democratic socialists who have taken control of the federal government are giddy with their power. Their view of utopia is government control of virtually everything. In Cuba, people who owe their livelihood to Castro, are not about to vote for anyone but Castro. The Democratic socialists are creating a society in which the vast majority of people are dependent upon the government for their livelihood. These are the people who are most likely to keep the Democratic socialists in power.

Opponents are increasingly labeled as “potential terrorists,” and “anti-government.” These are the people who are most likely to be punished.

Government control of every automobile is the perfect way to control – reward or punish – every citizen. This GPS road tax system is being promoted as a way for road tax revenue to keep pace with road maintenance and construction requirements. This goal can be easily achieved by simply increasing the tax rate collected on each gallon of gasoline sold. For electric cars, a tax could easily be applied at the recharger.

Tax collection is simply an excuse to put this system into every vehicle. Once in place in every vehicle, every automobile owner will be a slave to the government. By increasing or reducing the tax rate, the government can lead the automobile owner around like a dog on a leash. Should the owner become uncooperative, the government can transform him into a pedestrian in the twinkling of an eye.

Expect the Democratic socialists to promote this system as the way to end stolen vehicles. It can end dangerous high-speed chases. By monitoring in-car conversations, all manner of crimes can be prevented before they happen. By increasing the tax rate at rush hour, government can force people to take mass transit. By reducing the tax rate on GM vehicles, the government can assure the success of its auto enterprise.

There is virtually no end to the mischief the government can achieve once this new GPS system is in place. The only way to prevent it is to dump the Democratic socialists now in power, and replace them with people who understand and support the U.S. Constitution.

There's a great day coming!

By Henry Lamb

In his [great old hymn](#), Will L. Thompson tells us that “There’s a great day coming – bye and bye.” Thompson’s great day, of course, is judgment day, “When the saints and the sinners shall be parted right and left.”

Judgment day in America is coming. It’s inevitable.

It is impossible for a nation to borrow its way out of debt. And it is impossible for a free people to be forever enslaved by regulatory chains. Thompson’s hymn asks: “Are you ready for the judgment day?”

Ready or not, judgment day is coming.

Obama and his left-leaning cronies have already borrowed more than all the past presidents, and he is pushing his cronies to run up another trillion dollars of debt to enslave the entire health care system in regulatory chains of government.

Obama and his left-leaning cronies are rushing to forge regulatory chains around every citizen who uses energy, using the bizarre excuse that these measures are required to prevent the planet from overheating - when mountains of scientific evidence says otherwise.

Obama and his left-leaning cronies are rushing to restrict the use of privately owned land by claiming authority to regulate activities that may affect the [waters of the United States](#) – which they define to be all water, anywhere it may fall, flow, or accumulate.

For 20 years, Obama championed the [black liberation theology of the Reverend Jeremiah Wright](#), but since political pressure forced his resignation from Wright’s church, Obama has deliberately distanced himself from Christianity. At [Georgetown University](#), by [ending the White House Prayer Breakfast](#), and by [avoiding church](#) in general. He even declared the United States to be a [non-Christian nation](#).

On the other side of the political aisle, there is growing evidence that the “saints” are getting ready for the judgment day. That day will come Tuesday, November 2, 2010, (congressional elections) when the political saints and the sinners shall be parted right and left.

It will be a great day if Obama’s left-leaning cronies in the House and the Senate are sent packing by free people who are sick and tired of letting government continue to wrap regulatory chains around them. It will be a great day if Obama’s left-leaning cronies are unable to force their “crap & charade” energy tax into law. It will be a great day if Obama’s left-leaning cronies are unable to confiscate the nation’s health care industry in order to ration services to only those they deem worthy. It will be a great day, indeed, if the left-leaning Obama cronies are turned out of office on judgment day.

Are you ready for the judgment day?

Thousands and thousands of people are getting right with their conscience. The guilt of apathy and fear of left-leaning lunacy has mobilized people from one end of the nation to the other to gather in Tea Parties to express their dissatisfactions with the bankrupting, enslaving policies of the liberal left. More important, they are organizing in every state, in every county, in every precinct, to get the right people to the polls to ensure that the trumpets will blow and the angels will sing in celebration of a glorious victory for freedom and common sense on judgment day.

All of this is practice for another judgment day, November 6, 2012 (presidential election).

Are you ready?

Right-thinking people who are dedicated to the Christian principles that spawned this great nation must mobilize like never before. Those who have been too busy to see the great national tragedy Obama and his left-leaning cronies are constructing must [launch an immediate learning initiative](#). Those who have not yet joined a local activist organization must do so now. Those who have always left politics and public policy to others must now get ready for the judgment day - for surely, it is coming.

Thompson's hymn suggests that when the saints and sinners are parted on that great judgment day, the saints will know a "brightness" that will never be known by the sinners.

If America is to know the "brightness" of freedom earned in blood by our founders and preserved in faith by our predecessors, we must get ready for the 2010 judgment day. We must rid Congress of Obama's left-leaning cronies who blindly follow his wishes. We must reject forever the deeper-debt, higher-tax, bigger-government policies Obama offers. We must return to a government that honors Christian principles and operates solely on the authority of the Constitution.

When an army of saints marches right up to judgment day and separates the political sinners from government, it will truly be a great day.

The problem with Obama is...

By Henry Lamb

It is accurate, but not enough, to say that Obama is transforming the United States of America into a socialist nation. The term “socialist” no longer carries the fear-and-trembling reaction it evoked during the cold war years. Since the “boomer” generation, the term has lost its meaning - and when the eloquent Obama pitches his socialist snake-oil, the alleged cure sounds reasonable.

It sounds reasonable, for example, to take the profit out of the college loan program. The government subsidizes and guarantees student loans already. Why not just make government loans directly to the students, cut out the middle-man – and the profits they make – and save all that money now going to the greedy shareholders.

Think about it. In order to get the money needed to lend, private lenders ask ordinary citizens to invest in their company with a promise to the investor to pay a profitable return on his investment. On the other hand, government gets its money to lend by taking money from everyone in the form of taxes. A student may inquire among hundreds of lenders to find the best possible rate and repayment terms. If there is only one source for student loans, the lender may set the rate and the terms with no concern that a competing lender might provide a better deal.

Private lenders couldn't care less what subjects a student might pursue; timely repayment is the only concern. Not so when the government is the only lender. At any time, the government could decide that there are enough nuclear engineers in the world, and provide no loans to nuclear engineering applicants. The government could decide that there are not enough teachers, and choose to fund loans for teachers only. When the government controls the source of a commodity, the commodity users become little more than slaves.

Moreover, when government controls the source of a commodity, there is absolutely no incentive to make efficient use of the commodity, but there is a strong incentive for bureaucratic corruption. When bureaucrats, who have no skin in the game, can dispense goodies – such as loans – with no risk to their own well-being, fraud, waste, and abuse flourish. A private banker, whose paycheck literally depends upon making and collecting good loans, is sure to be much more vigilant in his decision-making.

Private lenders who make good loan decisions and earn a profit for their shareholders provide employment and incentive for more investment from their investors. Government lenders require tax dollars to pay employees, and to fund loans, and the inevitable fraud, waste, and abuse that accompanies every government program.

Obama's student loan takeover is only a drop in the bucket, compared to his takeover of the entire health care system. The principle is the same, however: take the profit out of health care and let government run the program.

Health care in the United States is currently the best in the world. It has become the best in the world precisely because it has been a private system. Entrepreneurs have attracted private investment to develop machines, procedures, and medicines unmatched by any socialist system run by any government.

If the truth could be fully known, it would reveal that the problems within the health care industry are mostly caused and exacerbated by government's increasing involvement.

The very thought of turning over the entire health care system to the government should cause fear and trembling in every person. Aside from saddling society with the incredible costs, the more frightening thought is the realization that government bureaucrats would be making the life or death decisions that affect every family.

Some people will recall the HMO rage of a few years back, where costs would be reduced by pooling services in what then was called "managed health care." No one will ever know how many people suffered or died because some corporate bureaucrat, sitting in a top-floor office somewhere, refused to allow a patient the critical service needed at the moment it was required.

Imagine, if you dare, a nation-wide HMO run by the government.

Recall, if you dare, what it takes to get a building permit that requires an environmental impact statement and approval by the EPA, the Corps of Engineers, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and on, and on.

Now imagine, if you dare, that you have a new, strange, pain on the left side of your head – and you are 68 years old, and the MRI costs \$2,000, and if it is a tumor, treatment could cost tens of thousands of dollars. Who will decide whether you get treatment or not? The decision will be made by a federal bureaucrat; not you, not your doctor, not your family.

This is how socialized, government-run health care works.

The problem with Obama is that he is a socialist, regardless of how much he denies it.

It must be in their genes

By Henry Lamb

There must be some yet-undiscovered gene in the DNA of people who feel the need to control others. Kings, Mullahs, tyrants, despots, dictators, and Democrats are all afflicted with this malady. Not since Franklin Roosevelt has evidence of this disorder been so rampant in Washington.

The Obama regime is restructuring and empowering government to ensure that all people everywhere are subject to its control.

First, understand the strategy: (1) identify problem(s); (2) devise action plan; (3) authorize plan in law; (4) implement plan;

Urgent problems the Obama regime has identified include: the economy; global warming; and health care. Further down the priority list are Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Russia, education, national security, national sovereignty, and, at the very bottom of the list are the concerns of people who are not infected with the “control” gene.

At the heart of Obama’s action plan to deal with every problem is the principle of government control over individual action. Consider the first problem: the economy. Obama’s first action was to infuse failing financial institutions with borrowed money, with government strings attached. In exchange for the money, government gained veto power over the management of private corporations.

Had the people in power not been infected with the “control” gene, financial institutions that had made bad business decisions would have paid the consequences, and the self-correcting free-market financial system would, ultimately, have been stronger. But alas, the poisoned tentacles of government now permeate the financial system.

The auto industry, an important part of the economy, experienced the same kind of intrusion, with direct government control over the naming of CEOs, directors, budgets, and operating plans.

Consider the second problem: global warming. The immediate plan of action was for government to take control over private industries that emit carbon dioxide – that is every business that uses fossil fuel. The plan, euphemistically labeled “cap and trade,” would arbitrarily limit the quantity of carbon emissions that could be produced by every business. Government control would be exercised in the form of a tax levied against every business that

exceeds the government-dictated emission limit. Government's power to tax behavior it does not want, and to reward with tax rebates and incentives the behavior it does want, allows government to virtually control the behavior of the people. The "cash-for-clunkers" program, for example, gives \$4,500 of your tax dollars to individuals who behave the way governments wants.

Ultimately, the cost of Obama's global warming action plan will cost individuals thousands of dollars each year, and will be passed on to everyone who uses energy. It doesn't matter to the people who are infected with the "control" gene that the global warming action plan [will not affect global climate in any detectible way](#).

Now consider health care. Obama's plan of action is what he calls a "public option." This is a government-run insurance program financed with your tax dollars. Representative [Barney Frank](#) [correctly identifies](#) this program as the first step toward a single-payer health care system. A single-payer (read: government payer) system puts the entire health care system under the direct control of the government. Consequently, every individual who needs health care would be subject to the whims of a government bureaucrat or the winds of political favor.

These are the problems, and a brief description of the plans of action. Now take a look at the process by which the plans are given the authority of law. The Obama regime relies heavily on the [Cloward-Piven strategy](#) for forcing change through orchestrated crisis. This is the strategy that informed Saul Alinsky's [Rules for Radicals](#), and [ACORN](#) community organizer, Barack Obama. This strategy says to overwhelm the system with evidence of the problem in order to effect a predetermined solution.

To wit: a thousand-page, \$787 billion so-called [stimulus bill](#) was rushed through Congress in less than 24 hours after the bill had been printed. Not one Congressman could have possibly read the bill. In similar fashion, the massive "[American Clean Energy and Security Act](#)" was rushed through the House of Representatives on June 26 with only a two-vote margin.

Obama launched an all-out publicity blitz, demanding that his health care plan be approved before the August Congressional recess. The rush, of course, was to avoid scrutiny and debate. The idea is to convince Congress, and the public, that the problem is so severe that immediate action must be taken. Sound familiar? Does this sound like the Cloward-Piven strategy? The blitz didn't work. This plan is still awaiting legislative authority. And vacationing Congressmen [are getting an earful](#) of reasons why it should not become law.

Next comes the implementation phase. Remember how taxes on tobacco products drove the price of cigarettes from \$15 per carton to as much as \$50 per carton in just a few years? This "sin tax" remedy will be applied to all behaviors the government doesn't like. News [reports such as this](#) are paving the way for a new batch of "sin taxes" to force people to behave the way government wants them to behave.

This is just a preview of the many ways the “control” gene compels Democrats to use the power of government to satisfy their insatiable obsession to control others. Stay tuned.

Hey Nancy, their anger is real!

By Henry Lamb

If Nancy Pelosi really believes that the anger displayed at town hall meetings is manufactured by “Astroturf” Republican groups, she is either stupid or totally disconnected from the real world. Democrats appear to be shocked by the intensity and the volume of the opposition they have encountered to the health care bill that awaits their return from August vacation.

Of course, Obama knew that there would be opposition; that’s why he insisted that both the House and the Senate get a bill passed before the recess. Had both houses passed a bill, then all this opposition would not matter. The two bills could be reconciled in September, in secret, and passed into law without having to suffer the indignities of actually listening to the people.

Voters really need to study the difference between the Democrats in campaigns, and the Democrats-in- charge. During the campaign, the Democrats promised the most transparent, honest administration ever. Democrats-in-charge, however, demonstrate just the opposite. Obama promised that no bill would become law before it had been displayed on the Internet for five days, so people could register their opinions. What a laugh! The 1000-page stimulus bill was passed just a few hours after it rolled off the press. [No congressman could have read it.](#)

The people who are showing up at these town hall meetings are angry because the stimulus bill was shoved down their throats. They are angry because Speaker Nancy Pelosi forced the Waxman-Markey “Cap and Trade” bill through the House with a two-vote margin, with no attempt at honest debate or citizen input. They are angry because they now see the Democrat leadership trying to force what they perceive to be a government take-over of the nation’s health care.

Nancy Pelosi demonstrates her hypocrisy when she hurls the “[un-American ” bomb](#) at health care opponents, but remains silent when the students at Columbia University shout-down a speaker from the Minutemen, or says nothing about the [organized shout-down of Rep. Tancredo](#) at the University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill.

Nancy Pelosi demonstrates her ignorance of grassroots organizations when she calls opposition to the Democrat agenda the work of “Astroturf” groups. Astroturf is the correct term when applied to groups that are paid to produce a group of protesters at an event (rent a riot). ACORN is the [best current example](#) of this type of Astroturf.

Another example of Astroturf is the appearance of a non-existent group that is created by a public relations initiative. Obama’s chief advisor, [David Axelrod, specializes in this activity.](#)

Grassroots, on the other hand, are people who join real organizations to work collectively to advance an agenda or to block someone else's agenda. These are the people who showed up at the April 15th, and July 4th Tea Parties all across the nation. These are the people who are clamoring to get into town hall meetings with their Congressmen. By the time Congress reconvenes in September, most Congressmen will know the difference between grassroots and Astroturf. Nancy Pelosi and the upper-echelon of Democrat leadership can't be bothered to learn the difference by actually listening to the people.

Americans who got caught up in the Obama miracle and rushed to vote in the first black President ignored the signs which suggested that he might bring with him a socialist agenda. Now that his socialist agenda has been unmistakably exposed, some of Obama's supporters are becoming the questioners at town meetings.

Neither Republicans nor Independents oppose improving the nation's health care. Republicans and Independents, however, seem to realize that much of the problem with health care is government's involvement in it. To improve the nation's health care would involve getting government out of it - rather than turning more of it over to the government.

The people who are attending these town meetings are angry about government getting into more and more facets of daily life. They are angry about government bailing out the banking industry, and now exercising control over the management. They are angry about government bailing out the auto industry, and now exercising control over the naming of GM's CEO and selecting members of the board.

The people who are attending these town hall meetings are angry about the threat of government taking control of virtually every facet of the private affairs of individual citizens. The National Animal Identification System seeks to identify every owner of a livestock animal, electronically tag and trace the movement of every animal, and impose heavy fines on people who fail to comply. The Food Safety Enhancement Act ([HR2749](#)) wants to do the same with all food producers.

The House-approved Cap and Trade bill ([HR2454](#)) gives government control over the use of energy.

This government takeover is making freedom-loving people angry. It is real, not Astroturf-manufactured anger.

The anger displayed at these town hall meetings is nothing compared to the anger that will show up at the ballot box next year, if the Democrat leadership continues to ignore, or arrogantly ridicule the voice of the people.

Col20090822

Snake-oil salesmen always lie

By Henry lamb

It's true, there is no health plan; there is only a dream. Obama and his socialist cronies dream about a 100% government-run health care system. This is socialism in its purest form. Once health care is taken over by the government, other segments of the economy will fall more easily.

Obama is quick to say publicly that he doesn't want to take over health care; he wants to lower costs by increasing competition. Obama said he didn't want to take over GM, but he did. He said he didn't want to take over financial institutions, but he did. Snake-oil salesmen always lie. Obama is a master snake-oil salesman.

There is no health plan. Congress is in the process of creating a health plan. Obama wanted a health plan before the August recess, but it didn't happen. The bills that are now floating around in Congress contain various proposals for elements to be included in the health plan.

A year ago, while campaigning, [Obama said](#) "If I were designing a system from scratch, I would probably go ahead with a single-payer system." This is clearly his dream; this is the socialist system he wants to achieve.

Rather than try to design his own system, Obama described his dream, and left the actual construction up to his Congress-cronies. The collapse of the Clinton health care plan is still too vivid a memory for most of the congressional socialists. What emerged from Congress is something called a "public option."

A public option is a government-run insurance program said to keep private insurance firms honest by creating effective competition. A government-run public option:

- Gets its start-up capital from tax revenue;
- Needs not comply with state or local regulations;
- Pays no state or local taxes;
- Is priced specifically to sell for less than private competition; not to cover costs and make a profit for shareholders;
- Can subsidize losses by simply taking more taxes.

As [Barney Frank says](#), this public option is "the best way to reach single payer." Employers who now provide some form of health insurance for their employees would be foolish to continue to do so. By cancelling existing coverage, employers would become eligible to sign up in the tax-subsidized government-run public option.

No private industry can compete with a government that can coerce revenue in the form of taxes.

This is precisely the argument of the socialists: eliminate the profit. Let government provide the service without a profit, and costs will be reduced for everyone.

It sounds like a reasonable argument. But it fails to recognize history and it completely ignores the benefits of competition in a free market.

Perhaps it is instructive here to review the objective of the nation's health care system. In a free market system the objective is to provide the best health care possible to the greatest number of people. In a socialist single-payer, or public-option system, the objective is to provide some service to all the people, at whatever cost it takes.

In order to achieve its objective, the government system selects its brightest bureaucrats to decide what services the doctors may provide, how much the doctors will be paid for their service, and the location where the patient will receive the service. This system thrives on what is called "comparative effectiveness analysis." This analysis looks at similar health problems and chooses the most cost-effective method of treatment for the doctor to apply. The doctor and patient are merely bystanders in this critical decision process.

This system completely removes the incentive to find a new treatment or new procedure because the government bureaucrat will not find it on his list of approved procedures. It completely removes the incentive to find a less expensive way to deliver a service, since the government will decide what it will pay for every service delivered.

The free market system, on the other hand, has a built-in mechanism called price to constantly force prices to be as low as possible to cover costs, and return a profit for investors. There is constant incentive for cost reductions at every point in the service delivery process.

The problems in the current system begin at the point of government involvement. Medicare and Medicaid costs have skyrocketed because of the waste, fraud and abuse. Obama himself says that two-thirds of the cost of the proposed socialist system will be paid for by eliminating the waste, fraud, and abuse in the current system.

The question is, if Obama's analysis is accurate why not eliminate the waste, fraud, and abuse to reduce the cost of Medicare and Medicaid? Why should the nation have to endure the socialization of medicine to realize this savings?

Of course, this is just more snake-oil from the master snake-oil salesman.

If the goal is to provide the best possible service to the greatest number of people, the first step Congress should take is to put a leash on the ambulance-chasing attorneys, by enacting meaningful tort reform. Another step could be to remove the state market restrictions and let all insurance companies compete in all states.

Better health care for more people is a worthy goal. Unfortunately, this is not the goal of the socialists in Washington. Their goal is control.

Why can't we win?

By Henry Lamb

Everyone agrees that the nation needs health care reform. If this is true, why can't one side or the other actually win the battle for congressional votes and reform the health care system?

The progressives in Congress, mostly Democrats, want a system in which the government provides healthcare to everyone. Some go so far as to claim that health care is a basic human right. This side of the debate believes that it is immoral for people who need health care not to get it, and that government is the only entity with the money to provide it.

The conservatives in Congress, mostly Republicans, realize that before government can provide health care for anyone, the money to pay for it must first be taken from the people who earn it. This raises a question: if the money to pay for health care must first be taken from the people, why not let the people keep their money and pay for their own health care?

The answer is this: some people earn enough money to pay for their own health care, and some don't. Therefore, government must take enough money from those who earn it to pay for the health care needed by those who cannot pay for their own care.

The progressives in Congress, mostly Democrats, consider this to be a perfectly legitimate function of a socialist government: take from those who have, and redistribute to those who have not.

The conservatives in Congress, mostly Republicans, consider this to be theft, a penalty upon the successful; and absolutely abhorrent to the Constitution and to the notion of equal justice under the law.

Where the Constitution first authorizes taxation (Article 1, Section 8) it requires that taxes "...shall be uniform throughout the United States." This establishes the principle of equal taxation. Not until 1913 does the 16th Amendment authorize taxes on income. The Amendment does not require uniform application, and the progressives in Congress were quick to abandon the principle of equal taxation under the law, in favor of the socialist principle of taking from those who have and redistributing to those who have not.

Conservatives in Congress have been fighting to re-establish the principle of equal taxation ever since, but there are far more voters who are recipients of government largesse than there are voters who pay for it. Even so, the progressives have not yet completely won.

Every time the progressives mount a major campaign to finally take over the health care system completely, the flaws in their fantasy emerge. Not the least of which is the fact that any government-run system must not only ration health care, but also create a massive bureaucracy to administer the system.

When people really begin to envision a single-payer system that has to decide on virtually every medical decision, and then either reject or approve and pay for every health care service provided in the entire country, only the most rabid progressive can keep down their last meal. Most Americans recoil at the notion of more government intrusion into the most personal aspects of private life.

This kind of reality check is what doomed “HillaryCare” when the progressives last controlled Washington. This example of the consequences of too many progressives in Washington sent many of them packing in the first election after the rejection of “HillaryCare.” The progressives wondered why they could not win.

The conservatives, eager to reform health care, suggested tort reform as a way to reduce the rapidly rising cost of health care by limiting the exorbitant fees ambulance-chasing attorneys were extracting.

The trial lawyers’ lobby quickly filled the campaign coffers of the progressives, mostly Democrats, and urged them to reject the conservative’s remedy.

The conservatives, eager to reduce the costs of health care, suggested Health Savings Accounts, and tax deductions for health insurance payments and medical expenses. No way! The progressive mantra throbbed through the media like jungle drums announcing imminent disaster: “tax breaks for the wealthy; tax breaks for the wealthy.” The conservatives wondered why they could not win.

Now comes ObamaCare. ObamaCare is an ill-defined fantasy that promises to provide health care to 47-million people who do not now have it, without adding one dime to the deficit, without forcing anyone to change a thing about their own health care, and without increasing taxes for anyone who makes \$250,000 or less per year. This is the health care fantasy that Obama is pushing.

The closest thing to ObamaCare reality is a 1000-page bill now awaiting action in the House of Representatives. Even though few, if any, Congressmen have read the bill, all have been called upon to answer questions about it, and about Obama’s health care fantasy.

Conservatives, as well as a few Democrats, are frightened by the Obama fantasy, and point to various sections of the bill as ominous precursors of far too much government control, and to the Congressional Budget Office analysis that projects massive deficits.

Progressives, as well as many Democrats, claim the conservative critics are “un-American,” and “astro-turf” pawns of the greedy insurance profiteers.

Why can't we win? The conservatives are not willing to roll over and let the progressives transform America into a socialist nation without a fight. At the same time, the progressives are convinced that if they can distribute enough government largesse to enough voters, eventually, the takers will overwhelm the payers - and the progressives will finally win.

ObamaCare is the fulcrum upon which rests the future of the nation.

Democrats' despicable duplicity

By Henry Lamb

Democrats insisted on changing the law in Massachusetts to require an election to fill the office of Senator John Kerry, should he be elected president in 2004. They argued that the people, not the governor, should choose the Senator's replacement. Of course, the governor at the time was a Republican, Mitt Romney. Now that the governor is a Democrat, the people should not choose Ted Kennedy's successor, the governor should make the appointment. The duplicity here is despicable.

Democrats went berserk over what they called President Bush's "[power grab](#)," but are silent in the face of President Obama's massive consolidation of power. The duplicity here is despicable.

No president has ever abused the power of the presidency as has Barack Obama. In view of the many abuses in which several presidents of both parties have engaged, this is a damning indictment. While Obama claims to be a teacher of the Constitution, he obviously does not believe the powers of the federal government are limited to those enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution. Obama, the Democrat Party, and far too many Republicans completely ignore these limitations.

What Obama has done to the American system of government in the few months he's been in office is absolutely staggering. He has done it with the blessings of a Congress controlled by Democrats, and a largely adoring media. Among his power-grabbing initiatives, Obama's government has:

- Taken control over private industries without Constitutional authority to do so;
- Created a network at least 32 of Czars, or "special advisors," whose powers and responsibilities are known only to the president, and who are accountable to no one but the president;
- Allowed [special interest groups such as the Apollo Alliance](#), which includes radical left-wing groups, to draft stimulus legislation, from which these same groups benefit directly;
- Pushed through the House of Representatives a massive "Cap and Tax" bill with little debate and no Republican input, which, if enacted, will give government virtual control over energy use;
- Tried to push through Congress a complete government take-over of health care;
- Stripped the CIA of its powers, and shifted the power to interrogate detainees to a group appointed by the president, who is accountable only to the president;

- Supports [pending legislation](#) that would give the president power to take control over the internet;
- Launched a major expansion of AmeriCorps to create what he calls a new [Civilian Security Force](#) for purposes known only to Obama and his close advisors.
- Tried to put the census under the control of the White House, and [use ACORN members to assist in taking the census](#).

These are only a few of the more blatant steps to consolidate Obama's power. There is much more going on that is not readily known.

It is significant to know the people that Obama has chosen to administer his growing powers. Glenn Beck has done a masterful job [exposing many of the so-called Czars](#) to be either self-proclaimed communists, or black liberation extremists, or radical left-wingers with a history of promoting a Marxist agenda. These are the people Obama has chosen to help him fulfill his promise to [transform America](#).

To get a glimpse of the America Obama is creating consider Obama's selection of [Mark Lloyd](#) to be the Chief Diversity Officer at the Federal Communications Commission. This man believes that government should control the media and regulate content. He publicly admires the "Incredible revolution" launched by Hugo Chavez, and says that Chavez's take-over of the media is largely responsible for the success of the revolution.

Obama and the Democratic Party he leads claim to love America, but are hell-bent on transforming America from the land of the free to the home of government-controlled slaves. Obama, and the people he has chosen to be around him, appear to hate capitalism and to embrace complete government control of society. They appear to despise individual freedom and worship government-forced egalitarianism – euphemistically called "social justice."

Obama and the Democratic Party he leads are transforming America's government into a series of administrative units that get their marching orders and resources from an all-powerful national administrator, rather than from the consent of the governed.

Across the nation, ordinary Americans are resisting this transformation. At Tea Parties and Town Hall meetings across the country, ordinary Americans are standing up and demanding that their elected officials reject the Obama agenda. Democrat demagogue Nancy Pelosi says it is "[un-American](#)" for ordinary Americans to speak out against the Obama agenda. But in 2006, when organized Astroturf, rent-a-riot protestors ranted about the war in Iraq, [Pelosi says their shouting was very American](#).

This Democrat duplicity is despicable.

Save our Constitution

By Henry Lamb

September 17th is Constitution Day. This day commemorates the day the U.S. Constitution was signed by 39 courageous Americans in 1787. The document these men created is the best blueprint for the organization of society yet devised. This document has allowed the people in the United States to prosper beyond the wildest dreams of every preceding generation. The government these men created was no accident. It was the result of extensive examination of all preceding governments, the problems inherent in dictatorial regimes, and, perhaps most important, the realization that freedom is a gift endowed by the Creator to which every human is entitled.

Not all of the men gathered in Philadelphia accepted the notion that black people were entitled to freedom. In fact, some of the men considered black people to be property. This difference of opinion almost destroyed the new government before it was created. Honest men, sincerely seeking a better government found a compromise that satisfied neither side, but was an acceptable way to postpone the resolution until another day.

The most distinguishing characteristic of the new government was its limitation of power. Article 1, Section 8 sets forth the specific powers the federal government may exercise. The 10th Amendment further defines this limitation by reserving all powers not delegated to the federal government, "...to the states respectively or to the people."

The government created by the Constitution is a Republic, not a Democracy. The Constitution requires that the federal government guarantee that every state operate as a Republic. Moreover, the government was divided into three co-equal branches: legislative, judicial, and executive.

The genius of the Constitution is the built-in tension that must exist between the members of Congress, the two houses of Congress, between the Congress and the Executive, and between the Judiciary and both the Congress and the Executive. This design requires that each participant and each branch continuously fight to keep others, and the other branches of government, from usurping their power.

The system worked reasonably well until the Roosevelt administration. Much of Roosevelt's New Deal exercised powers not enumerated in Article 1, Section 8. When the Supreme Court began to nullify elements of his New Deal, Roosevelt tried unsuccessfully to [expand the Supreme Court](#) in order to appoint more judges who would uphold his expansion of powers.

To some extent, every President since Roosevelt has tried to expand presidential powers, and every Congress has turned a blind eye to the limitations of power imposed by Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution. Consequently, the government now in power in Washington has abandoned any care or concern about the Constitutional limitations of power, and some are even trying to [revamp the Supreme Court](#) to insure that it poses no threat to the power-grabbing aspiration of the new crowd in Washington.

Much has been said about the [similarity of circumstances](#) between the election of Roosevelt and the ascension of Obama. Perhaps the greatest similarity is that neither man recognized the Constitutional limitations imposed by Article 1, Section 8, and the 10th Amendment.

Liberals have long since developed academic arguments to justify their departure from the clear language and intent of the Constitution. Obama is well-versed in these arguments. Argue as they will, they cannot change the clear meaning of the Constitution; they can, however, ignore it.

The Constitution is not even a factor in Obama's effort to nationalize health care. Though his press people use terms such as "public option" and "insurance reform," they are simply euphemisms for socialized medicine. The delivery of health care is not a federal power authorized by the U.S. Constitution.

The Constitution is not a factor in Obama's "Cap and Trade" agenda. His plan is to impose tax on the use of energy through which government can amass vast sums of money while actually controlling the use of energy. Controlling the use of energy is not a federal power authorized by the U.S. Constitution.

The Constitution does, however, require that major appointments made by the President be reviewed and approved by the Senate. The Constitution has not been a factor in Obama's unprecedented appointment of nearly three-dozen "Czars," or "Special Advisors," who are not reviewed and approved by the Senate, and who are accountable only to the President.

The Constitution has fallen out of favor with the government now in Washington, and sadly, far too few people even know what the Constitution allows or prohibits. Next week, Constitution Week, is a perfect time for everyone to re-read the Constitution. In fact, Constitution lovers should see to it that their friends and neighbors [get a copy](#).

Every school and community organization should show the movie "[A More Perfect Union](#)," endorsed by the Bicentennial Commission, to see and appreciate anew, how our Constitution was created. This two-hour dramatization should be seen by every American.

Never before has our Constitution been under such a serious attack. It can be saved only by dedicated Americans who value freedom more than government handouts and free markets more than a government-managed society. The only way to save our Constitution is to unseat the

usurpers in Washington and replace them with people who know that less government is the best government.

After the Tea Parties, what's next?

By Henry lamb

"One of the penalties for refusing to participate in politics is that you end up being governed by your inferiors." --Greek philosopher Plato (c. 428-348 B.C.)

America is witnessing an awakening unlike any seen since the king tried to ram his agenda down the throat of unwilling colonials. Americans said "no!" Then, "Hell no!" And next, the king had to go.

A modern king-in-his-own-eyes now commands an army of liberal lemmings who are trying to ram their power-grabbing agenda down the throat of unwilling Americans. On April 15, nationwide Tea Parties said "no!" Then, on September 12, Tea Parties in Washington, and across the nation, said "Hell no!"

And next, the king and his liberal lemmings must go.

American colonials knew that it would take more than Tea Parties to rid the nation of the king and his agenda. They worked without the benefit of a bully-pulpit, and organized their volunteers into troops of soldiers determined to claim the independence they declared, and earn the freedom they craved.

Contemporary Americans know that it will take more than Tea Parties to rid Washington of the king-in-his-own-eyes and his liberal lemming army. For every American visible at a Tea Party there are another 50 unseen Americans organizing into troops of soldiers determined to defend the U.S. Constitution and reclaim the freedom won by the nation's founders.

The king-in-his-own-eyes, and his liberal lemmings, are in denial. They see the Tea Parties as nothing more than crude expressions from the unwashed masses, who couldn't possibly know what is best for the nation.

News flash for the king: the revolution is underway!

Patriots are organizing in every state, in every county, in every precinct, to translate the energy seen at the Tea Parties into concrete plans of action. Neighbors are being nudged out of complacency to attend local meetings to learn about the voting records of incumbents, and alternatives to the king's agenda.

Candidates who declare their support for the Constitution and pledge their vote to defend principles of less government, less taxation, and more free-market prosperity are coming forward and finding supporters.

Candidates are being measured by their Constitutional backbone; not by their party affiliation.

Arising from the crowds at all the Tea Parties is the awareness that the federal government has forgotten all about the limitations of power the Constitution imposes upon it. Americans want these limitations reinstated and respected.

A Congressman who votes for the king's government-run health care, or the king's "Cap and Trade" scheme, trashes the Constitution – and his oath to defend it – because not one Congressman can point to an enumerated power in the Constitution that authorizes either program.

A President rises to become a king-in-his-own-eyes – and trashes the Constitution - when he appoints dozens of czars, expressly to avoid the Constitutional requirement that executive underlings be approved by the Senate,

These examples are simply the most recent in a long train of abuses rained down upon a patient electorate, by both political parties, under several administrations. Through Tea Parties across the nation, Americans are saying enough is enough.

A revolution is underway; get on-board, or get out of the way.

Recruiters for the revolutionary army are not concerned about party affiliation. They are looking for candidates who will first pledge to defend the Constitution. Lip-service will not do; Congressional incumbents must co-sponsor, and pledge to vote for the [Enumerated Powers Act \(HR450\)](#), legislation that will require every Congressman who introduces legislation to cite specific Constitutional authority for the legislation.

Incumbents and aspiring candidates will have to publicly pledge to embrace a set of Constitutional principles at local town meetings in every state – before Election Day. These meetings are being planned right now. Candidates are being groomed right now. Campaign funds are being gathered right now. Incumbents – even the powerful Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid – are beginning to feel the pressure of a not-so-silent majority of Americans hell-bent on reclaiming their freedom from a tyrannical government.

Ordinary people, who have never been involved, are seeking out local organizations through which their voices and their efforts can be amplified. They are reading the bills that their representatives fail to read. They are arming themselves with knowledge, courage, and the determination to demand answers from incumbents, and evict those incumbents who have failed to live up to their oath.

America's colonials did not win their freedom in a single battle. Nor will contemporary Americans reclaim their freedom in a single election. The elections in 2010 will be the first of many battles that must be won at the ballot box over the next several years. America's governments – at every level – must be repopulated with patriots who honor and respect the U.S. Constitution, as the first qualification of office. When elected, their task will be to stop the growth of federal power, and then begin to return to the states, and to the people, the freedom, power, and prosperity the Constitution provides.

Welcome global governance

By Henry Lamb

If there were ever a question about Barack Obama's dedication to the concept of global governance, it has now been answered fully. His track record to date points toward his commitment to global governance; his speech to the United Nations removes all doubt.

In order to fully appreciate the effectiveness of Obama's pursuit, it is necessary to have an accurate picture of [what global governance really is](#). The picture of global governance has been deliberately camouflaged by images of black helicopters and imagined blue-helmeted U.N. forces invading nations to enforce its mandates. This is the picture of global governance that its proponents want people to see so they will not see the real events that are constructing the actual global governance.

Global governance is a new procedure for creating and administering laws that govern all nations.

The United Nations consists of a General Assembly, the Security Council, and more than 1300 different agencies, councils, and commissions. Each of these governmental bodies is staffed by individuals who perform administrative duties dictated by the administrative hierarchy. In theory, the policies that guide the administrative hierarchy are established by the delegates from the U.N.'s 192 member nations. Keep in mind that these delegates are *appointed* officials of their government.

These delegates meet in luxurious facilities, and mouth platitudes and indictments and, more often than not, eventually approve whatever agenda the administrative staff has laid before them. This form of government is most accurately described as the "Administrator" form of government. To be absolutely clear: global governance is a system of rules and regulations, created by an administrative hierarchy, that dictate how individuals and organizations must behave. Each nation becomes an administrative unit responsible for implementation of U.N. rules and regulations.

This is the form of global governance first envisioned by Woodrow Wilson's alter-ego, Colonel Mandell House, who shared his vision with the world in his book titled "[Philip Dru: Administrator](#)." Wilson's League of Nations was designed to bring global governance to the world, but the United States balked, and rejected a global administrator.

Franklin Roosevelt, who served in Wilson's administration, surrounded himself with others from the Wilson Years, and began implementing an "Administrator" system of governance in the

United States. With the help of a Democratic majority, Roosevelt pushed through Congress a laundry list of legislation that allowed the President, or Administrator, if you will, to undertake many programs for which there is no Constitutional authority. Eventually, the Supreme Court tightened the reins and slowed the transformation of U.S. government. But not before Roosevelt reconstructed the League of Nations using a new name – the United Nations.

It is significant that Obama quoted Roosevelt in his speech to the U.N.: “We have learned to be citizens of the world,” said Roosevelt. It is significant that Obama, campaigning in Berlin, told his audience that “I come to you as a citizen of the world.” Since assuming office as President, he has acted like Philip Dru’s Administrator, campaigning for the position of Administrator of the world.

Obama’s actions in office are similar to Roosevelt’s actions in office, except Obama appears to be on steroids. While relying on his teleprompter to mouth platitudes and indictments, Obama has ignored all Constitutional constraints, and surrounded himself with people who reek with Marxist ideology. With the help of a Democratic majority, he is pushing through Congress a laundry list of programs that will essentially change the American system of government – [just as he promised in his campaign](#).

Now he has told the world that America has not only “re-engaged” the United Nations, but that America is adopting policies that accept and embrace the global governance pursued by Mandell House, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt. While still a Senator, [Obama introduced legislation](#) to comply with the U.N. request to increase America’s contribution to international aid to .07 percent of GDP – to nearly \$845 billion per year.

In his speech to the U.N., Obama promised the world that America will reduce its defense capability, effectively leaving U.S security in the hands of the International Atomic Energy Agency. He is apparently content to leave the bad behavior of rogue nations such as Iran and North Korea to whatever “consequences” the U.N. may choose to administer.

To achieve “peace and security” in the world, Obama threw Israel under the proverbial bus, demanding that Israel stop construction of their settlements, return to pre-1967 boundaries, and provide “contiguous” territory for a Palestinian state. He forgets that Israel was quite happy with the pre-1967 borders until its neighbors invaded, a second time, in an all-out effort to push Israel into the sea. The additional land that Israel captured when it kicked Palestinian butt, was to provide a little more buffer between its sworn enemies and the sea.

Obama promised the world that America would bow to the U.N.’s global warming agenda and support the creation on a whole new set of administratively created rules and regulations to limit the behavior of individuals and organizations.

The final “pillar” of American sovereignty Obama promised to relinquish to the U.N. is the acceptance of a “...global economy that advances opportunity for all people.” The global

economy envisioned by Obama is not a free-market economy. It is a managed economy, managed by government administrators, when possible, and “approved” by either appointed delegates, or a willing Democratic majority when necessary.

When Obama promised to transform this government, he wasn't kidding. Welcome global governance.

All the king's men...and women

By Henry Lamb

“Birds of a feather flock together”

In the years that followed the Magna Carta, most of the world rejected the notion that kings rule by divine right. Obama acts as if he still subscribes to this theory, and as if he is the king.

It must have been by a perceived divine right that Obama named Steve Rattner to be car czar to oversee the government takeover of Chrysler and General Motors; there is certainly no authority in the Constitution for the President to take such action. Rattner, with the blessing of king Obama, set out to punish his king's opponents and reward his king's supporters. Of the 789 Chrysler dealers closed by Rattner, [788 had contributed exclusively to Republican candidates](#). Moreover, not one of a string of Chrysler dealerships owned by Obama supporters, Robert Johnson and Mack McClarty, was closed, but virtually all of the dealerships that competed with the Johnson-McClarty chain were closed. Chrysler president Jim Press said: [“It really wasn't Chrysler's decision.”](#) Rattner resigned July 13 in the face of a multi-million dollar pay-for-play scandal in New York.

Another of the king's men, Van Jones, bit the dust when the public learned that he was a self-proclaimed communist who signed a petition calling for the investigation of the Bush administration for complicity in the 9-11 tragedy. These views were perfectly alright with the king, whose chief advisor [Valerie Jarrett, said](#) “...we've been watching him as long as he's been active....” Jones' radical ideas were fine with the king, until the public expressed its dissatisfaction.

Speaking of Valerie Jarrett, the king's closest advisor, her Chicago exploits cannot go unrewarded. She was in charge of [two housing projects that were among the world's worst](#). While the king was only a prince in the Illinois legislature, he consistently voted to up the funding for housing projects such as those Valerie managed. Now that Valerie is the king's salesman to the Olympic Committee, pitching Chicago for the site of the 2016 Olympics, guess who would benefit most by her success. The developers who own the land under and around Jarrett's failed housing projects – where the proposed Olympic stadium is to be constructed. Learn more about Jarrett [here](#), and about her [politically incestuous Chicago background](#).

It is not at all surprising that another bird in the flock wants to repeal the First Amendment. Mark Lloyd, who holds the title of Chief Diversity Officer at the Federal Communications

Commission, is now in a position to render obsolete the whole idea of free speech. The Constitution forbids Congress from making any law that infringes the right to free speech; the Constitution does not know about the FCC or its Chief Diversity Officer, however.

Lloyd has written much about his [ideas on communication and democracy](#). He is convinced that ordinary people have no opportunity to be heard amidst the noise of giant corporate media. He believes, therefore, that the government must provide a “diversity” of voices in the media. He has proposed that privately owned media be taxed sufficiently to provide a government-dictated balance in the media.

Lloyd is too smart to tackle the First Amendment head-on. Instead, he contends that there is a structural imbalance in media ownership that allows the likes of Rush Limbaugh and other conservative radio hosts to have far more impact than minority voices. His cure for this situation is to levy a tax up to 100 percent of a station’s operating budget to be redistributed to minority-owned stations and to NPR. Much of Lloyd’s writing seems to suggest that he favors converting NPR to the official government media, and doing away with private media altogether.

He is a big fan of Hugo Chavez, and celebrates his takeover of the media as the primary reason for his success.

These are just a few of the birds that flocked to Washington at the behest of the king. This flock was raised on a diet of Marxism and in-your-face-direct-action. The nation survived a similar infusion by the Wilson administration, and by the Roosevelt administration. The nation will survive Obama, but not without suffering the consequences.

One might compare the flock that has descended upon Washington to a gaggle of geese or a flock of starlings that settle in a neighborhood for a while. The noise is horrific and when they are finally run off, the mess they leave really stinks.

Is “profit” a dirty word?

By Henry Lamb

To anti-capitalists, “profit” is a dirty word. Karl Marx hated profit - which he considered to be [“surplus value from the exploited proletariat.”](#) Despite the spectacular collapse of the Soviet Union, a nation constructed on Marx’s theory, there are still people who think “profit” is a dirty word. Many of these people are in Washington, D.C.

Senator John Rockefeller issued a statement claiming that “...insurance companies are awash in profits.” In reality, the health insurance industry stands 35th among Fortune magazine’s profitability rankings, with an [average profit of 2.2%.](#)

Senator Chuck Schumer doesn’t think much of profit, either. He has proposed fees (taxes) that will extract \$75 billion from private insurance companies over the next decade. Since taxes, or fees, are a cost of doing business which is simply passed along to the consumer, Schumer’s idea is nothing more than an indirect tax that individuals will have to pay. But by applying the tax to insurance companies, Obama’s promise not to increase taxes for people earning less than \$250,000 can go unchallenged.

It is clear that Rockefeller, Schumer, and the majority of Democrats want to reduce the cost of health care by squeezing profit out of the health insurance industry. This, of course, would kill the health insurance industry, and leave the task of providing health care services up to the government. This is the ultimate goal. Whether it’s called “public option,” “co-op exchange,” or “single-payer,” the goal is the same: get rid of the profit private companies earn, and let government provide the service.

Conservatives in the Senate, in the House of Representatives, and across the country know that the solution to the rising cost of health insurance is more competition. Obama, and his Congressional minions, claim that some form of a government-controlled “public option” will increase competition.

What nonsense! Government-controlled or government-subsidized not-for-profit organizations offering health insurance is not competition, it is confiscation of the industry. Government does not level the playing field for private competitors; it levels the competitors. Unlike private insurers, a government program does not have to cover costs to stay in business. Examine other government programs, the Post Office, or Amtrak, for example. When the costs of operation exceed the revenue, Congress ups the national debt limit, borrows more money, and the government-run program continues.

Medicare and Medicaid are often held up by Democrats as great examples of government-run health care programs that all Americans want. They are, indeed an excellent example of government's ineptness at operating a business that should be left to the private sector. According to the calculations of the Medicare Trustees, Medicare is operating at a deficit every year, and to fund the program over the next 75 years at the current level of service would [require \\$38 trillion](#) – that's with a "T" - which amounts to 260% of GDP.

Karl Marx would love this plan!

There is a way to increase competition among health insurance companies which would reduce the cost of health care almost immediately, with virtually no cost to the government or to the taxpayer. Simply let all health insurance companies compete across state lines. Costs would fall before breakfast!

Health care costs would decline significantly if Congress would limit awards in malpractice cases. The cost of malpractice insurance – which has to be passed on to the patient – has skyrocketed beyond all reason, as the direct result of ambulance-chasing trial lawyers manufacturing outrageous payoffs in medical cases. A baby doctor in a metropolitan area may pay as much as \$250,000 per year for malpractice insurance. Just to cover this insurance cost, charging \$100 per patient, the doctor would have to see 69 patients per day, 365 days per year.

Congress could reduce health care costs immediately with no cost to the taxpayer, by implementing these two changes.

Obama has said he can save \$500 billion by squeezing waste, fraud, and abuse out of Medicare and Medicaid. Hooray! Go to it! This money could be used to provide a tax credit when low income families choose to buy health insurance.

These ideas have been advanced over and over again in Congress. Democrats have blocked every effort to pursue these solutions to the health care cost dilemma. It would appear that their goal is not to reduce the cost of health care, but to destroy another major segment of our capitalist system in order to expand government's control over the economy, and American citizens.

A tidal wave is brewing

By Henry Lamb

Rep. John Shadegg has been trying to get a bill enacted for 15 years that would simply require legislators to cite the Constitutional authority for any legislation that is proposed. His bill is called the [Enumerated Powers Act \(HR450\)](#). It now has 52 co-sponsors, but there is very little chance that it will ever get to the floor for a vote.

Why? Because the Democrats in Congress will not allow it.

This bill would not be necessary if the Democrats would simply follow their own rules. House Rule XIII (3)(d)(1) requires:

“Each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain the following: A statement citing the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.”

That’s right. The rules of procedure in the House of Representatives already require that every bill or resolution cite the Constitutional authority for the proposed legislation. This rule is routinely ignored.

Why? Because Democrats control the Rules Committee and the entire House of Representatives, and they routinely “waive” or “suspend” this rule.

Some people remember when Nancy Pelosi stood on her pedestal and proclaimed: "This leadership team will create the most honest, most open, and most ethical Congress in history" (November 16, 2006). Ignoring a House rule is a minor offense, compared to the corruption that Ms. Pelosi readily accepts when it affects her Democratic colleagues.

How quickly did she and her colleagues invoke House rules to condemn Rep. Joe Wilson when he blurted out “you lie” during President Obama’s sales pitch to congress? But when Democrat Alan Grayson uses visual aids to claim that the Republican health care plan calls on sick people to “Die Quickly,” there’s nothing at all offensive to Pelosi and her colleagues about the gross lie Grayson speaks.

But even this duplicity is minor compared to the corruption that Nancy continues to reward by her failure to take action.

[Charles Rangel](#) has failed to report his income from rental property in the Dominican Republic; has used rent-controlled housing facilities for campaign activities to avoid more than \$7,000 in rental payments, and much, much more.

[John Murtha](#) provides a treasure trove of investigations into all sorts of abuse of power. Murtha's earmark list contains big rewards for the same companies that appear on his contributions list.

[Maxine Waters](#) completely ignores the conflict of interest rules by using her influence to set up meetings between the Treasury Department and her friends at OneUnited Bank – which, incidentally, wound up with \$12.1 million in bailout funds.

Corruption is not limited to Democrats, by any means; they just seem to be better at getting away with it.

But then, they have a good example. Obama also [promised to clean up the corruption](#) in the administration. Then, he proceeded to appoint Tom Daschle and other people who had failed to pay their taxes, or, like New Mexico's Governor, Bill Richardson, were caught up in some kind of investigation. Obama issued an extremely rigid Executive Order outlining a high bar of ethics his appointees would have to meet. Then, he proceeded to ignore his high bar and waive the requirements for several appointees.

It is pure corruption to deliberately give the appearance of high ethical standards, and then completely refuse to apply those standards.

What's needed is a tidal wave to wash over Washington to clean out every politician – regardless of party affiliation – who seeks personal power over constitutional compliance or personal profit over public accountability.

Tidal waves often follow earthquakes. And earthquakes often follow ground tremors. Seismic tremors are being recorded in cities across the nation. In nearly every city where a Democrat had the courage to hold a town meeting, the earth rumbled.

All across the land, individuals and organizations are preparing for a tidal wave. They are identifying those Congressmen who arrogantly refuse to answer their questions. They are making notes of the votes cast by Congressmen who want government to take over health care, energy, and the rest of the market place. They are putting targets on the backs of those elected officials who vote to increase taxes and blindly spend uncountable billions.

While Democrats pretended to look the other way on September 12, more than a million people politely paraded through Washington. These are the people who will take their families and their friends and neighbors to the polls next November. These are the people who are the tidal wave that can clean up the corruption in DC. These are the people who vote.

Get ready for the deluge

By Henry Lamb

Copenhagen is about to become the successor to Kyoto as the synonym for the U.N.'s plan to control climate change. The 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change will meet in Copenhagen December 7-18. Until this meeting ends, expect to hear a growing number of climate-related horror stories, presented by a wide array of so-called environmentalists, at a rising decibel level that's sure to drive the sane quite mad.

The UNFCCC was a voluntary treaty through which the United States agreed to voluntarily reduce carbon emissions in 1992. At the very first meeting of the COP in 1995, the delegates decided to add a "Protocol" to the treaty that would make specific emissions reduction targets set by the U.N. body legally binding on 34 developed nations. The U.S. Senate adopted a resolution instructing the Clinton administration to not participate in the Protocol unless it included all nations, or if it would have a negative impact on the U.S. economy.

At the third meeting of the COP in 1997 in Kyoto, Japan, the U.S. delegation followed the Senate's instruction and refused to agree to the terms set for the United States by the U.N. body, because the developing nations refused to accept any reduction in their carbon emissions. The impasse lasted well into the second week of the meeting.

Then, Prince Albert Gore made his entrance. In a private meeting in his hotel suite, Gore negotiated a deal that completely ignored the Senate resolution, and agreed to accept a legally binding emissions reduction equal to 7% below 1990 levels by 2012, while agreeing to impose absolutely no requirements on developing nations. (Read a [detailed personal report here](#)).

The Senate was steamed, and Clinton knew better than to transmit the Kyoto Protocol for ratification.

One of the two really good things that George W. Bush did was to withdraw from the Kyoto Protocol altogether. (The other good thing he did was to withdraw from the International Criminal Court).

The United Nations, Hollywood, environmental organizations, and most of the Democrats, squalled, bawled, cursed, and ridiculed "W" for his cavalier, go-it-alone, cowboy swagger. The Kyoto Protocol went into effect without the United States' participation.

The Copenhagen meeting is supposed to produce the successor to the Kyoto Protocol, which will expire in 2012. This new agreement is supposed to set new emissions reductions targets, even more onerous than the Kyoto targets. The same arguments plague the negotiations leading up to the Copenhagen meeting that plagued negotiations in Kyoto: developing nations absolutely do not want any kind of reductions imposed upon them, while insisting that developed nations, especially the United States, be forced to drastically reduce carbon emissions.

Problem for Obama: he has as much as promised the world that the United States would rejoin the international climate change treaty – regardless of the cost. Apparently, he thought his promise, and his teleprompter would be sufficient to persuade developing nations to join the party. So far, they haven't. His ace-in-the-hole is his "Cap & Trade" bill that he wants signed before the Copenhagen meeting. If he gets his bill, he can tell the developing nations that the U.S. has already done its part, and that he will not sign the Copenhagen agreement unless the developing nations do. Of course, if he doesn't get the Cap & Trade bill before Copenhagen, he may have to develop a new strategy.

Notice the absence of any discussion about the validity of climate change science, or the need to control it? Climate change has nothing to do with the negotiations or the meetings, or the treaties. It never has. Climate change is simply an excuse to construct a monstrous international bureaucracy that meets many times each year in exotic venues around the world. Billions of dollars flow into and out of the climate change industry. No one involved in the climate change business wants to hear anything other than a new horror story to put the fear of catastrophe into appropriators.

Dissent is worse than a dirty word at these U.N. meetings. The actual meetings where negotiations occur are closed. Mercy be unto anyone caught with a tape recorder or video camera in an area other than a lobby or cafeteria, or when accompanied by a U.N. staff member. Literature may not be distributed unless first approved by the U.N. staff. In fact, ordinary people cannot even get into one of these meetings. Only official delegates of a government, approved representatives of accredited NGOs, or approved press professionals can register.

Watch the momentum mount as the December meeting draws closer. Ice caps will melt faster, oceans will rise higher, droughts will be more severe, snow falls will be deeper, ice storms will be slicker, crops will fail more often, men will become impotent, and African pygmies will be recruited by the Boston Celtics – all because of climate change – with the only cure being enslavement by a new Copenhagen Protocol to the Climate Change Treaty.

How to save America

By Henry Lamb

The United States is on the brink of signing a new climate change treaty that many people believe will be the mechanism that ushers in global governance. Global governance has been under construction for many years. Every new treaty in which the United States participates requires the surrender of a little more sovereignty. International treaties have influenced domestic policy throughout the 20th century, forcing the federal government to impose restrictions on individual freedom which are not authorized in the enumerated powers set forth in the U.S. Constitution.

For example, nothing in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution empowers the federal government to restrict the use of private property. The Endangered Species Act, enacted to bring the United States into compliance with several international treaties, gives the federal government the power to dictate what a private land owner may and may not do on his own land. This is only one of the more obvious examples of how a treaty is used to extend the power of the federal government beyond its Constitutional limitations.

Stated plainly, treaties are being used to expand the power of the federal government beyond the limitations set forth by the Constitution.

When the Constitution was written, Senators were chosen by the legislature of each state. The power of the states was substantially diminished by the passage of the 17th Amendment in 1913, which allowed Senators to be elected by popular vote, rather than by the legislature. This loss of the state legislature's power to influence the central government is especially pertinent to the ratification of treaties. The Constitution requires two-thirds of the Senators present to vote in the affirmative to ratify a treaty.

Changes to the U.S. Constitution require ratification by three-fourths of the states. The Constitution, along with "... all treaties made, or which shall be made...shall be the supreme law of the land (Article VI)." It makes no sense at all to ratify a Constitution that explicitly limits the power of government, and then ratify treaties that require the government to exercise power beyond those authorized by the Constitution.

Patrick Henry cited the possibility that this situation could arise as a reason why he could not support the ratification of the Constitution. He said: "Sure I am, if treaties are made infringing our liberties, it will be too late to say that our constitutional rights are violated." (A more detailed discussion of this situation is available [here](#)).

It may not be too late to correct this situation. Article 2, Section 2 of the Constitution says:

“He [the President] shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur....”

Consider this simple amendment:

“He [the President] shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided ~~two thirds of the Senators present~~ [three-fourths of the state legislatures] concur....”

If treaties are co-equal with the Constitution as the “supreme law of the land,” is it not reasonable that treaties be subjected to the same ratification standard required by the Constitution? If treaties are being used to empower government to act beyond its Constitutional limitations, the states have every right to demand their approval – just as their approval was required to empower the Constitution.

Globalists and progressives will scream bloody murder, of course, claiming that it would be impossible to get three-fourths of the states to agree on anything. There are 27 Constitutional Amendments that refute this argument, the most recent of which came in 1992. One more Amendment is not only possible, it is essential if we are to save this great nation from the hands of international politicians and return it safely into the hands of the people.

Globalists and progressives will argue that this Amendment would slow, or stop the process of globalization. Others will argue that the process should have been slowed or stopped years ago.

Globalists and progressives will argue that this Amendment is a step backward for civilization. Others will argue that civilization needs to return to the values and virtues of America’s founders.

Weary and worn Constitutionlists will argue that it’s too much work to get another Amendment ratified, especially in the face of what will surely be an all-out war by the well-financed progressives. But then, others will recall the difficulties at Valley Forge, and Bunker Hill and Iwo Jima; getting an Amendment ratified is child’s play, compared to the work done by those who have gone before us.

The United States is the greatest nation on earth because its citizens are free. They earned their freedom and created a government empowered by their consent, expressly for the purpose of defending that freedom. But power craves more power, and government power is no exception. Over time, treaties have become an easy way to expand government power beyond the reach of the people whose freedom the government is supposed to defend.

The Amendment proposed above will take some of the wind out of the sails of the globalists and progressives, and it will return to the states some of the power taken from them by the 17th

Amendment. Most importantly, it will give the people an opportunity to express their wishes about treaty matters to their elected state representatives, who are much closer to the people than are the Senate elite.

Choosing America's Future

By Henry Lamb

It is impossible to overstate the importance of the climate change treaty now being negotiated for adoption at the Copenhagen, Denmark U.N. meeting in December. The Kyoto Protocol was bad enough. It required the United States to reduce its carbon emissions by 7-percent below 1990 levels by 2012. When fully implemented, the Kyoto target was supposed to reduce global carbon emissions by 5.2- percent. Thanks to George W. Bush, the U.S. did not participate in the Kyoto accord.

According to the World Bank, [global emissions have risen by 19-percent since 1990](#). U.S. emissions have risen 20-percent since 1990. India's and China's emissions have risen by 88-percent and 73-percent respectively. Neither of these countries was bound by the Kyoto Protocol

The new treaty now under negotiation seeks to impose an emissions reduction requirement on developed countries of as much as 45-percent below 1990 levels by 2017, and by as much as 95-percent by 2050. (Read paragraph 31 on page 16 of the 181-page negotiating text [here](#)). These numbers are completely ridiculous; compliance would require a return to the Stone Age.

The ongoing negotiations include whether developing nations will be required to reduce emissions, and if so, by how much. China, a so-called developing nation, has now surpassed the United States as the world's number one carbon emitter.

Regardless of the final numbers the negotiators decide upon, it will make no difference to the climate. It will, however, make an enormous difference to people, especially the people who live in the United States and the other developed nations.

This treaty will create an international bureaucracy with the authority to regulate energy use. This entity would, in fact, be a political institution with the power to govern. In other words, the treaty will create a world government to administer global governance.

Lord Christopher Monckton created a tidal wave across the Internet with excerpts from his [October 14 presentation](#) to the Minnesota Free Market Institute. He too, has read the negotiating text, and says without hesitation that this treaty will create a world government. He goes further, much further, to explain that while this treaty will have no impact on global climate, it will have a great impact on the global economy.

The purpose of the treaty is, and has been since the very beginning of negotiations in the early 1990s, to transfer the wealth from developed nations to the developing nations – under the

supervision of the United Nations. Treaty negotiations justify this action because developed nations have spewed more carbon into the atmosphere than the developing nations. Therefore, according to U.N. reasoning, it is the developed nations that caused the global warming. Therefore, the developing nations are entitled to compensation.

Go figure. Or better yet, go wade through the negotiating text, but only if you have a strong stomach. It will make a non-Marxist throw-up.

Monckton rightfully says that President Obama will sign the treaty. It will take more than his signature to make the treaty binding, however. It will take the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senate to ratify whatever comes out of Copenhagen.

That is, unless the politicians resort to procedural hanky-panky. The Convention on Desertification was [ratified by a show of hands](#) – no recorded vote – on October 18, 2000 when the chamber was mostly empty. To avoid the two-thirds vote requirement, the World Trade Organization was presented as a trade agreement instead of a treaty. A trade agreement requires only a majority in both houses of congress. This hurdle is much lower than two-thirds of the Senate. Or, Congress could simply impose the treaty requirements as domestic law. The Waxman-Markey bill (HR2454) which passed the House by only two votes, is a major step toward this option.

The treaty negotiators in Copenhagen will also have to decide how to enforce whatever emissions reductions they eventually decide are appropriate. In the past, negotiators considered using the International Criminal Court. The World Trade Organization has also been considered; the WTO has the authority to levy sanctions for various forms of misconduct. But now, a new possible enforcement mechanism is in the wind: a new international monetary policy mechanism that has been under development for the better part of a year. Obama gave his blessing to the G-20 recently, and this group is working toward controlling the global economy, much like the Federal Reserve controls the domestic economy.

Negotiators have talked openly about requiring developed nations to contribute two-percent of their GDP to the new U.N. climate change mechanism. To put this in perspective, total U.S. defense spending reached 3.9 percent of GDP in 2005. Imagine paying what amounts to a U.N. tax roughly equal to half our total defense budget for redistribution to developing nations. This would satisfy what the U.N. calls the “carbon debt” owed by developed nations to the rest of the world.

The only way to insure that this treaty will not be imposed upon every American is to change the majority in congress to people who pledge to reject all forms of international control. There are only 53 weeks before voters will choose America’s future. It’s time to get started.

Responding to modern Marxism

By Henry Lamb

The first unmistakable tremors were recorded on April 15. The earth shook again throughout the month of August, when politicians returned home to face their constituents. Those brave souls who dared to hold a town hall meeting were met with enthusiastic questions about cap & trade, about the stimulus, about health care and about what appears to be a mad rush to socialism.

Despite efforts by the White House and the media to downplay the significance of these events and to denigrate the people who participated in them, another tremendous tremor rolled across Washington on September 12. More than a million people – by most estimates – filled the street from Freedom Square to the Capitol. They were not there to worship Obama; they were there to bury his policies.

Tuesday's elections sent a plume of political fallout across the nation. Obama invested heavily in the incumbent New Jersey Governor - who was soundly defeated by a conservative Republican. A parade of Democrat dignitaries campaigned for the Governor's office in Virginia; the more conservative Republican won by a landslide.

The only Democrat victory was in New York's District 23 where it took both the Democrat and liberal Republican candidate, who withdrew from the race to endorse the Democrat, to narrowly defeat a conservative independent. Conservatism also prevailed in Maine, where the voters rejected same-sex marriage.

Denial is not that river in Egypt. It seems to be a river that begins in the White House and flows freely through the Democrat Party and the media. The rest of the nation seems to be encouraged by the prospects of reining in the runaway policies Obama's majority is trying to impose.

It is increasingly clear that the battle is no longer between Democrats and Republicans; it is between liberals and conservatives. Since these terms too, are fuzzy, let's be perfectly clear: the battle is between the people who subscribe to the principles of freedom set forth in our founding documents, and the people who subscribe to the principles of collectivism set forth by Karl Marx.

Every single Democrat in the current majority, including Barack Obama, swore an oath to "...preserve, protect, and defend..." the Constitution. Yet, they absolutely ignore the limitation of power set forth in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution. None of the 17 powers enumerated there authorizes the current health care bills or the cap and trade bill, or the bailout, or the stimulus package, all recently passed by the House of Representatives.

When asked by a reporter to identify the Constitutional authority for the current health care bills, Senator Patrick Leahy said: “We have plenty of authority, why would you say we don’t have authority?” Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s reply to the same question was: “Are you serious? Are you serious?” Obviously, neither one is “preserving, protecting, or defending” the Constitution when they ignore its limitation of Congressional power.

Conservatives in Congress have tried to enact legislation that requires every new piece of legislation to cite the specific Constitutional article that authorizes the legislation. It has been defeated in every Congress since 1994. The current Congress has yet to vote on the [Enumerated Powers Act](#) (HR-450).

From one end of the country to the other, Americans are demonstrating that their appreciation for the principles of freedom outweighs their admiration for any political Party, especially those which embrace Marxist principles. Organizations are springing up everywhere, helping people get their precincts, their counties, and their states ready for the next election. One Texas group formed in March, and still was able to muster 25,000 people to march on a rainy September 12 afternoon. [Watch their video](#); this is what the liberals call a right-wing, nut-job hate-group. Unlike ACORN, these people are not funded by government grants or wealthy foundations. They are ordinary Americans accepting their responsibility to defend freedom.

This scenario is being repeated all across the nation. “Choosing America’s Future” is a national campaign designed to focus on the principles of freedom and the candidates who pledge to uphold them. At the heart of the campaign is the U.S Constitution. Participating organizations will be providing pocket-size Constitutions at candidate rallies where the candidates will also be asked to sign a pledge to uphold the principles of freedom in every official act – or to explain why they will not.

The energy fueling this growing upheaval is neither money nor political strategy. It is a genuine love for American freedom and the absolute determination to never allow Marxist collectivism to invade, persuade, nor hypnotize this nation. Freedom is not quick to respond to suppression. Freedom is longsuffering. There is a point, however, beyond which tyranny cannot tread, even if that tyranny is disguised as a “public option” or “cap and trade.” Obama and his Democratic majority may well have crossed that point.

They're still after you water

By Henry Lamb

The 4th Amendment is quite clear: an American citizen's right to be secure in his property against search and seizure without a warrant – *shall not be violated*. The 5th Amendment underscores this right: "...nor shall private property be taken without just compensation."

This is the clear, unmistakable language of the highest law of the land: the U.S. Constitution.

Congress is about to pass another law that completely ignores the Constitution, the [Clean Water Restoration Act](#) (S-787).

For the first 100 years, the states set water policy. The feds got into the business in 1886 with the "River and Harbor Act, and expanded their interest in 1948 with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. From the outset, the federal government was interested only in "navigable" waters that affected interstate and foreign commerce, consistent with federal powers authorized in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

The federal government dipped its hand deeper with the 1972 "Clean Water Act," in which the first goal was to "to attain a 'zero discharge of pollutants' into navigable waters by 1985." It is significant that the word "wetland" did not appear in law.

Almost immediately, green advocacy groups began filing lawsuits claiming that the Clean Water Act required the protection of wetlands, as well as "navigable" waters. Interestingly, many of the lawsuits were settled out of court, through a [consent decree](#). This means that the green advocacy group and the federal agency got their heads together and wrote a definition of wetlands that far exceeded the congressional language and intent. When the judge approved the agreement, his "decree" became the law.

Between 1973 and 1977, the federal government's representative involved in writing the consent agreements with the green advocacy groups, was Russell E. Train, EPA administrator. Before assuming this position, Train headed the Conservation Foundation. When he left the EPA, he became president of the National Wildlife Foundation. For all practical purposes, these green advocacy groups wrote the definition and the rules of implementation that allowed the federal government to seize control over any land that it designated as a wetland.

Federal agencies had a field day prosecuting people for polluting the navigable waters of the United States. The Sierra Club created its Swamp Watch Committee of volunteers who rode the back roads to find bulldozers at work so the feds could descend on the worksite to inspect for

wetlands. The definition of “navigable” waters expanded to the point that the Corps of Engineers adopted its “Migratory Bird Rule,” also known as the “Glancing Goose Rule.”

Under this rule, the federal government claimed jurisdiction over every mud puddle (and the adjacent land) in which a migrating bird might choose to land. This ridiculous rule is based on the reasoning that a migrating bird crosses state lines, and since a hunter might shoot at it with a rifle and ammunition that crossed state lines, the migrating bird is an object of interstate commerce which is within the power of Congress to regulate.

Fortunately, the Supreme Court threw out this monstrosity in the SWANCC decision. (*Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 531 U.S. 159 [2001].) In another Supreme Court decision, the court ruled in favor of John Rapanos, who - 20 years ago - put dirt on his private property in preparation for building a shopping center, and was stopped by the government. The Rapanos land was 20 miles from the nearest “navigable” water, yet the government determined that his shopping center was on a wetland and therefore subject to federal regulation under the Clean Water Act. The Supreme Court said the land was not subject to federal regulation.

These two court decisions sent the green advocacy groups into orbit and their Congressional puppets into action. Senator Russ Feingold introduced The Clean Water Restoration Act (S787) to restore wetland policy to what it was before the Supreme Court Rulings.

What Feingold intends to do is to legitimize the rules expanded by the consent decrees generated by green advocacy groups’ lawsuits. The Supreme Court decisions returned the policy to the original intent of Congress for rules to apply only to “navigable” waters.

The Feingold bill solves the problem by simply removing the word “navigable” from all water law. This will give the federal government control over all water everywhere. By claiming jurisdiction over all water, everywhere, the government completely ignores the 5th Amendment. The law also claims jurisdiction over all “activity that may affect the water of the United States,” completely ignoring the 4th Amendment.

Under this law, federal agents would not have to sign an affidavit alleging wrong doing in order to persuade a judge to issue a warrant. Federal agents could simply demand that a private citizen cease and desist any activity on his own private property that might affect water.

How can Congress authorize a federal agency to violate the 4th Amendment? How can Senator Feingold and the two-dozen co-sponsors swear an oath to “...preserve, protect, and defend,” the Constitution and then write a law that completely ignores this absolute 4th Amendment right for every citizen to be secure in his property from all intruders, including the government, unless a warrant is issued.

The expanding power of the federal government must be reined in; the only power on earth that can do it are the people who choose the representatives who go to Congress.

Senator Christopher Dodd: U.N. Facilitator

By Henry Lamb

When the term “Sustainable Development” first entered the world, it was defined to be:

“Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

The term and the definition are the creation of the 1987 World Commission on Environment and Development, chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland, then Vice-chair of the International Socialist Party.

To give meaning to this grandiose definition, the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development adopted [Agenda 21](#), signed by 179 nations, including the United States. This document is a 40-chapter laundry list of recommendations to create “Sustainable Communities.”

Senator Christopher Dodd is facilitating these U.N. recommendations through his “[Livable Communities Act](#)” (S-1619), which further defines the term this way:

“The term ‘sustainable development’ means a pattern of resource use designed to create livable communities by:

- (A) providing a variety of safe and reliable transportation choices;
- (B) providing affordable, energy-efficient, and location-efficient housing choices for people of all income levels, ages, races, and ethnicities;
- (C) supporting, revitalizing, and encouraging the growth of communities and maximizing the cost effectiveness of existing infrastructure;
- (D) promoting economic development and economic competitiveness;
- (E) preserving the environment and natural resources;
- (F) protecting agricultural land, rural land, and green spaces; and
- (G) supporting public health and improving the quality of life for residents of and workers in a community.”

Senator Dodd: which of the enumerated powers set forth in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution authorizes Congress to legislate “sustainable development?”

Dodd’s bill will authorize the appropriation of billions of dollars to bribe states and local communities to transform the nation into soviet-styled communities where freedom is sacrificed for the utopian vision of sustainable development.

Dodd's bill will create two new grant programs, and two new bureaucracies. One-hundred million is authorized for "Comprehensive Planning Grants." These grants are available only to multi-jurisdictional organizations that are defined in the bill, which will assure comprehensive planning on a regional basis. "Sustainability Challenge Grants" are offered on the same multi-jurisdictional basis. Nearly \$4 billion is authorized over three years for grants to implement the projects set forth in the comprehensive plans.

The "Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities" is created within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This new agency is charged with issuing and overseeing the grants program and providing guidance and technical assistance in the transformation to "sustainable," or as Dodd describes them, "livable" communities. The other new bureaucracy is the "Interagency Council on Sustainable Communities." This is a new council consisting of Cabinet Secretaries – or their designees. The Council is authorized to hire a staff to "ensure interagency coordination of federal policy on sustainable development."

The United Nations has a similar agency. It's called the [DOEM](#): Designated Officials on Environmental Matters.

As a basis for his legislation, Dodd lists 20 "findings" which may or may not be true, but certainly do not provide an accurate picture. For example, he says that between 1980 and 2000, population growth in 99 urban centers "consumed" 16-million acres of rural land. What he did not say is that all urban land in all the cities occupies only 60-million acres, or [2.6 percent](#) of the 2.3 billion acres in this country. Land designated as "wilderness," however, occupies more than 107-million acres. Wilderness is land on which no human activity – other than walking carefully – is allowed.

Dodd's bill, like all sustainable development propaganda, paints a warm and fuzzy picture of what "livable" or "sustainable" communities should be. The propaganda fails to point out that in order to achieve this Marxist utopia, government has to enforce the vision. This means that people must live where government says they must live; in homes that meet the government's design criteria; and travel to work in vehicles approved by the government.

The end result of the comprehensive land use plan is to draw urban boundary lines on a map. Those individuals whose land is outside the urban boundary zones, are deprived of private property rights and the value of their land falls to whatever amount the government decides to pay for it. The value of land inside urban boundary zones skyrockets, as does the cost of living for all who reside there.

There is a free, detailed, 3-part video presentation available [here](#), that explains sustainable development quite thoroughly.

Dodd's bill goes a long way to transforming America into what looks a lot like regional soviets where unelected agency appointees draft a plan by which all must live, and then enforce the plan with the power of law.

Such a place cannot be described as the "...land of the free." Nor can it be called "...the home of the brave," if voters allow this transformation to continue.

Copenhagen confusion

By Henry Lamb

More than 14,000 people have pre-registered to attend the shindig in Copenhagen next week, none of whom are delegates. The facility, which accommodates only 15,000 people, will be overrun by special interest groups, all clamoring for attention and a piece of the [\\$94 billion pie](#) that is divided annually among the global warming congregation.

The number of delegates that attend these meetings usually reaches 4,000 and the press adds another thousand or so. The conference is an economic boon to the host city, and an opportunity to party for the attendees, and a potential disaster for everyone else in the world.

The Copenhagen meeting is the 15th official meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change. This is the annual “biggie;” delegates and special interest groups meet four or more times each year; each meeting drawing five to 10 thousand people. The U.N. actually pays a per diem to the majority of the delegates; expenses for most of the special interest groups come from grants from various governments, or from major foundations.

The U.N. works hard to see that a good time is had by all; they screen attendees tighter than the Secret Service screens State dinners at the White House. WorldNetDaily, for example, is not allowed to attend; they may report something that the U.N. does not want reported. The press that is allowed to attend may not film or record the meetings. They may not even carry their equipment into the area where the meetings are held without an official U.N. “minder” with them. Everyone is free to photograph and record in the public areas such as the restaurants and the exhibit area.

The actual meetings are another matter. Much of the time the delegates are divided into different groups, working to remove the [brackets] from the brain-numbing language that may eventually evolve into a treaty. The brackets indicate language that some, but not all, delegates want in the treaty. These sessions are interrupted by mass-meetings where all the delegates assemble to listen to translators reveal the speaker’s latest vision of cataclysmic eschatology dispersed by the despicable demons in the West. These “hate America” sessions provide the inspiration for the delegates to endure another day of bracket-removing.

By the end of the meeting, all the brackets will be removed and the delegates will produce some kind of a document in which they all agree to something. Everyone will hug, wave, say goodbye, and go home to begin preparing for the next meeting.

These people seem to have little awareness of what's happening in the real world.

They deny that the people they call "deniers" are increasing in number every day that the world continues to cool. They are shocked that people are upset by the thousands of emails from the East Anglia University Climate Research Unit. They are far more concerned that someone hacked into the system than they are about the contents of the messages. These messages reveal a corrupt process that has fed the U.N. system manipulated data on which the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has crafted its gospel of fire and brimstone for sinners who dare indulge in the consumption of fossil fuels.

Back in the real world, the politicians who are finding themselves out at the end of a very wobbly limb are maneuvering to avoid a fatal fall from public confidence. President Obama announced that he would grace the Copenhagen meeting en route to pick up his Peace Prize. While there, he is expected to announce that the U.S. of A. will reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 17% below 2005 levels. He has no authority to do this, of course, but shhhh...., don't tell him; let him learn the hard way.

China, not to be outdone, quickly announced that it would reduce emissions by a whopping 30% below 2005 levels, but independent monitoring of projects designated as carbon reduction projects, would be allowed only in those projects that are funded by the West.

The European Union continues to wring its collective hands, knowing full well that Obama's gestures are nothing more than another peacock performance subject to the very real reins of Congress where sits Senator Jim Inhofe and his fearless band of global warming agnostics.

The uncooperative climate data over the last umpteen years, coupled with the release of the hacked emails from the U.N.'s primary feeder system, have cast a rather large cloud of confusion over the future of the entire global warming religion. The global warming faithful must feel much like the Pope and his faithful felt as they began to understand that Copernicus was right after all.

Freedom doesn't have to ask the government for permission

By Henry Lamb

The federal government was created by people who were sick and tired of a king's government that controlled every facet of life. They wrote a Constitution that explicitly limited the power of the new government. Under this new government, individuals were free to pursue happiness as they chose. In 200 years, this new nation of free people created prosperity unmatched in all of history.

While free people were busy pursuing their happiness, others were free to pursue political power. Throughout the 20th century, a cancer grew in the very fabric of freedom. The idea that the role of government is to provide for its citizens is a return to the dark ages when the prevailing thought was that without the protection of a benevolent government (king), man's life was, as Thomas Hobbes put it, "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."

The people who share Hobbes' philosophy have been called by many labels over the years, but they all fit rather nicely into the ideas expressed most eloquently in modern times by Karl Marx.

It matters not what labels are pinned on the people who want to put government in charge of individual lives; what matters is that freedom cannot exist when it requires the permission of government.

The people who have found life to be "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short," are eager for government to take control of their lives, and the lives - and fortunes - of those people whose pursuit of happiness has produced prosperity. When government assumes control it can "spread the wealth around."

The war in Washington is far more than a battle between political parties; it is a war for the survival of America. Forget the labels; forget the political affiliation. Focus on the people who believe that America must remain a nation that honors its' Constitution and cherishes the freedom of every individual. These are the people who must be elected. People who want to transform the foundation of America must be rejected. Freedom cannot co-exist with a government that insists on controlling its citizens.

For generations, government has been moving away from the idea of Constitutional limitations. Now, Congress no longer even pays lip-service to the Article 1, Section 8 Congressional limitations of power. Now, led by a devout, admitted, "wealth-spreader," the federal government is moving rapidly to bury all traces of individual freedom. The new government now under

construction will require that the pursuit of happiness begin at the desk of a federal bureaucrat, and follow only the path prescribed by government.

The federal government has already imposed, or is imposing, what is called [Sustainable Development](#). This “sound-good” label obscures the control that government exercises over where an individual may live, what type of transportation must be used, and even the kind of materials that may be used in his home. This is not freedom; this is tyranny.

Government has taken control of land use through wetland, critical habitat, urban boundary zones, and other control mechanisms. Government is attempting to take control over all water in the United States, as well as the activities that may affect water ([S-787](#)).

Government ignored its Constitutional limitation when it used its citizens’ money to bail out those financial institutions it favored, while allowing others to go broke. Government didn’t even consider the Constitution when it fired the CEO of General Motors, reorganized a private corporation and used tax dollars to buy a controlling interest.

Government is taking control over energy use by declaring carbon dioxide to be a pollutant, and allowing the EPA to regulate it. Government is attempting to create a “cap & trade” program that will not only control the energy available to individuals, but will also produce windfall profits for the government at the expense of the individual.

Nothing in the Constitution authorizes the government to take control of the health care industry. Nevertheless, legislation now pending will create more than 100 new bureaucracies to take control of virtually every facet of health care.

The federal government has become the tyrannical king that our forefathers fought so hard to cast off.

The next two elections will determine whether the great American experiment succeeds – or not.

The current majority in Washington, which obviously rejects the idea of limited government and individual freedom, must be removed, or at least significantly reduced, in 2010. In 2012, a whole new regime must capture the Capitol.

Only candidates who demonstrate their reverence for the Constitution by pledging to vote only for legislation that cites its [Constitutional authority](#) should be elected.

The people who must be removed from Washington are those who vote for government’s takeover of all water, energy use, or health care. There is no way a politician can “preserve, protect, and defend” the U.S. Constitution while allowing the government to ignore the limitations imposed upon it by the Constitution.

Patriots must look beyond party affiliation to see how individual politicians vote. Support those who support the Constitution and its [principles of freedom](#). Reject all others.

'Tis the week before Christmas...

By Henry lamb

'Tis the week before Christmas and all through the land, not a freedom is safe from Obama's hand. Bankers, bewildered, before him now bow, while auto-makers, thankful, praise his cash cow. With energy and health care nearing control, his grasp on the nation is as he foretold. The people are stirred by his escapades, and are somewhat shocked by the history they made. Obama is not what he promised to be; he brings, instead, tyranny.

America's great experiment in freedom was designed by our Founders to create a new kind of government consisting of the very people for whom the government was made. The first purpose of this new government was to protect the freedom of the people against all enemies both foreign and domestic, and especially from governmental tyranny. To keep the federal government under control, the designers limited the power of the new federal government to those very specific areas set forth in Article 1, Section 8.

These limitations are now routinely ignored by both the House and the Senate.

The one mechanism in our system of government designed to rid our government of those who abuse the Constitution is the biennial elections.

America stands at the brink of a Marxist abyss because Americans have elected a majority of officials who do not honor the Constitution, who do not respect the value of individual freedom, who crave personal power and perks more than the prosperity produced by free people operating a free market.

A majority of disappointed non-Democrats allowed this congressional majority to be elected by staying home on Election Day.

If the United States created by the Constitution is to survive, Americans must mobilize and remove the current majority in Washington. Actions by the Washington majority have stirred deep-seated anger and patriotic enthusiasm across the countryside, but there is a very real danger that this anti-majority fervor will be splintered.

Tea Party activists are battling for leadership while Glenn Beck's 9-12 groups compete for attention. Third Party promoters vie for support in the face of waning Republican influence. This is a guaranteed formula for failure in 2010.

Victory in 2010 is not necessarily determined by party label. There Are Democrats who believe in the Constitutional limitation of Congressional power, and Republicans who do not. The challenge faced by voters is finding candidates – regardless of party affiliation – who are strong advocates of the U.S. Constitution, as demonstrated by deeds, not rhetoric. Sadly, many of these candidates labor fruitlessly in third-party campaigns.

Rush Limbaugh’s advice to third parties is sound: take control of the Republican Party and make it the Party of the Constitution.

In the last hundred years, third parties have done nothing but help elect the candidate they most wanted to defeat. Theodore Roosevelt was the most successful third-party candidate in the 20th century. His 27% of the 1912 vote assured the election of Woodrow Wilson, who gave the world the League of Nations. Robert LaFollett’s third party received 17% in 1924; George Wallace drew 14% in 1968, and John Anderson got 7% in 1980. Multi-millionaire Ross Perot mustered 19% in 1992, and 8% in 1996, both times, just enough to insure the election of Bill Clinton.

This is not the year for another failed third-party effort; this is the year to save the nation. The best way to do that is for conservatives to converge on the Republican Party and take control. Democrats who are sick of seeing what their Marxist leadership is doing to the nation may want to consider siding with the conservatives in the 2010 election – to help keep Republicans honest.

The argument that insists that a vote for either a Democrat or Republican is casting a vote for the lesser of two evils is, at best, superficial. A party label does not evil make. Evil exists in every political party – granted, more in some than in others. The challenge is to elect candidates who demonstrate their respect for the Constitution. The tragedy will be conservatives getting caught up in a power struggle that paves the way for another Marxist majority to march into Washington.

Ten months is barely time to find and fund the candidates who will reverse the wreckage wrought by this Marxist majority in Washington. This great American experiment in freedom is wholly dependent upon the desire of free people to stay free. America’s freedom is at greater risk than at any time in history. Just as our forefathers fought off those who would impose tyranny in the past, this generation is called upon now to cast off another threat to freedom. This time, the enemy is already in Washington.

America's lowest moment

By Henry Lamb

A reporter asked Majority Leader Harry Reid how he could justify exempting Nebraska from Medicaid payments forever, in exchange for Senator Ben Nelson's vote. [His reply:](#)

“There's a hundred Senators here. And I don't know if there's a Senator that doesn't have something in this bill that was important to them. And if they don't have something in it important to them, then it doesn't speak well of them. That's what this legislation is all about.” (Harry Reid, 12/21/09, Democratic press conference after cloture vote on health care bill.)

Apparently, Senator Reid sees the legislative process as an activity through which individual Senators vie for tax-payer dollars to obtain results that are beneficial to them. If individual Senators don't get something out of specific legislation, then it “doesn't speak well of them.”

As the supreme benefit broker, behind closed doors, Senator Reid [dished out abundant benefits](#) to selected members of the Senate as a reward for their vote on the health care bill.

This behavior is nothing short of bribery – with tax payer dollars. Reid is not only proud of his skullduggery he suggests that Senators who do not poke their hands into the public honey-pot aren't doing their job.

This Marxist majority has made a travesty of our government: the U.S. Senate should be the world's highest platform of political debate, but Harry Reid has transformed it into a cesspool of political payoffs. Democrats everywhere should be embarrassed. Non-Democrats everywhere should be determined to rid the nation of this corruption.

The elections in 2010 will reveal whether the United States has succumbed to the immoral, unethical, “end-justifies-the-means” corruption practiced by this administration and Congressional majority, or whether the people will rise up and demand a return to the limited federal government, and free market the Constitution requires.

This is the choice: America as a land of individual freedom, free markets, and unlimited opportunity for personal achievement, or America as the land where individuals are forced to buy what government dictates, and surrender their prosperity to the government in taxes to subsidize the failure of others.

When people were free to pursue their own self interest, and the market was free to provide what the people wanted, the nation flourished. In a free market, failures are corrections, and a learning experience on the road to getting it right. In a managed market, failures provide an opportunity for government to expand its control and corruption.

Government regulations and arbitrary taxes are unnatural weights on the market. As these weights continually increase, the rate of market growth continually decreases. For half-a-century, government has been piling regulation on top of taxation, virtually strangling a formerly robust free market. Now that the economy is teetering on the brink of collapse, government ignores the real cause, blames greedy capitalists, and is moving rapidly to “fix” the problem by taking absolute control over the economy.

A government-managed economy means a government-controlled society.

Obama and his Marxist majority’s health care bill is a major step toward government confiscation of more than 16-percent of the economy, and control over the people who consume, and those who deliver health care services.

Obama and his Marxist majority are poised to effectively confiscate the energy industry, and control over the people who consume and deliver energy products.

Legislation is also moving through Congress to give government ultimate control over the use of land and water. Other legislation creates a new bureaucracy with [the power to shut down private businesses](#) that the government says may create a threat to the economy.

Obama and his Marxist majority are transforming America into a Marxist nation – just as he promised to do. It is significant to note that this transformation is taking place over the unanimous objection of Republicans.

This transformation must be stopped - and be reversed. The only way to make this happen is to change the majority in Washington. Therefore, every non-Marxist freedom lover who believes that the U.S. Constitution created the best government yet devised, is duty bound to do everything possible during the next ten months to unseat the current majority in Washington, and replace them with candidates who honor, and pledge to support and defend the U. S. Constitution.

How do you separate those who will, from those who only say they will defend the Constitution? Ask every Congressional candidate if they will co-sponsor, endorse, and vote for the [Enumerated Powers Act](#), which requires the citation of Constitutional authority for all proposed legislation. Any candidate who refuses to make this commitment should be rejected.

It's not just a Sagebrush Rebellion anymore

By Henry Lamb

Cowboys saw it coming nearly 40 years ago. People who had never even seen a meadow muffin, or a calf arriving in the world, or a rattlesnake coiled for business – persuaded the feds to lock up the land. Pre-war socialists had been working on the project for years. Way back in the 1930s, Benton Mackaye and Eugene V. Debs, both avid socialists, along with Robert Marshall and Aldo Leopold, founded the Wilderness Society. They published a book called *The People's Forest*, which advocated government control over all forests.

The Wilderness Society's director, Howard Zahniser, and Laurence S. Rockefeller were primarily responsible for getting the Wilderness Act passed in 1964. Rockefeller headed the Kennedy-appointed Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission which produced a 1962 report calling for more government control over land use. Congress obliged: The Wilderness Act set aside nine million acres as "Wilderness" defined to be, essentially, places where humans were not welcome.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund then financed a series of three publications over the next 15 years. The first, in 1972, was called: *The Use of Land: A Citizen's Policy Guide to Urban Growth*. It is significant that this publication was edited by none other than William K. Reilly, who later became Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for George H.W. Bush. The document begins with a quote from Aldo Leopold:

"It is time to change the view that land is little more than a commodity to be exploited and traded. We need a land ethic that regards land as a resource which, improperly used, can have the same ill effects as the pollution of air and water, and which therefore warrants similar protection."

City dwellers paid no attention to the publication. That was a mistake. Morris King "Mo" Udall paid attention. The document provided the Arizona Congressman fodder for a five year campaign to enact the Federal Land Use Policy and Planning Assistance Act. This ambitious legislation promoted multiple ways to lock up the federal land, mostly western land, which was covered by sagebrush and good for little more than grazing.

The terms "land use policy," and "planning assistance" meant nothing to the folks east of the Mississippi; these terms meant survival - or not - to ranchers whose livelihood depended on using the resources Udall's bill wanted to lock up.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the federal government tightened the restrictions on the use of federal lands. Land designated as wilderness grew from 9 million acres to nearly 38 million acres. The Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area expanded from 26,000 acres

to more than 539,000 acres. In Alaska, the feds locked up 104 million acres, which prohibited all resource development.

International influence

The control of land use was an obsession with government bureaucrats. Few people realized that all the attention to land use control was ginned up by the United Nations. William K. Reilly, for example, the same guy who edited the Rockefeller Brothers Fund publication on land use, represented the United States at the 1976 U. N. Conference on Human Settlements that met in Vancouver, British Columbia. On behalf of the United States, he signed the final U.N. document which says:

"Land...cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Private land ownership is also a principal instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth and therefore contributes to social injustice.... Public control of land use is therefore indispensable...."

The same year, Congress passed the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, which put a padlock on all federal lands.

Colorado Governor, Richard Lamm, summed it up pretty well at the time, when he told a reporter for the *U.S. News and World Report*, that "What the federal government fails to do is differentiate between its role as landlord and its role as sovereign. They [government bureaucrats] can't figure out whether they're landlord or king."

Legislatures in Nevada, New Mexico, Washington, Wyoming, Utah and Arizona all introduced legislation of some sort trying to claim control over the federal land in their states. Passions were so heated that Alaskan rebels burned an airplane that belonged to the National Park Service. Alaskan voters approved a special "Statehood Commission" to reconsider and recommend "appropriate changes" in the state's relationship with the federal government.

Charlie Lee, a third-generation rancher in New Mexico who leased more than 90,000 acres of federal land during the 1970s, complained that "bureaucrats now tell him how many cattle to run, where to pasture them and where, when and what type of windmills, fences and corrals he can build. When the feds take control to that extent" he said, "the ranch operator is no longer necessary; he's a federal-government caretaker."

In Wyoming, the Bureau of Land Management discovered that a 47-year old house owned by Gerald Chaffin had been built on land claimed by the BLM. Rather than find a solution that allowed Chaffin to keep his house, the BLM required the house to be removed. Chaffin's choice was a fine of \$6,000 and 18 months in prison, or a match. He chose the match and a gallon of gasoline.

The election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 infuriated the land-control zealots and green advocacy groups (which some rebels insisted on calling GAGs). The control agents drew in their domestic horns and turned again to the United Nations. The World Commission on Environment and

Development, headed by the Vice-Chair of the International Socialist Party, Gro Harlem Brundtland, worked for four years and in 1987 released its report, *Our Common Future*. This publication set the stage for the 1992 U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. This is the event that planted the seeds that produced the policies that are spawning a revival in the art of rebellion.

Sustainable Development

The election of Bill Clinton and Al Gore in 1992 was the result of work done by the land-control zealots and GAGs. It was rumored at the time that the only reason Gore agreed to the VP slot was that Clinton promised to turn over to Gore all matters related to the environment. Gore was an excellent gardener. He nurtured the government-control seeds planted in Rio. To comply with the Rio document *Agenda 21*, an Executive Order was issued that created the President's Council on Sustainable Development. Tons of federal dollars were funneled to organizations that used the phrases "sustainable development" and "comprehensive planning." The EPA and other federal agencies bribed local communities to create "visioning councils," and funded non-government organizations to train facilitators to help local communities develop a "Vision 2020 Plan of Action." Surprise, surprise; all these plans were remarkably similar. They all wound up recommending policies that matched the policy recommendations set forth in the U.N. document, *Agenda 21*. All of the policy recommendations gave government more control over land use, and other affairs of private citizens.

The feds funded the American Planning Association to produce model legislation for states to adopt, which would write into state law the *Agenda 21* policies on comprehensive planning and land use. Terms such as "urban boundaries, urban sprawl, green belt, light rail, viewshed, foodshed, urban gardening," and many other new terms entered the modern vocabulary.

The same government obsession to control land-use that spawned the sagebrush rebellion was now focused on people east of the Mississippi. South Carolina State Representative Joe Neal went on the war path when he discovered that a comprehensive land use plan in the counties he represented blocked all development on some private land in his district, while encouraging development on other lands. Strangely, the land which could not be developed was mostly owned by descendents of slaves, while the land designated to be developed was mostly owned by the descendents of slave owners.

Throughout the country, comprehensive plans were adopted through which government determined what land could be developed, how it could be developed, and who could develop it. The free market was revoked in favor of government control. Land located outside the urban development zone lost its value overnight. The value of land inside the development zone skyrocketed, as did the power of the government bureaucrats who drew the lines on the planning map.

The first signs of a new rebellion emerged when the U.N. Convention on Biological Diversity was not ratified by the Senate in 1994. Sovereignty International, People for the USA, and several other organizations were successful in getting the treaty removed from the Senate calendar one hour before the scheduled vote. Al Gore decided to implement the goals of the

treaty anyway. He developed what he called his “Ecosystem Management Policy” which was implemented administratively by appointed bureaucrats without the benefit of Congressional debate or approval.

The rejection of Al Gore in 2000, and the election of George W. Bush, angered Gore’s green land-control crowd, but did little to stop the expansion of government control. While Bush did block participation in the U.N.’s Kyoto Protocol, he also rejoined UNESCO, which reopened another U.N. Agency’s government-control influence over U.S. policy.

It was the election of Barack Hussein Obama in 2008 that really triggered the current rebellion.

He wasn’t kidding when he told a throng of admiring supporters, ”we’re just five days away from fundamentally transforming the United States of America.” From the moment he took control of the government, it was painfully clear that his idea of government control was not limited to land use. Obama is the champion of those people who believe that government must control and manage every facet of human existence in order to “spread the wealth around” and equalize prosperity (or poverty).

America’s founders limited the power of federal government for a reason. In Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, they deliberately described 17 specific areas in which Congress may exercise legislative power. The president’s powers are set forth in Article 2, Section 2. Nowhere does the Constitution authorize any government official to fire the chairman of General Motors. Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the appropriation of tax dollars to give, or lend to private businesses. Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the federal government to go into the auto manufacturing business, or the insurance business, or the health care business, or the consumer finance business.

Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the federal government to dictate the type or source of energy a private citizen or business may use. Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the federal government to dictate how private property – or the resources found there - may be used.

The federal government no longer even pretends to care what the Constitution says, and the people of America are mad as hell about it, and are mounting a rebellion the likes of which has never been seen.

The nation got a glimpse of it on April 15th, when Tea Parties sprang up across the nation. Tens of thousands of people showed up in hundreds of cities across the country to say we’re “Taxed Enough Already,” and to express their dissatisfaction with government’s disregard for Constitutional limitations of power, and government’s disregard for deficit spending – measured now in the trillions.

The ruling class quickly discounted the April 15th event as “Astroturf,” manipulations by rich right-wing hate groups. Janeane Garofalo told an MSNBC audience that the protesters were a “bunch of confused racists who had no idea what the Boston Tea Party was all about.” She said the protesters were just “tea-bagging rednecks who couldn’t stand to see a black man in the White House.”

The ruling class was wrong.

When Congressmen returned to their districts for their August vacation, they got little rest. Their constituents demanded town hall meetings to ask their representatives unusually hard questions, such as: where does the Constitution authorize you to take over the health care industry? How are you planning to pay this trillion-dollar deficit? Why are you even considering a cap and trade bill that will send energy prices to the moon?

Many Congressmen were visibly shaken. John Tanner, a Tennessee Democratic Representative, refused to even hold a meeting with his constituents, as did several other Congressmen. These Americans are on the move, and they are manipulated by no one. The organizations they are creating do not apply for federal grants. Their expenses are not paid by George Soros, or fat-cat foundations. They are motivated by the love of freedom, the love of country, and the determination to repel all forms of Marxism whether disguised as land use planning, critical habitat, cap and trade emissions reduction, “public option” health care, or any other government control concoction not authorized by the U.S. Constitution.

The ruling class called the unruly town hall meetings the work of ignorant right-wing teabaggers. Again, the ruling class was wrong. The people who attended the town hall meetings were ordinary Americans, from all walks of life, who share a common frustration with their elected officials.

The September 12th march on Washington followed the August Town Hall confrontations. From Freedom Square to the Capitol, people stood shoulder to shoulder in protest of government’s arrogant indifference to their appeals to return to the principles of freedom enshrined in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. Even though the media quickly reported that as many as 50,000 people participated in the event, the D.C. Park Police told attendees that their estimate was at least 1.5 million. Aerial photographs revealed crowds larger than those that attended the Martin Luther King “I Have A Dream” event, or the Million Man March, and perhaps even larger than the Obama inauguration shindig.

Though they deny it, the ruling class is rattled. The elections last November, the first real evidence of the growing rebellion, dumped both Democratic governors and replaced them with conservatives. The ruling class is clearly rattled, and rightfully so.

Americans are tired of writing to their Congressmen and being ignored, or worse, getting a stock reply that fails to answer the questions asked in a constituent’s letter. They are tired of getting the run-around by a staff intern when they call their elected official. They are tired of watching thousand-page bills being enacted into law before anyone has time to read them. They are tired of watching Congress pile debt upon debt upon generations yet to be born.

They are mad as hell, and they’re going to rebel. For this rebellion, bullets are not required; ballots, however, are in great demand.

Frustrated Americans are doing more than marching and attending town hall meetings. They are organizing in every county and every precinct. They are holding neighborhood learning sessions in homes, in restaurants, in churches and high school gyms. They are registering voters – real people, not the Disney characters, football teams, and dead people ACORN members are paid to register. They are setting up phone teams. They are studying the voting records of incumbents and examining the qualifications of new candidates. They are getting ready for the rebellion: Election Day 2010.

Choosing America's Future

Americans will choose their future with the next election. The stakes are high: freedom or government control. Freedom21 is a national organization, working with dozens of local organizations in an effort get all candidates to sign a pledge to uphold eight principles of freedom in every official act, or to explain publicly why they will not. These principles are:

1. All people have inherent, natural, unalienable rights to life, liberty, and property, in their pursuit of happiness.
2. Governments exist expressly to protect these rights.
3. Government's power derives from the consent of the governed, and is limited to those powers enumerated in the U.S. Constitution.
4. Public policies which constrain people's rights must be enacted only by representatives elected by the people – not by appointed agency officials.
5. Freedom requires a free market economy - with minimal government intrusion.
6. Freedom and security demand abundant, affordable energy and food production, which requires high priority utilization of domestic carbon-based and alternative fuel resources, as well as land and water resources.
7. Government has no authority to restrict or suppress non-violent religious expression.
8. No foreign or international government shall supersede the authority of the government of the United States of America.

These principles are non-negotiable if America is to remain the land of the free. This rebellion is not about race, or political parties; it is about the very heart of America. This rebellion seeks to identify, embrace, and elect people who subscribe to the principles of freedom as set forth in the nation's founding documents, and to remove from public office, and reject every candidate who embraces the principles of collectivism set forth by Karl Marx.

The rebellion is well underway. Old-timers who cut their political teeth during the sagebrush rebellion, as well as new-comers who were not yet born then, are now joining forces to restore Constitutional values to this great land. The founders provided a method, and encouragement to rebel whenever the train of government abuses grows too long.

The train is now too long and the abuses are much too heavy, and America is in a state of peaceful rebellion. This time, it's not just a sagebrush rebellion. It reaches from sea to sea and from border to border. Its soldiers include every race, the rich and poor, young and old, men and women. It is truly an American rebellion preparing to deliver a nationwide broadside to every official who has dishonored his oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.