

Columns by Henry Lamb in 2010

Table of Contents

Resolved: remove the Marxist majority	4
“...A little rebellion now and then is a good thing”	6
Limiting congressional power	8
Repudiation of the unholy trinity.....	10
Angry voters track RINOs and Incumbents.....	12
Corruption, collusion, or legal thievery	14
Where the jobs are	16
Purveyors of hate.....	18
Climate change is natural.....	20
Utah to challenge federal land ownership	22
Who’s the boss?	24
Reconciliation: the Dems’ “Nuclear Option”	26
Obamacare: shortcut to socialism.....	28
The goal is control.....	30
If once is good twice is better	32
Marxist is as Marxist does.....	34
A skunk by any other name.....	36
Obama’s private army?.....	38
What’s really behind the Tea Parties?.....	40
Philip Dru Obama.....	42
Winning the battle for freedom.....	44

What's a government to do?	46
He wasn't just whistling Dixie!	48
Global Governance is here!.....	50
Rand is right!.....	52
Obama's New World Order.....	54
Is Sustainable Development Global Governance?.....	56
The relentless effort to control the news.....	58
You can fight city hall!.....	60
The most dangerous president in history.....	62
Playing politics with disaster.....	64
How do you spell incompetence?	66
The cause of, and cure for economic woes.....	68
Selective enforcement.....	70
\$8 gas – if you can find it	72
Incumbents: meet Horatio Bunce	74
Obama complies with Agenda 21 and expands federal power.....	76
The wolves are at the door!.....	78
Senator Dodd bows to global governance	80
Global currency coming	82
A nation divided.....	84
Celebrate Constitution Day.....	86
Separate the wheat from the chaff.....	88
Dueling demonstrations.....	90
U.N. calls for sustainable development, global governance.....	92

Look out for a lame duck94

Feds say global governance at “critical juncture”96

Birds of a feather flock together98

“A Republic, ma’am, if you can keep it”100

The U.N. at 65102

Vote for freedom, or government control104

Tea Parties’ next challenge106

Repeal Obamacare – and more.....108

Platform for the 21st century110

What is a sustainable community?112

Progressives crave control114

Hands off the First Amendment!116

Are “Black Hats” genetically defective?118

Going (for the) green120

Tea Parties123

Sustainable Development or Sustainable Freedom?127

Taking aim at the predators132

Utah’s quest for its own land135

Resolved: remove the Marxist majority

By Henry Lamb

[Listen \(6:24\)](#)

The nation's most important New Year's resolution is to remove the Marxist majority in Washington. The most important question facing the nation is how to do it. There can be little doubt that the national sentiment opposes the Marxist policies being imposed by the current majority in Washington. Poll after poll, after parade, after Tea Party, vividly demonstrates the nation's frustration with Obama's "fundamental transformation of America." Removal of this majority will take an extraordinary effort from people who are willing to put the nation ahead of ego, and work together to achieve the common goal.

An objective analysis of the situation leads to only one conclusion: Republicans must regain the majority in the 2010 election.

Of course, people who have been working for years to build a viable third party will disagree – violently. Those who hate George Bush, and by extension, all Republicans, will also disagree. Those who think Obama will somehow prevent another election have thrown in the towel and given up. The cold, hard truth is, however, that the Republican Party has the best, if not the only chance to unseat the current majority.

This does not mean that all of the people who are marching in the streets have to trade in their convictions and morph into Republicans. It means that the people who want to return America's government to the vision set forth in the U.S. Constitution must seize control of the Republican Party and transform it into an unbeatable political power focused on restoring the Constitution, free markets, private property rights, and individual freedom.

In many ways, the Republican Party is no better than the Democrat Party, especially judging by its performance in recent years. The fact remains, however, that it is the second largest political party in the nation. It has an infrastructure in every state. Its candidates get on the ballot without the hassle experienced by third parties. There is an existing war chest and money stream. It is all available for the taking.

The quickest way to political power is to take control of the Republican Party, in every precinct, in every county, in every state, and finally, across the nation.

There are many great candidates working hard to gain recognition, funds, and ballot access in several conservative political parties. Most are working in vain. These candidates should run as Republicans in Republican Primaries, and then all join in support of the winning candidate. Any conservative candidate who has any chance to be elected would have an even better chance of getting elected as a Republican than as a third party candidate.

The reason third parties exist is because someone became so frustrated by the major party's refusal to acknowledge a particular issue, that rather than argue, fight, and persuade, they simply left to try to find like-minded people outside the party. At the national level, despite many third-party efforts, none has been successful. The nation cannot stand another century of third-party building. The nation cannot stand another year of this current Marxist majority.

All conservative third parties should put their party-building on hold for a year, and descend upon the Republican Party en masse, and demand that their county and every state adopt a strong, Constitution-based platform, and offer only candidates whose life demonstrates respect for the Constitution. Send the mealy-mouth RINOs packing, and present a slate of candidates who honor the Constitution and the American values that are being trashed by the Marxist majority.

Democrats, particularly in the South and rural communities of the West and Midwest, are sick of the crowd now dominating Washington, and of the Marxist philosophy that has overwhelmed the Party. They too should be recruited to help – if only for this year – to remove the cancer that is eating away at America's freedom.

There are dozens of conservative political parties, each shouting for attention, each working to restore American values, and each being largely ignored by most Republicans, and all Democrats. On their own, none of the conservative parties, including the Republican Party, can remove the Marxist majority in Washington. Working together toward the common goal of changing the current majority, the conservatives cannot fail.

Like it or not, the Republican Party is the best tool available to do the job that needs to be done. As it is, it is not sufficiently powered, nor even aimed in the right direction to accomplish the job that must be done. It will take disgruntled Democrats, Third Party advocates, Libertarians, Constitutionlists, Free-marketers, Tea Party marchers, and even formerly apathetic couch-potatoes, all working together, to take control of the Republican Party, and to run the Marxists out of town.

There is no more important New Year's resolution for the nation.

“...A little rebellion now and then is a good thing”

By Henry Lamb

[Listen \(6:04\)](#)

The underlying reason for America’s past greatness is the freedom of her people. As the people’s freedom is diminished, so is America’s greatness. Once lost, neither freedom nor the nation’s greatness can be easily regained. The people’s freedom has been dramatically eroded in recent years, and the Marxist majority now in control of the federal government is trying hard to extinguish those few flames that still flicker.

The underlying principle of America’s system of government is clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence: Governments derive their just powers “from the consent of the governed.” People are free when they control their government. When government controls the people, there can be no freedom.

For most of the 20th century, the philosophy of Karl Marx permeated most of Europe and made strong inroads in America. The strong anti-communist movement of the 1950s collapsed when political power was abused. Except for a brief period during the Cuban Missile Crisis, communism, socialism and Marxism faded from the American vocabulary. Instead, “give peace a chance,” the war on poverty, and environmentalism, filled the popular agenda.

The new agenda required new government involvement. Lyndon Johnson’s 1960s war on poverty promised to end poverty through government supervision and redistribution of wealth. Detroit’s “Model Cities” program was the predecessor of today’s “Sustainable Communities” agenda. Detroit [provides a great example](#) of why these Marxist policies should be avoided at all costs.

Reduced to its lowest common denominator, Marxism is government managing society. Freedom is society managing government. The current, arrogant, Marxist majority in Washington could not care less about what the people want or say. They are convinced that they know best how society should be managed, and they are hell-bent to manage it the way they want.

Led by President Obama, Harry Reid, and Nancy Pelosi, this government has become, as Thomas Jefferson describes governments of force, “...a government of wolves over sheep.” The Marxist majority completely ignores the overwhelming expressed will of the people who say, “do not enact the currently proposed health care legislation.” They completely ignore the will of the people who say, “treat terrorists as combatants, not as criminals entitled to Constitutional protections.” The leaders of this government have turned the ship of state directly toward Marxism, and they fully intend to impose every people-management system they can create.

This is precisely the kind of situation Jefferson had in mind when he told his friend, James Madison, that “...a little rebellion now and then is a good thing.” And a rebellion is rising.

The rebellion is not simply one political party rising to defeat another. This rebellion is deep seated. It stretches across many political parties and stokes the fires of freedom in people who have not been politically active in the past.

People who have never attended a political party meeting are showing up at precinct meetings. They are bringing their friends. They are registering to vote in the primaries. They are meeting – and questioning – potential candidates. They are signing up to be poll watchers. They are volunteering to join mobilization teams to see that people are able to get to the polls to vote. They are [examining the voting records](#) of the incumbents. They are preparing for a rebellion.

They are looking for candidates who believe the U.S. Constitution created the best form of government yet devised. They are singling out for defeat those incumbents who want to “fundamentally change the United States of America.” They are looking for candidates who believe that the Constitution limits Congress to those specific powers enumerated in Article 1, Section 8. They are looking for candidates who believe in a free market, rather than a government-managed market. They are looking for candidates who have the backbone to stand firm for the Constitution, despite what a President, a party boss, the media, or fat-cat lobbyists may say.

The ruling party has pulled out all the stops to get its Marxist agenda enacted into law before the rebels frighten officials into withdrawing their votes. The ruling party has pulled out all the stops to discredit their opponents by ridiculing everyone who opposes their actions. This government-funded [propaganda piece by NPR](#) is a disgusting example.

Americans who prefer Marxist, redistributionist, government-managed lives will continue to accept the loss of freedom and the decay of America. Americans who cherish freedom will continue to train their troops and attack at the primaries, in preparation for a full-scale rebellion on November 2, 2010.

Limiting congressional power

By Henry Lamb

[Listen \(6:28\)](#)

Power corrupts. Power in Congress corrupts Congress. In hopes of preventing, or at least minimizing congressional corruption, the nation's framers carefully limited the power of Congress to those specific powers set forth in Article 1, Section 8. The 10th Amendment makes it impossible to misinterpret the limitation of congressional power by expressly stating that all power not granted to the United States by the Constitution is retained by the states or by the people.

The House of Representatives once recognized this limitation and included this language in their [rules of procedure](#):

"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."

Congress lived within its limitation – generally speaking – until Roosevelt's Democratic tsunami. Roosevelt's "New Deal" trashed the Constitution nearly as badly as Obama's current "Raw Deal." The Supreme Court ruled a dozen of Roosevelt's new laws unconstitutional. Furious, Roosevelt set out to pack the court, proposing legislation that would let him appoint six new justices. His legislation failed, but it frightened the Supreme Court so badly that not another piece of legislation was ruled unconstitutional for 60 years.

The Supreme Court did vote 5-4 to uphold the Social Security Act in [Steward Machine Company v. Davis](#) which, in effect, extended the "general welfare" clause beyond the enumerated powers. Since that 1937 decision, both parties have ignored the concept of limited government, and mangled the Constitution in the process.

Interestingly, Obama's pledge to "fundamentally transform the United States of America," includes the [transformation of the Supreme Court](#). There has not been a lot of publicity, yet, but a lot of important Obama-backers are weighing in to [transform the Court](#) into another tool for their use.

The debate over the limitation of congressional power goes all the way back to Alexander Hamilton, who believed that the "general welfare clause" did extend congressional power beyond those enumerated. James Madison, on the other hand, told his friend Henry Lee, that if there were no limits on Congress that the Constitution might as well be [thrown into the fire](#).

Honest people who care about the Constitution will pray to understand and apply its great principles accurately. Power-hungry politicians corrupt the Constitution when they twist and stretch its meaning to apply the power of government to achieve their personal goals.

Politicians who claim that the “general welfare clause” empowers Congress to enact the health care bill currently under consideration stand on very thin ice. If the founders had intended the “general welfare clause” to extend congressional power to any whim a congressman might have, why would they have bothered to list the remaining 16 enumerated powers?

A completely separate argument can be made, that should Obama’s health care bill be enacted, it would *not promote* the general welfare, but instead, it would diminish the general welfare by forcing the rationing of health care and increasing the cost.

The most important issue, however, goes beyond the health care bill, and beyond the carbon-reduction schemes under consideration. The most important issue that every politician, and every voter, must confront is this: will the United States remain a nation under God, and under the Constitution, or will Obama and his Marxist majority be allowed to “fundamentally transform” it into his vision of a “redistributive” society under his direct administrative control?

This question will be answered, in part, on November 2, 2010, when the people choose America’s future. The presidential election in 2012 will either dump the would-be dictator, or crown him. At this point in time, a clear prediction is not possible.

Progressives, who advance Marxist policies, are hiring an army, gearing up from the ground up, [hiring “community organizers”](#) in 32 communities across the country.

Conservatives, who believe the Constitution limits congressional power, are working without the benefit of foundation or federal grants, to inform and involve their neighbors in a campaign to oust Marxist incumbents, and replace them with candidates who want to retain the Constitution, with its limitation on congressional power.

America’s future is truly in the balance. Not since Roosevelt, have we had a Marxist in the White House and in control of both houses of Congress. If they have their way, America will be transformed into another Marxist society subject to the whims of its leaders, en route to inevitable economic disaster.

To separate those candidates who *say* they will defend the Constitution from those who really will, every candidate should sign a pledge to support only legislation that explicitly [cites its Constitutional authority](#). Any candidate, including incumbents, who will not make this pledge - has no business in Washington. It is the people’s business to see that they stay home.

Repudiation of the unholy trinity

By Henry Lamb

[Listen \(6:39\)](#)

The [rebellion](#) that swept across Massachusetts Tuesday should provide Washington's unholy trinity – Barry, Harry, and Nancy – with convincing evidence that the American people will no longer tolerate their tyranny.

Tyranny is the “arbitrary or unrestrained exercise of power; despotic abuse of authority.” Does this not describe perfectly the actions of the unholy trinity? Consider the so-called \$787 billion “Stimulus Bill” that the [public opposed](#); enacted with little Republican support. Consider the government takeover of General Motors, AIG, and the banks. Consider the pending health care bill which the unholy trinity has twisted, shaped, and manipulated into such a corruption that even the people of the nation's bluest state rejected it.

The unholy trinity now must decide whether to follow the clear instructions of the people and repent from their tyrannical past, or will they choose instead to follow Master Saul Alinsky's advice given in “Rules for Radicals,” which says, “when times get tough, step on the accelerator.”

Some of the President's advisors are telling him that now is the time to get tough and show strength and conviction of character by forcing his health care bill through Congress. Nancy told reporters that regardless of the outcome of the Massachusetts election, “...we will have health care one way or another.” Congressional underlings, however, who must face a hostile electorate in ten months, are less confident.

There is no doubt that the election of Republican, Scott Brown, in Massachusetts has dramatically altered the progress of the progressive agenda Obama is pursuing. This remarkable victory, in no way, reduces the urgency of continuing the rebellion across the country.

The unholy trinity and the Marxist majority they lead are not defeated. They have simply been forced to slow down a little, and devise new strategies. Their long term goal is still “fundamentally transforming the United States of America” into a government that reflects their Marxist ideals. While they are trying to put the best possible spin on the Massachusetts debacle, they are also moving ahead with other initiatives that don't get the national spotlight.

Wall Street Journal's John Fund told a gathering recently to expect the Democrats in Congress to call for [Universal Voter Registration](#). The plan, Fund says, is for the federal government to require all states to combine all their existing databases into a massive list of registered voters. According to Fund, this would mean that all welfare recipients, all unemployed people, all incarcerated people, all licensed drivers, all the people in any state or county government database would automatically be registered to vote.

Fund says that the idea will be sold as a way to end the outrageous voter-registration fraud by third party groups such as ACORN. Such a scheme would simply upgrade the fraud from a third party activity to another corrupt government activity.

Such a bill may already exist in the "[Universal Right to Vote Act](#)". This bill says:

"A State may not provide an absentee ballot to an individual for an election for Federal office unless the individual's signature is included on the official list of registered voters in the State or some other official record of the State connected to such list (*emphasis added*)."

While the purpose of this bill is to force all states to allow vote-by-mail, it may also be the vehicle through which John Fund's warning is realized. "...Some other official record of the state..." is any official record that requires the signature of the person. Once a person – whether a legal citizen or not – has signed a government form of any kind, he may be automatically registered to vote. This expanded voter registration list, coupled with the requirement to allow vote-by-mail creates a condition ripe for corruption. It is precisely the kind of circumstance Alinsky teaches in "Rules for Radicals."

The depth of corruption the unholy trinity has demonstrated in its efforts to transform America's health care system into a government-controlled system reveals just how devious they can be, and the lengths to which they will go to achieve their goals.

They must be removed from power. The Massachusetts election shows that the people want no more of the unholy trinity's shenanigans. It shows that the people prefer basic conservative values over utopian promises of government largesse. Scott Brown's election also proves that a little-known Republican, armed with honesty, sincerity, and the right agenda can defeat the Kennedy-Obama-Democrat machine in the bluest state in the nation. This is the formula for success.

Scott Brown's example can be the formula for success across the nation in November. Aspiring candidates would do well to study his campaign and his conviction. Both provide inspiration for the rising rebellion.

Angry voters track RINOs and Incumbents

By Henry Lamb

[Listen \(6:37\)](#)

Barack Obama told reporters that he rode the same wave of public anger into office that brought Scott Brown into Ted Kennedy's Senate seat. Not quite. The wave of public anger that elected Scott Brown is focused on Barack Obama and the Congressional Democrats who are pushing his policies.

The public anger is [more than justified](#). Both the President and Congress have turned a deaf ear to the expressed will of the people throughout the first year of the new administration. Even after the candidates Obama endorsed and campaigned for in Virginia, New Jersey, and Massachusetts all lost convincingly, Democrat strategists are advising the leadership to "show character" by fighting even harder to impose government-controlled health care.

They would, were it not for the inconvenient fact that every Representative and 33 Senators must face the "angry public" at the polls this year.

All across the country, local, state, and national organizations are preparing to choose a new future for America. The future America wants is controlled by neither Democrats nor Republicans, but by elected officials who honor their pledge to "...preserve, protect, and defend" the U.S. Constitution.

Instead of its eleventh annual national conference this year, one [national grassroots organization](#) is scheduling regional, state, and local conferences around the country, focusing on ways to elect only those representatives who will publicly sign a pledge that includes ideas such as these:

I will vote *for* only that legislation which contains a citation to the specific authority granted in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

I will vote *against* any legislation that infringes the individual right to keep and bear arms.

I will vote *for* legislation that allows the use of domestic resources to achieve energy and food independence.

I will vote *against* any legislation that results in a federal takeover of any private corporation, institution, or entity.

I will vote *against* any legislation that authorizes the United Nations to impose a tax, levy, fee or royalty on the United States or any of its citizens.

These are basic Constitutional principles that the federal government has forgotten over the years. The current leadership routinely ignores the [limitation of power](#) imposed upon Congress by the Constitution. This is the source of much of the public anger that has become so visible.

Another [national organization](#) is organizing from the precinct level on up through the state party machinery. Their goal is essentially to take over the Republican Party by replacing RINO party official at the lower levels in order to send delegates to the state level who will oust RINO state officials. This strategy has [worked quite well in Nevada](#) and is currently being implemented in several other states.

These activities reflect the growth of last year's Tea Party movement. This year, in addition to planning a variety of public events, Tea Party activists are getting involved in local and state organizations that are working behind the scenes to elect a new crop of officials at every level of government.

Congressional incumbents are vulnerable, especially those who voted for the so-called stimulus bill, or the Cap-and-Trade bill, or the notorious health care bills. These bills blatantly ignore the Constitutional limitation of Congressional power and would go a long way toward fundamentally transforming the country into what would look like a socialist state.

Under socialist rule, the government decides how much payment an individual will receive for his labor, and what services the individual will receive from the government. Should Obama's agenda be enacted, the taxes required would, in effect, dictate how much payment an individual would be allowed to keep, while the government takes whatever portion it needs. The government would dictate how much energy a consumer might use, and the level of quality and quantity of health care a person might receive.

The vast majority of Americans want no part of socialist government control. The Tea Party movement is evidence of their resistance. Their organization into action groups is evidence of their strategy and their voting record in Virginia, New Jersey, and now in Massachusetts, is evidence of their effectiveness.

It's too late for the Democratic leadership to say "excuse me," and back up and pretend to be concerned about what the people want. They have already shown their true color and their true agenda. Americans who are grounded in the U.S. Constitution will have no part of it. The rebellion that began last year is mounting, getting better organized, and is taking aim at the November elections.

The November election, at best, is just a start at restoring the principles of freedom in the federal government. The campaign must continue through 2012, and beyond. Americans must never forget: freedom is not a destination; it is a hard, never-ending journey.

Corruption, collusion, or legal thievery

By Henry Lamb

In 2008, the Forest Service issued a land use plan that environmental organizations didn't like. The Earthjustice Legal Foundation filed a lawsuit on behalf of four environmental groups. The suit took 15 months. The bill to the federal government from Earthjustice was \$279,711.40. The Western Environmental Law Center filed another lawsuit challenging the same land use plan. They represented 15 environmental groups and sent the government a bill for \$199,830.65. These two outfits claim that seven attorneys spent more than 930 hours (working full time, that's 116 days), at rates between \$300 and \$650 per hour.

That's good work if you can get it.

Think that's bad? Read on.

In September of last year, the Wildearth Guardians sued the Federal Emergency Management Agency, asking the court to prohibit FEMA from issuing flood insurance to private citizens on 52,535 structures that may lie within the range of an endangered species. The group could not sue individual land owners unless they could prove that the structure caused the death or "harm" to any endangered species. This suit is designed to block the use of privately owned land, and to collect a handsome fee from the government for doing it.

The government keeps no record of these "environmental" lawsuits. Payments, however, are made from a single budget line item called the "Judgment Fund." The Budd-Falen Law firm in Cheyenne, Wyoming has done a yeoman's job in [researching payments](#) made from this fund to environmental organizations. They include:

2003	10,595 payments made	Total paid: \$1, 081,328,420
2004	8,161 payments made	Total paid: \$800,450,029
2005	7,794 payments made	Total paid: \$1,074,131,007
2006	8.736 Payments made	Total Paid: \$697,968,132
2007	6,595 Payments made	Total paid: 1,062,387,142

During these five years, tax dollars have funded environmental groups to the tune of \$4.7 billion dollars in attorney fees alone. Another \$1.6 million was paid between 2003 and 2005 from the Equal Access to Justice Act. These funds come directly from the agency that loses the suit. This doesn't begin to include all the direct grants and contracts that are awarded to dozens of environmental groups.

A closer look at the nature of these lawsuits is also instructive. Between 2000 and 2009, the Western Watershed Project filed at least 91 lawsuits and 31 appeals. They were awarded more than \$1,150,528 for such things as failing to list certain grass species as “endangered,” and failure to waive photocopy fees for mass document requests.

During the same period, the Center for Biological Diversity filed at least 409 lawsuits and 165 appeals. They didn’t win all the cases of course, they just cluttered the courts and walked away with \$941,332, for such things as Endangered Species Act (ESA) challenges for failure to list the killer whale, a butterfly and an earthworm as “endangered.”

These lawsuits are not confined to western environmental organizations. The Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the National Wildlife Federation have filed a total of 2,034 cases. These lawsuits are often based on alleged procedural wrong doing, rather than on substance. An example of what the greens call “strategic litigation” is the petition entered by the Wildearth Guardians to list 206 species as endangered. At the same time, the Center for Biological Diversity entered a petition for 225 species to be listed as endangered. There is no earthly way the EPA can issue a finding on 431 species within the 90 days required by law.

This is another classic example of the [Cloward-Pivin strategy](#) that seeks to demolish a system by overwhelming it. In this case, it is an extremely profitable enterprise for environmental organizations.

It is way past time that Congress put an end to this corporate welfare. Many of these [environmental organizations](#) boast assets and income in multiple millions, and pay their [executives salaries](#) greater than the CEOs of most for-profit corporations. The president of the Environmental Defense Fund, for example, takes home a total of \$496,000 per year. The president of the World Wildlife Fund takes home \$486,000.

These organizations represent what appears to be the worst kind of corruption or collusion, but apparently, it is legal. To the people who pay the taxes, it looks a lot like legal thievery. The people who believe that environmental groups can do no wrong - are wrong; flat wrong. Environmental groups are the worst kind of corporate welfare, feeding at the government trough while doing everything possible to put brakes on economic development. These groups then have the audacity to beg for public donations, claiming to be the only salvation for the future of the planet. Hogwash!

Congress should immediately launch a thorough investigation of every environmental organization that has applied for legal fees or federal payments of any kind, to assure the tax payers that their money is not being frittered away just to line the pockets of those who run the wealthy green groups.

Where the jobs are

By Henry Lamb

Everyone agrees that we should reduce our dependence on foreign oil.
Everyone agrees that we need to increase American jobs.
Everyone, except perhaps the President and his minions in the majority, agrees that the government cannot afford to subsidize either of these goals.

Both of these goals can be achieved quite easily with no government subsidy: drill here; drill now!

Congress could open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) in the twinkling of a Senate vote. This would pave the way to upwards of 10 billion barrels of new crude for America. Paving the road to this new inventory would [provide employment](#) for as many as 735,000 people – at no cost to the government.

Congress could open the oil-rich areas off shore, where as much as 85 billion barrels of oil is waiting for our use. Every new barrel produced provides new jobs for America – at no cost to the government.

Instead of choosing this perfectly logical course of action, the President, and his minions in the majority, chose to spend \$159 billion to [create 640,000 jobs](#). That's \$248,000 per job, for a job that typically pays much less than \$100,000 per year, and in many cases, will last only a few months. How dumb is that?

When a stupid program doesn't work as well as was projected, the only thing to do is to up the ante and do it again. That's why the President wants to spend another \$100 billion doing what didn't work last time. How dumb is that?

This stupidity cannot be laid at the feet of this President alone. Democrats, and a few Republicans, in Congress have justified this wrong-headedness on the U.N.'s threat that the continued use of carbon fuels would sink the continents and fry the Polar Regions. Anyone who still believes this nonsense has refused to read the [preponderance of evidence](#) that is now available.

Global warming that may have occurred over the last century is well within the range of normal variability.

The global warming that occurred leading to the Medieval Climate Optimum (800 – 1300) was not caused by human use of carbon fuel. Yet, the earth was much warmer then than it is now. Global temperatures then plunged to what scientists call the "Little Ice Age" (1650 – 1850). The earth was much colder during this period than it is now. Fossil fuel had nothing to do with the change.

The history of global temperature drawn from proxy data in ice cores and tree rings reveals a timeline of peaks of warming and valleys of ice ages. Even a casual look at the history of global temperatures

demands recognition that after the “Little Ice Age” the temperature must rise. It did, but began to plateau at about mid 20th century. Many scientists predict that the earth is entering a [new cooling period](#). Given a choice, any right-thinking person would choose global temperatures experienced during the Medieval Climate Optimum rather than the temperatures experienced during the Little Ice Age.

There is no choice. The climate will do whatever the climate does - despite the predictions of Al Gore or the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. It shall be as it has always been: people and all other life forms will adapt to whatever the climate does – or not. Neither increasing mileage requirements for toy cars, taxing smoke-stack emissions, nor all the other foolishness contrived by the global warming enthusiasts will make one degree of difference. Were all the goals of the Kyoto Protocol fully met, the result would be a reduction of about [one part per million](#) in atmospheric carbon – about as noticeable as spitting in the ocean.

Why do Al Gore, the IPCC, and the Democrat leadership insist on demonizing the use of fossil fuel and imposing some kind of emissions control legislation on the world? There are two reasons: money and power. Literally billions of dollars have flowed into global warming research and global warming projects of various sorts. The global warming myth has become so pervasive that the Center for Biological Diversity has collected \$6,709,467 in attorney fees from tax dollars by suing the federal government for not protecting alleged endangered species from alleged global warming.

Other environmental groups have collected billions of dollars in attorney fees and direct grants for activities related to what has been touted as “man-made” global warming. The money that has been wasted on global warming since Al Gore invited Jim Hansen to testify before his Senate Committee back in 1988 would have been much better spent had it been used to help third world countries build electricity generating plants and municipal water and sewer systems.

Aside from the wasted money, the entity that controls the use of fossil fuel controls the entire economy. That’s real power - worth all the lying and cheating that may be required.

It is nothing short of stupidity to throw good money after bad. Therefore, Congress should forget about the House-passed Cap & Tax Bill, and turn to the obvious path toward more domestic energy production and the creation of more American jobs. Both are available by opening ANWR and the other oil reserves within American jurisdiction.

Purveyors of hate

By Henry Lamb

What is the correct word to describe people who deliberately, publicly, and repeatedly use the “N” word when they refer to black people? There are such people. Are they sick? Are they mean? Are they stupid? Are they just full of hate?

How do you describe people who deliberately, publicly, and repeatedly call gay people “queers?” There are such people. Are they sick? Are they mean? Are they stupid? Are they just full of hate – or are they all of the above.

Obviously, people who insist on doing these things have no compassion or appreciation for people who are different from themselves. They have no tolerance. Most people condemn this behavior and find it appalling.

What is the correct word to describe people who deliberately, publicly, and repeatedly call the people who attend Tea Parties – “teabaggers”?

These people are called: Anderson Cooper (CNN); Keith Olbermann, Chris Matthews, Dylan Ratigan, Rachel Maddow, Anna Marie Cox, Janeane Garofalo, (MSNBC); Bill Maher (HBO); ABC News; CBS News; Daily Kos; Huffington Post; and a host of other bloggers and [TV personalities](#).

The people who deliberately, publicly, and repeatedly refer to Tea Party participants as “teabaggers” suffer from the same character flaw that makes people use the “N” word, and call gay people “queers.” The character flaw that would allow someone to tie a hangman’s noose on a tree in front of a black man’s house, or burn a cross on his front lawn is precisely the same flaw that allows a person to deliberately, publicly, and repeatedly call someone a “teabagger” when they know it to be untrue.

These are the same people who preach tolerance – but practice hate.

These are the same people who never missed an opportunity to denigrate and demean President Bush, but rush to label Obama protesters as hate-mongering redneck “teabaggers.”

By their deliberate, public, repetition of the term “teabaggers” in reference to the participants of Tea Party events, these people and institutions are condoning and perpetuating hate for those who hold a different political view. Moreover, their actions tell those who are influenced by them, that it is normal and right to belittle and demean the people who are not “politically correct” as defined by the “in” crowd.

It is sad to realize that this attitude is learned in school, particularly in many colleges and universities. David Horowitz was [shouted down](#) at Emory University by students who suffer this same character flaw. Representative Tom Tancredo met the [same fate](#) at the University of North Carolina. College kids have

learned that it is perfectly normal and right to shout down, or deny the First Amendment to anyone who holds a political view different from their own.

Is it any wonder that when this crowd gets to Congress they think it is perfectly normal and right to shut out opposing views? Democrats [routinely reject amendments](#) offered by Republicans, often with no discussion or debate. On President Obama's health care bill, Democrats refused to even let Republicans into the room when key portions of the bill were being negotiated. Then they have the audacity to call Republicans the party of "No."

This is the kind of disingenuous political representation that makes ordinary people rise up.

Watch Nancy Pelosi, Harry Reid, or Barack Obama, make their pronouncements on TV. Then watch Keith Olbermann, Bill Maher, or Janeane Garofalo make their "teabagger" pronouncements on TV. There is a similar air of arrogant condescension; a symptom of the character flaw that allows people to use the "N" word, or call gay people "queers."

Ordinary people put up with this hateful abuse for too long. When the arrogant, condescending congressional majority started dictating stimulus bills and bailouts by the bushel, the takeover of private businesses, Cap & Tax bills, and socialized medicine – they not only awakened and arose - they assembled in what are being called Tea Parties.

Ordinary people – moms, pops, grandmas and grandpas, students, black, white, gay and straight – ordinary people that the character-flawed progressives refer to as "teabaggers" – are now responding. They elected a Republican Governor in Virginia and in New Jersey – despite the personal campaigning of Barack Obama. They even elected a Republican Senator to the seat previously held by Ted Kennedy – despite the personal campaigning of Barack Obama.

These ordinary people are organizing from the precinct level to counties, to states and into national groups. They fully intend to reject the Washington majority's plan to empower government far beyond its Constitutional limits in order to nationalize the economy and enslave individuals.

People who insist on calling these American patriots "teabaggers," are, indeed, purveyors of hate.

Climate change is natural

By Henry Lamb

In his February 12 “Climate change is inevitable” commentary, Dr. Brian Moench ridicules Rep. Kerry Gibson, a mere “...dairy and crop farmer from Ogden,” for having the audacity to doubt what he erroneously calls the conclusion of “97 percent of all climate scientists.” As a dairy and crop farmer whose livelihood is dependent upon nature, it is quite likely that Mr. Gibson has a much firmer grip on natural processes than does an Anesthesiology professor from Harvard.

Moench’s condescending tone throughout the piece is typical of the “holier-than-thou” prognosticators of environmental gloom and doom who have flourished throughout the 20th century. Monech, Al Gore, and a handful of others, follow in the footsteps of the “scientific experts” who sold the idea of eugenics in the early 20th century. Eventually, real science emerged, and pushed the charlatans into oblivion.

Forty years ago, global cooling was the scientific rage, along with E.O. Wilson’s outrageous claims of species extinction. Paul Ehrlich joined the gloom and doom express and frightened the world with his “Population Bomb,” claiming that it was already too late, that people would be dying of starvation in the streets, by the mid 1980s.

Dr. Brian Moench is clearly a member of this society of manufacturers of spurious scientific scenarios.

With all of his definitive pronouncements, he failed to even acknowledge that the so-called scientific foundation of the man-made climate change hypothesis is finally crumbling before the world. The grossly unscientific practices at Britain's East Anglia Climate Research Unit give powerful testimony of the extent to which “warmers” will go to advance their misguided theory.

The widely discredited “Hockey Stick” graph used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) tried to distort history by claiming that the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age never happened. The IPCC used speculation from a non-scientist environmentalist magazine writer to claim that the Himalayan glaciers would melt by 2035 to try to frighten people into accepting their climate change agenda.

No one denies that the climate is changing. Only those who draw some benefit, or promise of future benefit, continue to deny that the climate change witnessed in the last century is similar to, but less dramatic, than the global warming that led to the Medieval Warm Period, and to the global cooling that led to the Little Ice Age.

Both of these historic events occurred without the use of fossil fuel or human caused atmospheric carbon. The idea that human caused carbon dioxide – less than one percent of greenhouse gases – can result in all the doom and gloom predicted by Dr. Moench is preposterous.

The climate has always changed. It will continue to change. It will change at the behest of the original Architect; not at the behest of Al Gore, Brian Moench, the IPCC, or because people burn gasoline and breathe out.

Utah to challenge federal land ownership

By Henry Lamb

In a modern David and Goliath battle, Utah Representative Christopher Herrod has introduced HB143 which, if enacted, would authorize the state to use eminent domain to take land from the federal government. About 60 percent of the state is owned by the federal government.

Herrod, and his backers, hope to inspire other western states to join their effort to force the Supreme Court to hear their arguments. The federal government owns [most of the land](#) in all western states.

As a condition of statehood, the citizens of Utah were required to “...forever disclaim right and title to unappropriated public lands.” In the same July 16, 1894 Enabling Act, the federal government agreed to grant four sections of every township, and various other grants of land, to the state to provide permanent funding for schools and other government purposes.

Herrod, and his backers, contend that the federal government has not lived up to its end of the bargain, and its failure has imposed economic hardship on Utah. Virtually every other western state can make the same claim. Moreover, the federal government has imposed environmental regulations that have further stifled the state’s ability to use its natural resources.

A particular target of eminent domain will likely be the massive reserves of low-sulfur coal that was locked away forever by the Clinton-era designation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. Estimates of the value of the coal deposits reach into the tens of billions of dollars.

Backers of the initiative recognize that it will be an uphill battle. The legislature’s own research staff concludes that “...there is a high probability that a court would hold that the federal government is the sovereign of public lands.” Nevertheless, the state’s Attorney General, Mark Shurtleff, is ready to lead the fight in court, and Herrod’s bill sets aside \$3 million for the legal battle.

Should the other western states get on board, and join Utah’s initiative, the Supreme Court would be hard pressed to ignore their petition. More important might be a public awareness of the case and a public outcry in support of returning the lands to the states.

The timing could be perfect for this battle. The federal government is facing robust public criticism for the unstoppable bloating bureaucracy, and the spiraling cost of government. If federal lands were returned to the states, massive downsizing of the federal government would follow. If there were no other reason to return the land to the states, the downsizing of government should be sufficient justification.

There are other reasons. Good reasons. Western states were admitted into the union on a so-called “equal footing” status. How can Utah, with the federal government owning 60 percent of the land, be

considered equal to any state east of the Mississippi, where the percentage of land owned by the federal government is minimal.

Environmentalists and socialists are quick to claim that federal lands are “public” lands, which belong to all people. Except for public parks authorized by elected representatives of the people, there is absolutely no justification for government to own any lands, aside from the lands authorized by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution.

If the federal government is justified in owning 33 percent of all the land area in the nation, why is it not justified in owning 66 percent, or 99 percent? Of course, environmentalists and socialists would prefer that the federal government own all the land, and absolutely control its use. This position is diametrically opposed to the concept of private property honored in both the U.S. Constitution and the Utah Constitution.

The federal government should own no land other than the land authorized by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17.

Were the Supreme Court to rule in favor of the Utah initiative, the federal government could shed enormous expense and reduce the size of government. State governments would have enormous resources to convert to revenue to fund budget deficits and provide tax relief for private citizens and small businesses.

The Utah initiative is, indeed, a modern David and Goliath battle, but it can be a battle joined by a powerful equalizer. The legislatures of western states can follow Utah’s lead. The people in every state can demand that the federal government reduce its size and cost. A painless way to do both is to simply return federal lands to the states.

The people would reap an additional benefit because states are far better stewards of the land within their borders than the federal government could ever be. The people who live in Utah know Utah far better than bureaucrats in Washington. The people who live in Utah are entitled to their own land and resources, just as the people of New Jersey are entitled to theirs. Perhaps Utah’s initiative will be the stone that will knock some sense into the federal Goliath.

Who's the boss?

By Henry Lamb

Is the federal government sovereign, with authority over state governments? Or, are individual state governments sovereign, with authority over the federal government? It's a simple question; it's the answer that's a problem.

The federal government exists because representatives of the states created it. This fact should provide a clue. The federal government was designed by representatives from the states in a document called the Constitution of the United States. The federal government became a reality when the Constitution was ratified by the 9th state, New Hampshire, on June 21, 1788. This infant government, created by the states, began operation March 4, 1789. From that day until this, people have been arguing over whether the federal government or the states possess the supreme authority.

It is quite clear that the people who designed the federal government intended it to be limited in its power. Article 1, Section 8 sets forth 17 enumerated powers of the federal government. The first clause empowers the new government to "lay and collect taxes," to provide for the "defense and general welfare" of the United States. Here's where the argument gets nasty.

One group of people argues that the phrase "general welfare" means whatever Congress wants it to mean with no limitations. Another group of people argues that if this is what the designers intended, why on earth would they have bothered to enumerate the remaining 16 specific powers? It's a reasonable question that the first group prefers to ignore rather than answer.

To be sure that the federal government's authority stayed limited, the primary architect of the Constitution, James Madison, introduced the Bill of Rights in the very first Congress in 1789. These first ten Amendments further clarify the authority and limitations of the federal government. The 10th Amendment in particular, limits the federal government to those powers enumerated in the Constitution and explicitly reserves all other powers to the states and to the people.

Among the powers granted to the federal government is what is known as the "Enclave Clause," which happens to be the 17th enumerated power. This clause provides authority for the federal government to exercise supreme authority over an area "ten miles square" ceded by the states to be the Capitol of the new government, and over any lands purchased from the states with the approval of the state legislature for "...the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings."

This is where it really gets sticky. Clearly, the designers intended for the federal government to purchase "with the approval of the legislature" any land to be owned by the federal government within any state. The Constitution empowers the federal government, however, to exercise sovereign authority over its territories, and the authority to add states which are carved out of the territories.

It is reasonable to conclude that when a state is carved out of a territory, it becomes a state subject to the powers and limitations of all the other states within the jurisdiction of the Constitution, and no longer subject to the federal authority suffered by the people when the land area was a territory.

This is pretty much the way it went when Texas was admitted to the Union in 1845. What was called “public land” was shifted to the state of Texas. Today, only 1.9 percent of Texas is owned by the federal government.

In Utah, however, the federal government required, as a condition of statehood, to “disclaim all right to title” of public land, and the feds retained nearly 60 percent of all the land in the state. In Nevada, the feds retained 85 percent of the land.

How can it be legal for the federal government to own land in a state that it did not purchase with the consent of the state legislature? How can it be legal for the federal government to exercise sovereignty over land within a sovereign state? Why were the eleven Western states and Alaska treated differently upon admission to the Union than were the other 26 states that joined the Union – when all states were supposed to be admitted on an “equal footing”?

There is only one logical conclusion: the federal government should not own the land it now claims within any state unless it is purchased with the approval of the state legislature for the purposes set forth in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17.

There is a growing effort in Western states to force the federal government to honor its Constitutional limitation on land ownership and return to the states that which is rightfully theirs.

Reconciliation: the Dems' "Nuclear Option"

By Henry Lamb

A few years ago, the Democrats were in the minority in Washington. They took great delight in using the 60-vote filibuster rule to prevent President Bush's judicial nominations from ever coming to the floor for a vote. The Republicans threatened to change the rules so judicial nominations and Presidential appointees could get approved or rejected with a simple majority vote. Democrats went absolutely ballistic. The threat was dubbed "The nuclear option."

Dianne Feinstein said:

"If the nuclear option is successful, it will turn the Senate into a body that could have its rules broken at anytime by a majority of Senators unhappy with any position taken by the minority. It begins with judicial nominations. Next will be executive appointments. And then, legislation."
(Senate chamber 5/18/05)

Then-Senator Obama said:

"...a change in the Senate rules would change the character of the Senate forever. And what I worry about would be that you would essentially still have two chambers in the House and the Senate, but you would have, simply, majoritarian absolute power on either side, and that's just not what the founders intended." (National Press Club 4/25/05)

It's a different story, now that the Democrats are the majority party. Now, however, the issue is not simply whether judicial nominees and Presidential appointments should require 51 or 60 votes. The issue now is by-passing the filibuster rule so that the health care system - 17 percent of the entire economy - can be handed over to the government by a simple majority vote rather than the 60 votes required by the current filibuster rules.

Five years ago, Democrats believed that by-passing the filibuster would destroy the government.

Five years ago, Senator Schumer believed:

"We are on the precipice of a crisis, a Constitutional crisis. The checks and balances which have been at the core of this Republic are about to be evaporated by the nuclear option."

Then-Senator Joe Biden said:

"The nuclear option is ultimately an example of the arrogance of power. It is a fundamental power grab. I say to my friends on the Republican side: you may own the field right now, but you won't own it forever. And I pray God that when the Democrats take back control we don't make the kind of naked power grab you are doing." (Senate chamber 5/23/05)

What irony. If the Democrats proceed with their version of the nuclear option, it will be none other than Joe Biden who will make it happen. As President of the Senate, he is the only person who can overrule the Parliamentarian who will have to recommend the removal of all policy matters from the bill. There's wisdom in the old adage "be careful what you pray for."

This "naked power grab" the Democrats are trying to exercise is far worse than anything the Republicans ever threatened. The so-called "reconciliation" process is a special rule authored by Democrat Senator Robert Byrd, exclusively for the event that the House and the Senate could not agree on a budget bill.

Democrat Senators Byrd and Kent Conrad have disavowed the reconciliation process as a means to pass the massive health care bill.

Then-Senator Hillary Clinton said:

"The Senate is being asked to turn itself inside out; to ignore the precedents, to ignore the way our system has worked, the delicate balance we have obtained that has kept this Constitutional system going – for the immediate gratification of the present President." (Senate chamber 5/23/05)

Hillary was talking about then-President Bush, who only wanted an up or down vote on his judicial nominees. How perfectly appropriate are her comments - now applied to Obama - who wants to "...ignore the way our system has worked, the delicate balance we have obtained that has kept this Constitutional system going..." and ram through this take-over of the entire health care system.

Senate Majority Leader, Harry Reid's comments are also appropriate:

"No, we're not going to follow the Senate rule, no, because of the arrogance of power of this Republican (insert Democrat here) Administration." (Senate chamber 5/18/05)

Perhaps Senator Baucus' comments are most appropriate:

"This is the way democracy ends. Not with a bomb, but with a gavel." (Senate chamber 5/19/05)

The Democrat's rampage against the Republican threat to bypass the filibuster rule [can be seen here](#).

The Marxist majority in Washington is determined to take control over health care. They want it all, now. If they can't get it all, they will take whatever they can get now, and come back and back and back again, until they get the entire economy under government control. This is the obvious goal of this administration and of the Democrat leadership. This end justifies any means for these people.

For the rest of the people, this means an end to the arrogance of Democratic power in November.

Obamacare: shortcut to socialism

By Henry Lamb

The official title is the “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act,” ([bill text here](#)) popularly known as “Obamacare,” passed by the Senate in the wee-hours of Christmas Eve. This 2400-page monstrosity does what no enemy of America has ever been able to do: transform the land of the free into the home of the enslaved.

For the first time in the history of the nation, the federal government will force its citizens to purchase a product.

If Americans – through their elected officials – accept this principle, there is nothing to prevent the federal government from forcing its citizens to purchase any other product that the government decides its citizens should have.

Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the federal government to require its citizens to purchase anything. The writers of this bill, however, conclude that even though insurance sales may be limited by each state, health insurance is still sold across state lines, and therefore is subject to federal regulations under the commerce clause, and that regulatory authority includes the authority to force citizens to purchase health insurance, whether they want it or not.

Individuals who fail to purchase the required insurance will be fined 1/12 of the annual cost of the required insurance with penalties “not to exceed 300 percent.”(Chapter 48, Section 5000A, Page 321 ff)

As bad as this legislation is, it is just the first step toward a much worse condition: government control of health care.

That’s the plan.

Like a master snake-oil salesman, Obama loudly condemns the horrible insurance companies that increase rates and make profits, as the reason the government must act to provide relief to consumers.

He ignores the fact that increased rates are required to pay the increased costs of providing health care service. He ignores the fact that much of the increased cost of service is the unintended consequence of government’s involvement in health care.

There are two primary reasons why health care is unaffordable for some citizens: (1) the misguided belief of some that everyone has a “right” to health care; and (2) government’s efforts to provide health care to everyone, including people who are in our country illegally.

In its effort to provide more health care to more people, the government has distorted the market and the consequence has been removal of the cost factor from the consumer. In a free market, the consumer is king. It is the purchase that triggers the flow of money. Providers compete for the consumer’s purchase by offering products and services at prices low enough to incite the consumer to

act. Consumers shop and compare, denying dollars to providers whose price is too high or service is too low.

Enter the government. Medicare offers an excellent example. Consumers no longer care about price; the government will pay. The cost of service is not a deterrent. Consumers are thereby encouraged to consume at will. Providers no longer care about winning the customer's purchase; the government will pay. Moreover, the government will pay what the government wants to pay, so there is no incentive for the provider to compete in price or service. Since government is paying a fixed fee for products and services, suppliers throughout the system seek ways to maximize payment. Over time, they get really good at it. That's why the actual cost of Medicare has vastly outstripped its estimated costs.

These increased costs permeate the industry, and apply to non-Medicare patients as well. That's why insurance companies are forced to increase rates. In a real free market, consumers would be able to shop different insurance companies to find the best service at the best rate.

Enter the government – again. Government limits the choices consumers have. Obamacare will limit private choices even further by imposing regulations that will force private companies out of business.

When government is paying for health care, government dictates the quantity, quality and price of the care. The costs that are not extracted as premiums or co-pay will be extracted as increased taxes.

When government is paying for health care, there are no choices, there are no options. Every life is subject to whatever requirements the government may choose to impose. Smokers, for example, could be denied certain services – should the government so decide. Overweight people could be denied certain services unless they meet government-imposed weight limits. Seniors could be denied life-extending procedures should the government decide that the cost is greater than the benefit.

Perhaps the worst consequence of Obamacare is the expansion of a culture that depends upon government; that teaches that government can bestow rights, whether to health care, or education, or a living wage, or all the other so-called rights listed in the [socialists' agenda](#).

Obamacare, if enacted, is indeed a shortcut to socialism.

The goal is control

By Henry Lamb

Whether they are called Democrats, Socialists, Marxists, or Progressives, the current leadership in Washington has but one goal: control. The current leadership has demonstrated its belief that government must control virtually every facet of the economy, of politics, and the life of every citizen.

With unprecedented arrogance, this leadership manufactured nearly two trillion dollars with which to exercise its control over the banking industry, the auto industry, and over virtually every other entity that was persuaded to take the federal handouts. Government is now firmly in control and working overtime to expand its control

Since the turn of the 20th century, progressives have championed the idea of universal health care delivered by government. No other program touches so many lives with such absolute control as does the delivery of health care. When government is in control, it is government that decides what services and procedures will be provided, to whom, and when. When government is in control, it is government that decides how much doctors and nurses will be paid, how much hospitals will be paid and how much will be paid for drugs.

People who have been disappointed by the brick wall an insurance company can build will not believe the impenetrable barrier that government can build when a bureaucracy is in control. In a free market, there is always another insurance company; when government is in control, there is no alternative.

Government control doesn't end with health care. The feds are taking control over student loans. On the pretext of eliminating profit to the greedy bankers, the federal government will begin making loans directly to students. Some shallow thinkers may welcome this progressive innovation - until the government begins directing students into fields of study of the government's choosing. When government is the only lender, it is a simple matter to make funds available for those subjects the government wants to promote, and deny funds for study in those fields the government wants to discourage.

The government exercises this kind of control every day in every lending program it operates. Farmers who depend on federal loans for spring planting must plant what the government approves, and jump through all kind of additional hoops to do exactly what the federal bureaucrats require before one dollar is disbursed. Control is the name of the game.

Pushed by progressive, the USDA tried for years to impose a National Animal Identification System which sought to require every person who owned even one of any of 29 species of livestock animals to register his premises - with GPS coordinates – in a federal database, tag every animal owed with a government-issued number, and report to the government within 24 hours every time an animal left the registered premises for any reason.

Citizen pushback has forced the USDA to back up and take a different approach. Now it appears that the leadership is formulating the same kind of controls for everyone who produces any kind of food, as well as livestock owners. There is just no end to the ways this progressive philosophy seeks to quash freedom in order to control the people.

Progressives in Congress are determined to take control over [every drop of water](#) in the nation.

Despite having been rejected in the past, promoters of the “National ID Card” are at it again. These folks are hell-bent on forcing every American to have a government-issued identification card that contains whatever information the government decides you must make available to whoever swipes your card.

It continues to worsen. The feds have promoted Comprehensive Planning laws for states to enact. Local communities have embraced these plans as evidence of their progressive thinking – and to get billions in federal “Sustainable Development” grants. These plans have no appreciation for individual freedom or private property rights. The City of Gilbert, AZ has [banished Bible study](#) in a private home. Some cities dictate the color each home must be painted; others dictate the length and species of lawn grass. Most counties now have an “Urban Boundary Zone” beyond which municipal services are not available. This destroys property values outside the zone and inflates the value of property inside the zone. It is government control instead of a free market.

It’s almost as if the U.S. Constitution did not exist. The congressional powers enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, have, for all practical purposes, been erased. The 4th Amendment that guarantees security from government without a warrant is routinely ignored. The 10th Amendment that reserves all powers not granted to the federal government to the states and to the people – has been rendered meaningless.

Unless this entire crowd of progressive control-freaks is booted well beyond the D.C. Beltway in the next election, America will continue to spiral downward, deeper into a government-controlled hell-hole.

If once is good twice is better

By Henry Lamb

Obama is so happy with his new health insurance program he has decided to launch a new auto insurance program as well. He is convinced that his program will provide coverage for all those uninsured motorists now on the nation's highways, reduce costs, and finally, provide the protection every driver has a right to enjoy.

The new bill, called "Driver's Protection and Coverage Act," will require every insurance company to guarantee coverage to every driver who applies. No longer will people be denied coverage just because they have been arrested for driving under the influence, or speeding, or for having had multiple accidents in the past. Moreover, insurance companies will no longer be able to discriminate against people with poor driving records, or against people who drive expensive cars. Everyone will pay the same premium.

"The American people are tired of being gouged by greedy insurance companies," Obama said. "We're leveling the playing field; we're giving America's drivers the coverage they deserve."

The new bill also requires all auto insurance companies to pay out 85% of their total premium revenue in claims, or in refunds to policy holders. This absolutely guarantees that the insurance companies will no longer be able to pay outrageous dividends to shareholders or fat-cat salaries and bonuses to executives. Every insurance company will have to operate on no more than 15% of its revenue.

Individuals and families who can't afford insurance will be given subsidies. A new tax on gasoline, automobiles, and insurance companies will provide the funding for the subsidies.

"Not one cent will be added to the deficit because of this program," Obama assured an audience in Topeka. "This program is deficit neutral, and it will create thousands of new jobs."

As might be expected, insurance companies are not happy with this new scheme.

Geico's gecko vowed to resign should the bill become law and a spokesman for Allstate said they would wash their hands of the entire mess.

Emboldened by his recent success with health care, Obama is determined to move forward. Senator Reid and Speaker Pelosi have had two meetings with Rahm Emanuel, which Washington watchers say were to plan strategy for the new auto initiative. And this could be just the beginning.

Representative Maxine Waters is said to be circulating a petition among members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to apply the same profit principle to Exxon and the oil industry. Although the petition has not yet been made public, Representatives who have seen it report that it makes the argument that "...since we have successfully limited the insurance industry to a 15% operating margin, why can we not limit the oil industry, and every other profiteering capitalist corporation to the same

guidelines.” Every member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus voted for Obamacare, and they have expressed support for the auto insurance bill.

When confronted by a reporter from FOX News, Representative Waters denied that the petition idea came from the Democratic Socialists of America.

Marxist is as Marxist does

By Henry Lamb

People who believe that health care is a right instead of a privilege embrace a fundamental principle of Marxism. This philosophy is built on the idea that workers are the source of productivity and must not be exploited by kings or capitalists; that workers must control their own destiny. This is the foundation of socialism. The [Democratic Socialists of America](#) admit that:

“We are not a separate party. Like our friends and allies in the feminist, labor, civil rights, religious, and community organizing movements, many of us have been active in the Democratic Party. We work with those movements to strengthen the party’s left wing, represented by the [Congressional Progressive Caucus](#).”

This belief system, articulated eloquently by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their [Communist Manifesto](#), envisions the perfect society to be one in which everyone shares equally in work and wealth, coordinated by a hierarchy of representatives chosen from the workers. The Democratic Party considers its leaders to be that hierarchy, empowered to do whatever it takes to redistribute society’s wealth more equitably.

Despite the ridicule and denials that spew forth from the Democrats, the enactment of Obamacare is a victory for Marxism in the United States, recognized and publicly acknowledged by [Al Sharpton](#). What Democrats have done is absolutely consistent with Marxism; the way it was done provides a course in this Marxist principle: the end justifies the means.

Marxists, Socialists, Communists, and Democrats have been trying for most of the century to advance a [Marxist agenda](#). Woodrow Wilson implemented two major Marxist principles: the central bank and the income tax.

Germany, in particular, and Europe in general, were much more successful in advancing a Marxist agenda, including universal health care. The influence of Marx and Engels, and other collectivists, was much greater in Europe than in the United States early in the 20th century.

Franklin Roosevelt pushed the Marxist agenda quite hard and was partially successful. Social Security, enacted in 1935, was a major step. While the goal of creating a mechanism to ensure that senior citizens had retirement income was laudable, the Marxist notion that government could do it better than free enterprise condemned the program to constant shortfalls, ever-increasing taxes, and eventual failure. How much better would it be now, if Congress in 1935 had chosen to simply allow the creation of individual retirement accounts in which untaxed principle and interest would be the property of the citizen for use after retirement?

Roosevelt and the Democrats believed the time was right in 1943 to introduce the first real legislation to create a universal health care system. A bill, known as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill (H.R. 2861),

launched a Congressional debate that continued until the 1964 election of Lyndon Johnson. He brought an overwhelming majority of Democrats to Washington: 66 to 34 in the Senate and 295 to 140 in the House.

[Medicare and Medicaid](#) were highlights of his “Great Society” in 1965. Originally, the plan cost each beneficiary \$3 per month. In 2009, Medicare Part A cost 2.9 percent of payroll, and Part B cost \$96.40 per month. This program, combined with Social Security shortfalls, faces [unfunded liabilities](#) totaling \$106.8 trillion – that’s TRILLION with a capital T. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that to meet this liability, the range of income tax rates will have to increase from the current 10 to 35 percent, to 26 to 92 percent.

Marxists, Socialists, Communists, and Democrats are unfazed by this reality. They believe it is their moral duty to take whatever is necessary from the rich, to give to the poor whatever they consider to be a civil right. Like Marxists around the world, Democrats have always believed that universal health care is a right, not a privilege. Just as the cost of Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid have exploded way beyond the projections promised at the time of enactment, the real cost of Obamacare will make a mockery of the published estimates. Democrats couldn’t care less because, like all Marxists, they believe in the second principle from the [Communist Manifesto](#): that government should impose “A heavy progressive or graduated income tax” to pay the costs of their agenda.

The Marxist agenda being advanced by the current Washington majority will not stop with Obamacare. Another principle from the Manifesto is the “Centralization of the means of communication and transportation in the hands of the state.” The new push to create a federal ID card is the means toward controlling transportation, and Obama’s choice for the FCC Diversity Czar, Mark Lloyd is [on the record](#) supporting the Marxist principle of government-controlled communications.

The first principle of the Communist Manifesto, the abolition of private property, has been high on the Democrats priority list for most of the century. They continue to use tax dollars to buy private property when necessary, take it whenever possible, or control it through regulations when all else fails.

Passage of Obamacare is the most dramatic step forward for the Marxist agenda in more than a generation. It must be undone. The U.S. Constitution does not authorize the federal government to force people to purchase insurance – unless the people allow it. The people must not allow it. This Marxist agenda must be stopped, and the only way to stop it is to remove the Marxist advocates from Congress and the White House.

A skunk by any other name...

By Henry Lamb

People who follow the teaching of Buddha are called Buddhists. People who follow the teaching of Christ are called Christians. People who follow the teaching of Karl Marx are called Marxists, except in the United States, where they prefer to be called Democrats.

In the United States, people who oppose the teaching of Karl Marx are called a variety of names that include teabagger, trailer-trash, and even domestic terrorist. In fact, the primary defense used by Democrats against the Marxist label is [arrogant, condescending ridicule](#).

Obama says his critics accuse him of using a “socialist” mop to clean up the mess he inherited.

Socialism, according to Marx, is the transition between capitalism and communism; both political systems are based on the teaching of Karl Marx.

The [Socialist Party USA](#) “...stands for a socialized health care system based on universal coverage, salaried doctors and health care workers, and revenues derived from a steeply graduated income tax.”

Obama [agrees with this goal](#) and his Democratic majority in Congress has delivered the first major step toward this most important plank in the Socialist Party’s platform.

The Socialist Party Platform says: “The Socialist Party stands for municipal ownership and control of energy plants, in a non-profit and decentralized, but coordinated, system that ensures the most careful use of natural resources.”

During a legislative hearing, Democrat Representative Maxine Waters threatened a government [takeover of the entire oil industry](#).

The Socialist Platform says: “We call for public ownership and democratic control of all our natural resources in order to conserve resources, preserve our wilderness areas, and restore environmental quality.”

Even though the government already owns nearly 42 percent of all the land in the United States, Democrats have introduced [S-787](#) which will take virtually all water from private owners, state and local governments, and give it to the federal government. It will also give legal jurisdiction over “...all activities affecting these waters” to the federal government. Enactment of this bill will effectively deliver this plank in the Socialist’s platform.

The Socialist Platform says: “The U.S. must immediately return to participation in international agreements, such as the Kyoto Protocol, limiting carbon emissions, and accept a major role in worldwide efforts to control global warming.”

The [New York Times](#) reported that “within weeks of taking office, President Obama has radically shifted the global equation, placing the United States at the forefront of the international climate effort and raising hopes that an effective international accord might be possible.”

The Socialist Platform says: “We call for all financial and insurance institutions to be socially owned and operated by a democratically-controlled national banking authority.”

The federal government is on course to implement this socialist platform plank. It started with the [takeover of AIG](#) and other financial institutions. It continued with the [takeover of student loans](#). Senator Dodd has even introduced a bill to create a new [banking authority](#) (Section 111, page 20).

The Socialist Platform says: “We call for recognizing a union based on cards signed.”

[Obama promised](#) “Card Check” to the unions, and more than 200 Democrats have co-sponsored HR800 – the Employee Free Choice Act – which will end the requirement for workers to vote by secret ballot to form a union, and require nothing more than a majority of workers to sign a card. Democrats can’t wait to implement the Socialist Party’s agenda.

Read all of the [Socialist Party Platform](#). Study the website of the [Democratic Socialists of America](#). Learn how the [communists in Alabama](#) brought about the civil rights movement. Read the [Communist Manifesto](#). The more you learn about Marxism, socialism, and communism, the more you will recognize the agenda of the Democratic Party.

Public schools no longer teach the principles of Marxism or why every nation that embraces Marxism eventually fails. Schools no longer teach principles of freedom and free markets. Instead, schools have become propaganda mills with curricula designed to instill beliefs rather than to teach discovery using the scientific method; to shape attitudes rather than to teach facts; to promote acceptance of the collective good as a value greater than personal achievement. Obama’s takeover of student loan funding will ensure that the students who get loans will be those who pursue this vision of public education.

Marxism in a free society is like a cancer. It grows and spreads and infiltrates every facet of society, always demanding more taxes to provide universal health care, a living wage, adequate housing, education, and other entitlements, until eventually, there are no more taxes to take.

The only cure for Marxist cancer is radical surgery. The first of two necessary operations is scheduled for November 2, 2010.

Obama's private army?

By Henry lamb

Who knew that Obamacare provides for a "Regular Corps," and a "Ready-Reserve Corps," of officers and individuals who are appointed by the President? Commissioned officers are subject to active duty at the call of the Surgeon General. The new law provides \$17.5 million in each of the first four years to recruit and train these reserves.

During his campaign, [Obama said](#) "We cannot continue to rely only on our military...we've got to have a civilian security force just as powerful, just as strong, just as well-funded. We cannot continue to rely only on our military in order to achieve the national security objectives we've set."

Section 5210 of the Patient's Protection and Affordable Care Act (a.k.a. Obamacare) may be the beginning of Obama's civilian security force. This section amends Section 203 of the U.S. Public Health Service Act. Why it was included in the massive health care bill is a question in search of meaningful answers. Judge Andrew Napolitano from FOX News [has a few questions](#) of his own,.

The new law says "The purpose of the Ready Reserve Corps is to fulfill the need to have additional Commissioned Corps personnel available on short notice (similar to the uniformed service's reserve program) to assist regular Commissioned Corps personnel to meet both routine public health and emergency response missions."

The law requires the Ready Reserve to participate in "routine training" to meet the general and specific needs of the Commissioned Corps. The Ready Reserve "shall" be ready for involuntary calls to active duty. The Ready Reserve must be prepared to respond to orders from the President to go anywhere in the country, or anywhere outside the country.

It's hard to see how such a civilian security force under the direct control of the President might be justified, in view of the [Posse Comitatus Act](#) of 1878. This law prohibits the federal government from using federal troops for law enforcement purposes within the United States.

This is the law that prevented President Bush from sending the military into New Orleans immediately after Katrina. The federal government may not send in the troops without a specific request from the state. After Katrina hit, the federal government was ready to respond, but could not until the request was made from the state.

Language in Obamacare seems to remove this prohibition. The law says the Ready Reserve Corps: "...shall be available and ready for involuntary calls to active duty during national emergencies and public health crises, similar to the uniformed service reserve personnel." Since the President declares national emergencies and public health crises, it would seem that this new Ready Reserve Corps need not be concerned about the Posse Comitatus law.

What, exactly, will the Ready Reserve Corps do in the event of a national emergency or public health crisis that the National Guard is not already doing? If more people are required, simply increase the recruiting goals. There is no need to create a new branch of service with its attendant bureaucracy and officer corps.

This is exceedingly dangerous ground. The Constitution does not give the federal government any police power. In fact, the Constitution requires the federal government to stay out of the states' business except in the very limited ways expressly authorized by the Constitution.

Obama has already expressed his contempt for the idea that the Constitution limits the power of the federal government. There is not an enumerated power that authorizes the federal government to force individuals to purchase anything. Nevertheless, Obamacare forces individuals to purchase health insurance.

Democratic Representative Phil Hare spoke for 220 Congressional Democrats when he blatantly said [he didn't care about the Constitution](#).

With this demonstrated disregard for the Constitution by both the President and the Congressional majority, the new Ready Reserve Corps could, indeed, be the beginning of Obama's new civil security force. Recruits are already being prepared. This [short video](#) shows a class in a charter school in Kansas City which provides an example of what to expect.

Obama promised that when he was elected, he would "fundamentally transform America." Perhaps voters naïvely thought that he meant ending corruption, back-room deals, partisan bickering, and the arrogance that seems to infect Washington politicians. It is clear now that what he meant was a transformation from a democratic Republic to a Marxist autocracy. Rather than making government more open and transparent, as he promised, he brought his Chicago hit squad to Washington to twist arms and pull fingernails, when necessary, to gain control over his domain.

Obama's army is quick to label opponents as right-wing racist radicals in an effort to discredit them. This label might be considered a badge of honor because it is not bestowed upon Marxists and their supporters. If a Marxist is a person who accepts the philosophy of Karl Marx, and an American is a person who accepts the philosophy of the U.S. Constitution, then it is possible to be a Marxist in America, but it is not possible to be an American and a Marxist. The two philosophies are mutually exclusive.

What's really behind the Tea Parties?

By Henry Lamb

President Obama thinks the nation-wide Tea Party is built around a [small core group](#) of people who believe he is a socialist, born somewhere other than in America. Nancy Pelosi believes that the Tea Party is "[Astroturf](#)," a group of people funded by big-business Republicans, to protest against Democrats. The new website, [CrashTheTeaParties](#), believes the Tea Parties are "...a loose affiliation of racists, homophobes, and morons who constitute the fake grass-roots movement which calls itself 'The Tea Party.'"

Wow! How wrong can these people be?

The Tea Parties are a natural phenomenon caused by a periodic shift in society's tectonic plates. When the "government-control" plate slips slightly over the "freedom" plate, there is bound to be an uprising.

The election in 2008, followed by the magnet-like attraction to Washington of dozens of "Czars," all specialists in some form of government control, set off seismic activity deep beneath the political apathy to which the nation was accustomed. Consequently, Tea Parties have risen across the nation, and they are still building. Knowledgeable forecasters predict that the "freedom" forces will not likely subside until the "government-control" forces are well under control.

Neither Obama, Pelosi, nor the anonymous [Astroturf](#) owner of the [CrashTheTeaParty](#) website, have any idea of the power that underlies the Tea Party movement.

Long before the eruption, millions of freedom-loving Americans were meeting in thousands of groups in every state, studying the forces that continually work to erode individual freedom and private property rights. In Alabama, for example, the [Alliance for Citizens Rights](#) has been conducting meetings in local communities for years. Ordinary citizens attend these meetings after work, to learn about local ordinances that impact their daily life.

At one of these community meetings in Cullman, Alabama, Enna Miles told the group that her aunt had been visited by the Code Enforcement Officer who threatened to fine her \$150 per day if she planted tomatoes in her back yard.

Ordinary citizens know that this kind of government control is not right, but they did not realize how it became law. The goal of groups such as the Alliance for Citizens Rights is to teach citizens not only how this government-control became law, but how to repeal it, and how to prevent it. These are the people who are now populating the Tea Parties, demanding an end to the government-control policies issued from Washington, imposed on the states, and implemented in local communities.

Norman Davis has led the [Take Back Kentucky](#) group for years. Hundreds of ordinary citizens who work every day just to earn a living, meet at least once a month in various locations around the state to learn

what the federal government and the state legislature are doing. During the state legislative session, it is not unusual, at one of these meetings, to find 40 or 50 people gathered in a reserved dining room in a local restaurant, staring at a screen where Norman is explaining a bill that has been introduced either in Congress or the state legislature.

It's amazing. With a laptop computer and a projector, the bill is displayed for study by the group. There is no hoopla, no white robes and hoods, no cross-burning, there are just ordinary Americans learning what their elected officials are doing to them.

They also learn how to let their elected officials know how they feel about the bills that they read. This Kentucky group may be the most effective grass-roots organization in the nation when it comes to helping their legislators understand what the people want – and don't want.

The group employs telephone and email circles. Norman emphasizes the need to have communication "circles," instead of "trees." When an alert is issued, the message goes around the entire circle and ends back with the originator. This way, the originator knows the message was delivered to everyone in the group. When the "tree" structure is used, the originator never knows whether the message is delivered or not. The "circle" system has worked exceedingly well in Kentucky, and in dozens of other communities where Norman has conducted training sessions.

This is what the Tea Parties do. Contrary to what the media portrays, these people do far more than make signs and costumes. For the most part, these are some of the most knowledgeable people you will ever meet, when it comes to domestic issues and foreign policy. They read. They study. They debate. They disagree. They get worked up. They save their money and buy a seat on a bus to Washington to tell their elected officials we're "Taxed Enough Already!"

Washington had better listen.

The Tea Parties that have erupted across the nation so far are simply precursors of what is to come. Some forecasters are predicting a major eruption sometime this fall, perhaps as early as November. Others say the November event will cause a tsunami that will wash across Congress. There is some indication that the anticipated November event, as devastating as it might be, will itself be a precursor of even bigger events to come.

Philip Dru Obama

By Henry Lamb

Philip Dru is a fictional character created by Colonel Edward Mandell House. House was a political activist in Texas before becoming campaign manager for Woodrow Wilson. For eight years, House was Wilson's Czar-in-chief, and worked to fundamentally transform the United States of America into a government that operated like the government in his novel: [Philip Dru: Administrator](#).

Barack Obama must have read that book, and loved it. His performance in office is quite similar to the performance of Philip Dru. Philip Dru believed that:

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

Listen to [Obama explain](#) why he believes that the Constitution is “...an imperfect document, and deeply flawed...”

Dru believed that government and labor should be represented on the board of every corporation, and that “...his country was debased by the power of wealth, under the thin guise of the constitutional protection of property.” Dru also believed that Congress was an unnecessary obstacle to good lawmaking, and thus, he eventually bypassed it.

The similarity between Philip Dru and Barack Obama is uncanny. Obama set out immediately to create an “Administrator” type of government by naming more than 30 Czars that bypassed Congressional approval and oversight, each with administrative power and responsible only to the Administrator-in-chief.

Obama wasted no time getting representatives of government on the boards of the auto industry and in effective control of much of the financial industry. He has publicly pledged to support “[Card Check](#)” and has favored unions over management at every opportunity.

Dru believed that “...the property and lives of all” should be under the protection of the Administrator, who alone, had the power to make laws (pp 154, 221).

Every action Obama has taken during the 15 months he's been in office has been designed to put the lives and property of every citizen and corporation - under the “protection” (read: control) of the government.

He plunged the nation into debt to the tune of nearly a trillion dollars with his so-called “recovery” act. He transferred to government control nearly 16 percent of the economy and complete control over health care for the entire nation with his so-called health care reform act. He is now planning to take control over the entire financial industry with his so-called [financial reform act](#). This proposal goes way beyond regulation and is, in fact, government control of the financial industry.

The 89-page reform proposal was prepared by the Department of the Treasury. It calls for the creation of a new “Financial Services Oversight Council,” to be chaired (surprise, surprise) by the Secretary of the Treasury. The new Council will supersede the authority of all other financial regulatory agencies and will have a completely new staff, housed (surprise, surprise) in the Department of the Treasury.

It will create a Consumer Financial Protection Agency, another new bureaucracy with extraordinary rule-making and enforcement authority. This could well be the government’s “Brown Shirts” for the financial industry.

Obama is true to one of his campaign promises: he is fundamentally changing the United States of America into a nation totally controlled by government. The Constitution – which Obama believes to be flawed – created a government controlled by the people. Apparently, Obama believes this idea to be “...obsolete, even grotesque.”

Some form of the Cap & Tax bill will be front and center soon. It too, will be forced upon the people one way or the other. If the Senate balks, look for the EPA to implement new penalties administratively – for producing carbon dioxide. It’s coming.

The emergence of discussion about a Value Added Tax (VAT) is no accident. Regardless of how it is downplayed by the White House, it is a major part of the White House agenda. The incredible debt incurred by the Obama administration, combined with his ambitious government-control agenda, has to be funded. The VAT provides a way that the administration can say it will be a temporary tax, designed to eliminate the debt. Who can be against eliminating the debt?

The VAT will not be temporary, nor will its use be limited to debt retirement. Obama is following the same procedure used throughout Europe where the “temporary” VAT now ranges from 15 percent in Cyprus, to 25 percent in Norway and several other countries.

Philip Dru Obama is making unbelievable progress towards converting the United States to an “Administrator” type government under the control of his personally-chosen sub-administrators. His policies ignore the Constitution and the expressed will of the American people. The nation Obama is building is looking much more like the socialist nations in Europe, than the free-market America our founders created.

Obama can be stopped. It will take more than 41 Senators and 177 Representatives in Congress. It will take a majority in both houses of Congress who still believe in the U.S. Constitution, and that the government it created is the most perfect societal organization yet devised. Now is the time to be choosing incumbents to be replaced and finding new candidates who can replace them.

The litmus test should be simply to replace incumbents who support Philip Dru Obama’s brand of government, with new candidates who have demonstrated a belief in, and love for, the U. S. Constitution

Winning the battle for freedom

By Henry Lamb

The people of Houston County, Minnesota have found the way to protect themselves, and their property, from the abuses of government-run-amuck in pursuit of sustainable development. The county adopted a comprehensive plan consistent with the goals of sustainable development, but which completely ignored the U.S. Constitution and the principles of freedom.

A [local citizens group](#) tried to work with the County Commissioners in the development of the County's comprehensive plan two years ago, but opposing views and a petition signed by more than 700 land owners was not considered by the plan makers.

The citizen's group has now presented the county with a [notice of intent to sue](#), based on three complaints: (1) the plan violates Minnesota's state Constitution and the U.S. Constitution; (2) the county's implementation of the plan exceeds the authority given to counties by state law; (3) the county's actions in pursuit of the plan violate the Minnesota Constitution and the U.S. Constitution.

The notice of intent cites [Dolan vs the city of Tigard](#), which says if the Fifth Amendment is to have any meaning, "It must include the right to prevent the government from gaining an ownership interest in one's property outside the procedures of the Takings Clause."

The document describes multiple examples of how the county exercised ownership interest in deciding how privately owned property could be used. At least 27 times, the county prevented a landowner from building a second home on privately owned parcels of less than 40 acres. In other examples, the county forced land owners to build in a location other than where the owner wanted to build.

In another example of the county's exercise of ownership interest, a land owner wanted to replace an old mobile home with a new one, on the same site where a well and septic tank were already in place. The county said no, and forced the land owner to locate the new mobile home across the road on land used for crops, where a new well and septic tank had to be installed.

The 36-page notice is filled with similar examples of how the county plan violates the Constitution, the law, and common sense. The county has 30 days to respond.

The land owners have extended an olive branch to the commissioners. In a separate letter to the county, the land owners' group said they would appoint a small committee to work with the commissioners to correct the defects in the plan, providing that the county would officially adopt, as the basis for the county comprehensive plan, the same resolution signed by 700 local landowners.

The resolution the county commissioners were asked to adopt says:

- (1) Land use planning and zoning is governed by the United States and Minnesota Constitutions, as well as Minnesota law;

(2) These laws include the prohibition against the taking of private property for a public purpose without due process and just compensation;

(3) The purpose of land use planning and zoning is to promote public safety and welfare, not to regulate the legitimate use of private property;

(4) While permits may be needed for issues related to construction of a dwelling, sewer, water, etc., those permits shall not be approved or denied for arbitrary reasons;

(5) In order to preserve agriculture land uses, landowners may have to use their private property for additional economic uses other than the cultivation of crops, in order for those agricultural uses to be sustainable; and

(6) The neighbors should have strong voice in the outcome of controversial land use decisions but this voice in the use of the neighbor's property should be weighed as "harm" not just "personal choice."

The jury is still out on how Houston County will deal with this well-informed group of local citizens.

Every community that faces the same kind of excessive intrusion by government in the name of sustainable development can take a lesson from the Minnesota group. First, there needs to be a group organized to achieve a common, well-defined goal.

The Minnesota group sought expert advice from the Budd-Falen law firm in Wyoming. They adopted a conciliatory approach, rather than confrontation, but they were prepared to play hard ball if necessary. They did their homework to find specific examples of government excess and gathered irrefutable documentation. They are determined to prevail, but are politically astute.

They are giving their commissioners a perfect way to save face while solving the problems, and doing it in a way that will allow the commissioners to claim that they are the protectors of the Constitution and private property rights.

This group has been working for more than four years to protect their property rights from the insidious, freedom-eroding, comprehensive plans promoted in the name of sustainable development. They have gone about their task in an orderly, non-confrontational manner, and they are gaining the upper hand. They have become a beacon of leadership for countless other groups across the country fighting the same fight.

This is how freedom will survive: person by person, community by community, state by state, and nation by nation. The battle begins at home.

What's a government to do?

By Henry Lamb

The government of the United States of America exists for one purpose, according to the Declaration of Independence: to secure the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, endowed to every individual by their Creator. The people who adopted this profound declaration knew only too well the heavy weight of government oppression. In addition to declaring the purpose of the government they were creating, they wrote and adopted another document: the Constitution of the United States of America.

The Declaration of Independence declares the purpose of government; the Constitution declares the source and limit of power entrusted to the new government by its creators.

From the outset, there have been people who disagreed with the underlying philosophy on which the Declaration and Constitution were constructed, but they were distinctly in the minority for the first century or so. In the last half-century, this paradigm – and the purpose of government – has been shifting.

The purpose of government is no longer to “secure the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” for every individual. The purpose of government today is to dictate to every individual what he may or may not do, and to impose a fee for the privilege of doing it.

The people who created the United States wanted their government to defend them from invading enemies who might inflict bodily harm and steal their property. They wanted a system of law that dealt justice equally to all who would dare harm or damage their neighbors. They wanted a system of standard weights and measures and money to facilitate free and fair trade among the people.

The people who created the United States did not want their government involved in their personal affairs. In fact, the Constitution says quite explicitly that no government official may enter the private property of an individual without a warrant signed by a judge, after a sworn affidavit of probable cause of a crime.

No one remembers the first time the federal government ignored this limitation of power and sent an official into private property without a warrant for whatever purpose seemed justified at the moment. Now, no one questions the Environmental Protection Agency official who can show up on your property to declare that the ditch you are digging is polluting the waters of the United States.

Most employees of the Department of Agriculture – and too many in Congress – believe that government has every right to send its agents onto a private farm to count the number of livestock animals, to retrieve all sorts of information about the source, age, and movements of these animals, and to require the owner to report his activities to the government on a regular basis.

The Constitution was not amended; how did the government gain all this new, unspecified power?

While government honors the Constitutional prohibition from entering private property without a properly executed warrant, the people are in control of government. The moment government successfully violates this limitation - government is in control of the people.

Neither the federal, state, nor local governments pay any attention at all to this Constitutional limitation. Since the 1990s, a tidal wave of “Sustainable Development” has swept across the nation leaving in its wake so-called “Sustainable Communities” that are in reality, cages that contain people who must live precisely as government dictates.

Sustainable Communities are defined by comprehensive plans, often mandated by state government through laws prescribed and incentivized by the federal government. Typically, these comprehensive plans mandate the adoption of a series of “[International Codes](#)” which set forth requirements that must be met by private owners. Failure to conform to these requirements can mean fines, jail, and even the confiscation of property.

How does a nation of people thirsting for freedom so fervently that they were willing to fight the King of England to win it, move to a nation of people who allow its government to impose far more onerous taxes and living restrictions than the King of England ever did? Not only does this nation now allow its government to impose these unauthorized powers, many people celebrate the new “sustainable” (read: government-managed) society.

The moment the United States government gained and began to exercise control over its people is the moment the United States began its descent. The nation is no longer the sum total of the pursuit of happiness of its individuals, but is becoming the managed product of the current power brokers.

The moment the people realize that government control is extinguishing their freedom is the moment revolution is kindled. This moment occurred the first time in 1776. The threat of the loss of freedom to foreign powers produced overwhelming responses in the last century. The current threat of the loss of freedom to well-meaning central planners will – sooner or later – have to answer to, and finally yield to the unstoppable power of free people.

He wasn't just whistling Dixie!

By Henry Lamb

He said he would “fundamentally transform the United States of America.” He wasn't just whistling Dixie. He meant what he said, and he set out to do it the minute he took office.

People close to him knew exactly what he meant, and what he intended to do, and were ecstatic at the opportunity to vote for him. The vast majority of the black community who voted for him had no idea what he meant, but voted for him anyway because he was black. Southern Democrats had no idea what he meant, but voted for him anyway because he was not a Republican. Independents thought he meant that he would “change” the process in Washington and offer some “hope” for political integrity.

What he meant is now painfully clear: Obama is on a mission to transform the government of the United States of America into a government based on Marxist principles, acting to achieve Marxist objectives, using the Marxist tactic: whatever it takes.

Obama is quick to [ridicule](#) those who point out his socialist leanings. But in unguarded, unscripted moments – without the benefit of his teleprompter – he reveals [what he really believes](#) about “spreading the wealth” and limiting personal income.

He went even further in a recent speech, explaining that we have to rebuild the economy on a stronger foundation. There is no stronger foundation, of course, than a market in which people are free to become willing buyers of products and services from willing sellers at prices mutually agreed upon. It is precisely when government begins to “improve” upon this concept that the market begins to weaken and becomes less than free.

Obama says he believes in markets that are “free and open” to all who are willing to work. Then he explains how he [believes that government should intervene](#) in those markets to make them stronger. He says, for example, that government should provide loans to students to pay for tuition. Why?

There is no authority within the Constitution for the federal government to lend money to individuals. Moreover, in a free market, if there is a demand for tuition loans, the market will provide those loans. Government has neither authority nor need to be in the student loan business. Nonetheless, Obama has put the private student lenders out of business, and put the federal government in business where it has no business being.

Why? Obama's Marxist philosophy dictates that the more government controls, the better life is for all. If government controls student loans, then students will study in the fields that government wants to exploit and will not study in those areas which government wants society to avoid.

Obama believes that government should fund “basic research” and provide “incentives” for development in energy. This is not belief in a free market as he says; this is market manipulation which is the essence of Marxism.

A free market cannot tolerate tax levies placed on certain products to discourage their use, while providing subsidies for other products to encourage their use. Nevertheless, government maintains enormous bureaucracies to intervene in the market with extensive taxes and subsidies in an effort to control the market.

Obama’s actions to impose Marxist control over the market speak much louder than his words that proclaim belief in a free market.

Obama didn’t blink an eye before taking control over General Motors and Chrysler, and Wall Street institutions. His default assumption was that government had to take control; not that a self-correcting free market would sort out the winners and punish the losers. Actions always speak louder than words.

Obama’s handling of his health care agenda is the most revealing window yet on his true Marxist philosophy: whatever it takes to prevail. He promised openness; but he pursued privacy in all negotiations. He promised integrity; but he used political pressure when he could and bribes when he needed to. He proclaimed respect for the process, but in the end, he twisted the process beyond recognition. Obama couldn’t care less about a free market; his only concern is control over the government, which means, ultimately, control over the lives of its citizens.

The fundamental change Obama promised is this: a change from America’s historic Constitutional Republic form of government, to a new, modernized Marxism delivered in little bites with nifty new sound-good names: health-care reform; card-check; smart growth; cap-and-trade; comprehensive planning; and a laundry list of additional schemes, plans, and programs, all designed to tighten the government noose around the neck of every citizen.

Obama meant what he said, and he is doing exactly what he said he would do. He is fundamentally transforming the United States of America. He will undoubtedly continue this transformation until the voters transform the Marxist majority that now dominates Washington. November 2 is fumigation day.

Global Governance is here!

By Henry Lamb

Hooray for Glenn Beck! Right out there in front of God and everybody, he talks about global governance as a real and present danger. But right on cue, [progressive bloggers](#) do their best to ridicule the idea with wisdom such as this:

“Seriously, for a moment. We're going to have to address the paranoia about a global takeover at some point -- probably in easy-to-comprehend, Dick-and-Jane language -- for the Tea Party.”

Could it be that these people really don't know that global governance is already here?

As early as 1997, Gustave Speth, former head of the World Resources Institute, former Clinton transition team member, and then, head of the United Nations Development Program [told the Rio +5 gathering](#) in Rio de Janeiro that:

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

Speaking to the delegates to the U.N. Conference on Climate Change at The Hague in 2000, then- French [President Jacques Chirac said](#):

“For the first time, humanity is instituting a genuine instrument of global governance, one that should find a place within the World Environmental Organization which France and the European Union would like to see established. “

Just last month, Claude Trichet, President of the European Central Bank [told the Council on Foreign Relations](#) in New York, that:

“...the emerging economies are now economically and financially so important and systemically so influential that they must have a full and proper ownership of global governance.”

Glenn Beck is helping people realize that global governance is not an event. Global governance did not occur as the result of an invasion of blue-helmeted U.N. troops delivered in black helicopters. Instead, global governance is:

“...the framework of rules, institutions, and practices that set limits on behavior of individuals, organizations, and companies.” (U.N. Development Report, 1999, p. 34)

Few people realized that when the United States agreed to the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), March 3, 1973, that by December 28, 1973, there would be a federal law - the Endangered Species Act - “limiting the behavior of individuals, organizations, and companies” in order to comply with the “framework of rules” created by the institution called the United Nations.

Few people recognized it to be global governance when the United States endorsed the report of the [United Nations Conference on Human Settlements](#) in 1976, which said:

"Private land ownership is a principal instrument of accumulating wealth and therefore contributes to social injustice. Public control of land use is therefore indispensable."

By 1996, however, the recommendations in this report were being implemented through the President's Council on Sustainable Development, and were imposing comprehensive land use plans which mandate "...limits on behavior of individuals, organizations, and companies," as prescribed by the institution called the United Nations.

Few people paid any attention to the 1995 report of the [U.N.'s Commission on Global Governance](#) which outlined a procedure for achieving complete global governance, including the creation of a new U.N. Economic Security Council with the power to control the world's economy.

[Few people](#) dared call it global governance when the U.N.'s special High Level Panel on Financing for Development [produced a 2001 report](#) for a meeting in Monterrey, Mexico calling for global taxation, a global council to control the global economy, and for strengthening the World Trade Organization to control global trade.

Global governance has grown up around us. Except for the Reagan administration, both Democrat and Republican administrations have supported this push toward global governance. The current global economic crises are fueling the construction of the new global economic system that will swallow the U.S. economic system and make it subservient to the new global system. This new international institution, working in conjunction with a strengthened WTO and IMF, and World Bank, will result in *de facto* Global Governance.

Global governance is not a law, or resolution that requires approval of Congress; it is a process, the parts of which have already been approved by Congress, various administrations, and to a very large extent, by the American people, even though they do not recognize the result to be global governance.

Glenn Beck is in the process of discovering what global governance really is, and he is not afraid to tell his audience what he is learning, even though he knows his critics will ridicule his observations. It matters not how blatant the ridicule is, or the source from which it comes. "Global governance is here, it is here to stay, and...it will inevitably expand," unless the American people come to grips with the facts.

The American system of government that made America the greatest nation on earth cannot survive in the system of global governance being designed by the United Nations. The American system of government must be "fundamentally transformed" to fit into the European mold. This transformation is well underway.

Rand is right!

By Henry Lamb

Rand Paul told MSNBC's Rachel Maddow that he thought the Civil Rights Act might have gone too far when it required private businesses to serve all comers. He said he supported the Civil Rights Act, that government had every right to require non-discrimination in public facilities, but the government should not have the power to dictate to whom private business owners must provide services.

An individual who uses his own resources to invest in a risky business should have the absolute right and authority to decide to whom he will provide services. Rand said he detested racism in any form, and thought it would be foolish for a business owner to refuse to provide services to individuals simply because of skin color, but nonetheless, as a private business owner, he should have the right to refuse service, if he so desired.

Suddenly, "Rand is the Klan's Man," [according to a sign](#) carried by a person who must be too dense to digest what Rand actually said. Others too, including much of the media and the progressive blogs, jumped on Rand's comments with idiotic comments that completely misrepresented Rand's statements.

There are two lessons here for Kentucky's young Republican Senate nominee: it is not politically expedient to give opponents any unnecessary targets; and when opponents jump on a statement, never ever back away from it.

The issue in question is whether the government's Constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce or the authority to provide equal justice under the law can be stretched far enough to require that the owners of a private business provide services to whomever the government, rather than the business owner, decides.

There is no question that the law requires businesses to serve all comers. The question is whether this power is granted to Congress by the Constitution or not. Rand Paul says he thinks it does not. He is right. There is no reading of Article 1, Section 8 that justifies the government dictating to whom a business owner must provide services.

Is there a comparable power for Congress to dictate to private home owners that home owners must admit anyone who knocks on the door? Of course not. A person's home is his castle; ownership means that the owner has the authority to exclude or admit anyone the owner – not the government – chooses.

A person's business is his private property, an extension of his person. As such, the owner – not the government – should have the authority to exclude or admit anyone the owner chooses.

In a free market, a willing buyer should be able to purchase from a willing seller on terms that both find acceptable. When the government decides to whom a seller must sell, it becomes less than a free market.

When government decides to whom the seller must sell, and the terms upon which a sale must be made, as it did under the 1977 Housing and Community Development Act and the Clinton- era expansion under the Community Reinvestment Act, the free market is distorted to the point that disaster is inevitable.

Government intervention into the marketplace is the root cause of the housing bubble and the subsequent crash of the financial institutions that traded on the faulty mortgages guaranteed by the federal government. Finger-pointing anywhere other than directly toward government's intervention in the marketplace is misguided.

It is absolutely true that the free market denied mortgages to large segments of the community, especially to that segment of the community that lacked the income and credit worthiness to make the payments required by the mortgage.

Had the market been left alone, there would not have been a housing bubble or the subsequent disaster that still suppresses the economy. Moreover, the people who were denied mortgages, and houses, would have known what they had to do to earn a mortgage, and could have done what was necessary - or not.

Private entrepreneurs might well have seen the demand for "specialized" sub-prime mortgages, and created an instrument that did not require the federal government's guarantee. It would surely have been at a higher interest rate, or would have required a more substantial down payment, but that is the price of the product. Willing buyers could buy – or not.

When government yields to the people who want the government to force the market to provide an outcome that the market will not provide on its own, sooner or later, all the people will have to pay for the government intervention.

The less government is involved in the marketplace, the more vibrant, efficient, responsive, and prosperous the market is. Conversely, the more involved the government is in the market place, the more sluggish, expensive, and susceptible to corruption it is.

The people who carry signs condemning Rand Paul, and the people – from Obama on down – who insist on saddling the market with more regulations and government control, are people who can't see that the immediate "feel-good" of a government-guaranteed mortgage is an opiate that must inevitably be followed by a painful loss and withdrawal.

As America chooses its future this fall, Rand Paul's philosophy should be the litmus test that qualifies every candidate. The economic crisis the nation is suffering is the direct result of the absence of Rand's philosophy in government, and the relentless, expanding intervention of the government into the market place.

Obama's New World Order

By Henry Lamb

It should come as no surprise. During the campaign, he told us he was a “[citizen of the world.](#)” Last week, he told the cadets at West Point, and the rest of the world, just what [his vision of a new world order](#) is.

Obama wants a new international order that can “resolve the challenges of our times.” That’s what Woodrow Wilson wanted when he and his cronies created the League of Nations. That’s what Franklin Roosevelt wanted when he and his cronies created the United Nations. Fortunately, conservative Senators prevented the United States from surrendering its sovereignty to Wilson’s vision of a New World Order. Roosevelt steamrolled what few conservatives there were in 1945, and the United Nations was created to “resolve the challenges” of his time.

One of the fundamental flaws in the vision of these three globalists - and the New World Order crowd - is the idea that the United States must submit its sovereignty to an ultimate power greater than our own.

Absolutely not, and never!

In 1945, there was enough conservative influence to retain veto power for the U.S. in the United Nations Security Council, and to prohibit the U.N. from having the authority to levy taxes. Both of these provisions have been targeted by the New World Order crowd ever since. The U.N.-funded Commission on Global Governance recommends that the veto be removed from all five permanent members, and that the U.N. be given extensive taxing powers.

These two barriers, and the absence of authority to raise its own army, are what prevent the current United Nations from becoming the unchallenged government of the world.

If Obama’s “new international order” is to have the authority and resources it needs to “resolve the challenges of our time,” then it will have to have taxing authority to fund the army that will be required to enforce its mandates, which can be enacted at will without fear of veto from the U.S. or the other permanent members.

The United States must never be subservient to any governmental power on earth, other than the government elected by the citizens of the United States. The United States must never depend upon any other government on earth for its defense, or its welfare. The United States must be responsible for “resolving the challenges of our time.”

The United States should seek and welcome cooperation from all nations in all efforts to resolve challenges of mutual concern, but never in a structure where decisions that may control the behavior of U.S. citizens are made by people who are not elected by U.S. citizens. The United States could find itself

in just this situation, should the new global financial regulatory scheme now under development become a reality.

The United States has shown that free people who are allowed to invest time, energy, resources, and ideas into a free market can lift the world to unimagined heights of prosperity and well being. This is the example that the United States should offer the world. Those nations who wish to follow this example and benefit from its rewards will be excellent trading partners, worthy of support, assistance and cultivation. Those who curse capitalism and seek socialism should be free to follow their own course - so long as their course respects our right to ignore them.

Al Sharpton inadvertently revealed another fundamental flaw in the philosophy of the Wilson-Roosevelt-Obama New World Order Crowd. He said Martin Luther King's dream was not getting one black family into the white house; [his dream](#) was to "...make everything equal in everybody's house."

The United Nations reflects this dream in its [Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights](#) (Article 11(1)) which claims that all people have a right to "...an adequate standard of living...adequate food, clothing, and housing"

Think about it: a government that can declare these rights must have the authority and resources to grant these rights. Neither the United States government, nor the United Nations has any resources that have not first been taken from some of the people. It is the direct, expressed objective of the Wilson-Roosevelt-Obama One World Government crowd to take resources away from the people who have earned them in order to redistribute the resources to those who have not earned them. Only in this way can government "...make everything equal in everybody's house."

Voters whose net worth will be improved by wealth redistribution far outnumber voters whose wealth will be taken. The Obama-led Democratic majority in Washington has the votes necessary to take the wealth from those who have earned it in order to "...make everything equal in everybody's house" and they are doing it as rapidly as possible.

Obama's "New International Order" goes beyond the United States, and seeks to take the wealth of the United States and redistribute it to the rest of the world. He seems perfectly willing to make everything equal in every nation – until your wealth is gone.

The United States should show the rest of the world how to earn prosperity through free-market capitalism, and thereby help the other nations of the world elevate their wealth to equal ours. Obama and his crowd choose instead, to equalize the wealth of nations by draining America's wealth, and reducing Americans' wealth to the lowest possible common denominator.

The Wilson-Roosevelt , and now Obama's vision of a New World Order must be rejected, along with all those politicians who share it.

Is Sustainable Development Global Governance?

By Henry Lamb

Betty Perry was not concerned about sustainable development or global governance; she simply wanted to save money when she decided not to water her lawn. It was, nonetheless, a decision that [landed her in jail](#). Orem, Utah - like most other American communities, has been caught up in the [sustainable development craze](#).

The sustainable development process is this:

1. Government provides grants for planning bureaucrats and/or non-government organizations to conduct a “visioning” procedure in a city, county, or other defined geographical area.
2. The visioning facilitator selects the “stakeholder” participants who will create the vision.
3. The vision, when adopted by consensus, identifies goals that almost always reflect the recommendations set forth in Agenda 21.
4. The vision document becomes the basis for a comprehensive plan to achieve the goals.

All of this is done by a small group of agency bureaucrats and NGO staff, with just enough “stakeholder” participation to allow the group to claim that it is a “bottom-up” vision. When the plan is complete to the satisfaction of the bureaucrats, it is presented for approval to the elected governing officials.

These plans often embrace a series of extremely detailed “[International Codes](#),” which can require that people water their lawns as frequently as government thinks the lawns should be watered.

Sustainable development is government’s implementation of [Agenda 21](#), and Agenda 21 is 40 chapters of policy recommendations that affect virtually every facet of human life. Therefore, sustainable development is government’s management of human life according to the recommendations set forth in Agenda 21.

The first goal of [sustainable development](#) is government control of land use. The 1976 United Nations Conference on Human Settlements declared that “Public control of land use is...indispensable.” The conference then [developed 65 pages](#) of very specific recommendations for governments to use to achieve the control of land use.

Many of those recommendations found their way into Agenda 21, which recommended that each nation create a national mechanism for implementing sustainable development. President Clinton obliged in 1993, by issuing an executive order that created the President’s Council on Sustainable Development. It is through this mechanism that Envisioning Utah, and literally thousands of similar “visioning” operations spread across the nation.

In its wake are countless communities with comprehensive plans that allow government to manage the affairs of its citizens, even to the point of prescribing when a private home owner must water her lawn.

If global governance is “...the framework of rules, institutions, and practices that set limits on behavior of individuals, organizations, and companies” (U.N. Development Report, 1999, p. 34), then sustainable development certainly qualifies as a significant part of global governance.

Sustainable development is a “framework of rules,” most of which were initiated by the United Nations, Americanized by the President’s Council on Sustainable Development, tailored to individual communities through government-funded “visioning” processes, and implemented through comprehensive plans adopted by local governments in pursuit of economic incentives promised by the federal government.

Betty Perry would not recognize her situation to be the result of global governance. Very few, if any, of the people involved in “Envision Utah,” would know, or admit, that the goals they pursue originated with the United Nations. But any honest analyst who reads the documents would have to admit that what passes for sustainable development in most every community has its roots in one or more U.N. documents.

What should be immediately obvious to the most casual observer is the fact that where sustainable development prevails, individual freedom cannot. Private property rights take a back seat to the collective vision in a sustainable community. In a sustainable community, a committee of “stakeholders” decides what private land owners may do, or may not do, with their own property. This is not freedom.

For more than 200 years, families in America managed to live and prosper without government having to tell them when to water their lawn. America once was a place where people were free to decide for themselves whether to water the lawn – or not, without fear of fines or imprisonment. America is not improved by Agenda 21, or by the President’s Council on Sustainable Development, or by Envision UTAH. Neither is America improved by any of the comprehensive plans adopted by governments that now believe that their responsibility is managing the affairs of the citizens, rather than defending the freedoms the citizens are guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

American governments have lost faith in freedom, and in free markets. American governments are hell-bent on controlling the use of land by private citizens, controlling the education of private citizens, controlling the health care of private citizens, and ultimately, controlling every other facet of human life.

This is sustainable development. This is the essence of global governance.

Americans must decide whether to live free, or to live under the politically-correct sustainable development regime defined by global governance.

The relentless effort to control the news

By Henry Lamb

The Constitution is quite clear: “Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press....” This treasured principle of freedom is unknown in most of the world, and greatly compromised in many nations. Canada, Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, Japan, Ireland, Slovenia, Norway, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, Austria, Sweden, Belgium, Australia and France, all provide subsidies to the press ranging from \$7 billion to \$35 billion per year.

The Obama administration, and some in Congress, are looking for ways that government might exert more control over free speech, and particularly, over the press.

Since 1987, when the Fairness Doctrine was abandoned by the Federal Communications Commission, every Democratic majority in Congress has tried to restore it. Through its power to license broadcast stations, the Fairness Doctrine gave the federal government the power to force radio and television stations to also air content that countered opinions and points of view the government didn't like. The sad result of the Fairness Doctrine was a chilling effect on all controversial opinions. Broadcasters simply chose to avoid controversial programming that might invoke an FCC-required Fairness Doctrine response.

A more sophisticated effort is now underway to give government control of the information that is available to the public.

“News” is what newspapers, radio and television, and now, the internet delivers to the public. “News,” it is argued, is what provides the information needed for a free people to make intelligent public policy decisions. Therefore, “news” is a public good, in much the same way the national defense, and highways are public goods. Consider the reasoning of University of Illinois Professor, Robert McChesney, in a paper prepared for a Federal Trade Commission workshop:

“The starting point for exiting this dead-end street is the recognition that journalism is best understood as increasingly having the attributes of a public good, not a private good. It is like military defense, physical infrastructure, education, public health and basic research in that regard. It is something society requires, and people want, but the market cannot generate in sufficient quantity or quality. It requires government leadership to exist. There may be an important role for the private sector, but with public goods the government plays quarterback or the game never starts.”

If it is appropriate for government to pay for national defense and highways, then it must be equally appropriate for government to pay for “news.” This is the logic that prevails in Europe, and is being advanced here.

The argument is reinforced by the fact that the Internet is having a devastating effect on the news-gathering capability of both newspapers and television. Plummeting advertising revenues have forced dramatic newsroom layoffs across all media. The Obama Administration, and some Congressmen, are looking for ways that government can save the Republic by assuring that there is an abundance of the right kind of news available to the public.

The Federal Trade Commission, for example, is holding the third in a series of workshops on "[How Will Journalism Survive the Internet Age?](#)" The event will be held June 15 at the National Press Club. In preparation for the day-long event, the FTC released a 47-page "[Discussion Draft](#)" that provides a variety of ideas about how the government may insure the continuation of a healthy news media.

Cass Sunstein, Administrator of the White House Office of Information and Regulatory affairs, has also published a lengthy argument for government involvement in the news media. Some of the [ideas he advances](#) are quite consistent with those offered by the FTC.

What part of "Shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press..." do these people not understand?

If there is a demand for news, the free market will meet that demand – unless government gets in the way. Professor McChesney's conclusion that the market cannot generate sufficient quantity or quality of news is incorrect. The market is providing a greater quantity, and because of instantaneous fact-checking, a much higher quality of news than ever before.

The real problem being addressed by this administration and academic double-speak is this: "the media are producing more information to a broader audience about ideas that are not supportive of our progressive-Marxist philosophy and we have to find a way to stop it".

This administration and Congressional majority have already demonstrated their commitment to expand government control over the market, and over the lives of the people. Control over the flow of information is essential, if they are to be successful. Control over the flow of information is a critical step in the construction of a dictatorial regime. The only way to prevent it is to replace the Democratic majority in Congress with people who honor the Constitution, instead of trying to find ways to ignore it.

You can fight city hall!

By Henry Lamb

When Smart Growth and [Sustainable Development](#) washed across the nation in the 1990s, property rights activists were overwhelmed. Visioning councils sprang up everywhere, and towns, cities, counties, and regions soon had “Vision 2020 Action Plans” that transformed normal communities into “Sustainable Communities,” and, for the most part, land owners never knew what hit them.

A common element in this transformation is the creation of what is usually called a “Comprehensive Land Use Plan.” This plan, when approved by the governing authority, becomes the basis for bureaucrats to virtually control the use of private property.

The definition of property ownership includes the notion that the owner has control of the property and may use the property as the owner sees fit, subject to damages only if his use of his own property causes damage to a neighbor, provable in court. Armed with comprehensive plans, however, bureaucrats control the use of private property. Bureaucrats, not the property owner, decide whether the owner may use his property as he wishes – or not.

When Houston County Minnesota adopted its comprehensive plan, bureaucrats became little gods, telling landowners what they could, and could not do with their own land. Often, the bureaucrat’s decision made no sense at all, but could not be challenged. When the land control god spoke, forgetaboutit!

Houston County landowner, Jim Shimshak owned a 200-acre farm. He wanted to give each of his five sons a home site on the property. The land use control god said no. The comprehensive plan requires no more than one structure per 40 acres. Who is exercising the power of ownership here: the land use control god bureaucrat, or the owner whose taxes helps to pay the salary of the bureaucrat? Does this situation stink, or what?

Houston County landowner, Mel Davy wanted to replace his older mobile home with a new one, on the same site where a well and septic connection already existed. Sound reasonable? The land use control god said no. Davy was required to put his new mobile home across the road, in a corn field, and build a new driveway, dig a new well, install a new septic system, and install new electricity access.

Houston County landowner, Mark Rask wanted to tear down an old farm house on his property and build a new one. The land use control god said no, because there was another dwelling already on the property. Rask could, however, restore the old farm house by bringing it into compliance with current building codes.

Houston County landowner, Milton Burroughs wanted to build a new home and sell his old home. He wanted to build the new home close enough to the existing home to share the same well. You guessed

it. The land use god said no. Burroughs had to choose between moving his new home out into a farm field, and dig a new well, or tearing down the old home that he really needed to sell.

For more than 10 years, Houston County residents have bowed before the land use gods. Then they decided to fight “city hall.”

They created an organization of local land owners which they called “Landowners Concerned about Property Rights.” They began to document instances where the land use god exercised authority which the land owners believed to be well beyond the authority of the county’s comprehensive plan, and certainly beyond the authority of the Minnesota or U.S. Constitution.

Then the group circulated a petition that said something to the effect that private property rights should be given high priority in the development and execution of the county’s land use plan. The petition gained more than 700 signatures in this county of only 20,000 residents.

Then the group contacted the Budd-Falen law firm in Cheyenne, Wyoming.

On April 7, the county officials were notified of the group’s intent to sue, and offered a waiver from the suit if the County Commissioners would sign the petition and work with a small committee from the landowners’ organization to modify the most obnoxious provisions of the comprehensive plan.

Apparently the high and mighty land use gods of Houston County feel no need to recognize, nor communicate with mere landowners, taxpayers, and voters. No official even acknowledged the letter of intent to sue.

The landowners group has now filed suit with the Third Judicial District. If the arrogant masters of land use control in Houston County ignore this document, they will lose by default. They can’t let that happen, so some kind of response will be forthcoming.

The suit charges the county with exercising authority not granted by the Minnesota Constitution or the U.S. Constitution; and with applying the county’s comprehensive plan differently in similar situations; and with exercising power well beyond the authority granted by state or federal law.

Property rights organizations across the nation are waiting to see how Houston County responds, and perhaps more importantly, how the court will interpret the laws and precedents in the many specific examples detailed in the lawsuit.

Landowners Concerned about Property Rights in Houston County Minnesota has become an example that other property rights groups are following. Finally, someone is leading the way to an effective answer to the arrogance of government-imposed land use planning.

The most dangerous president in history

By Henry Lamb

Obama believes in the rule of law – his law. No other law is relevant. No other law matters. When Obama speaks, he expects the world to obey.

In his Tuesday night performance, he said “I will meet with the chairman of BP and inform him that he is to set aside whatever resources are required to compensate the workers and business...” “Inform him?” Where does Barack Hussein Obama get the authority to issue orders to the CEO of a private corporation? There is no such authority in the Constitution. There is no law that empowers the president to “inform” the CEO of any corporation how he will spend the corporation’s money. Obama couldn’t care less about the Constitution or the law.

There was no Constitutional authority for him to essentially take over General Motors and Chrysler, or the banks. Obama couldn’t care less about the law. When he speaks, he expects the world to obey.

There is no Constitutional authority for the federal government to require American citizens to purchase health insurance or any other product or service. It doesn’t matter. Obama spoke; his Congressional majority of comrades obeyed.

In 18 months, the man has demonstrated that he cares nothing about the system of government created by our founders and enshrined in the Constitution. He has demonstrated that he fully intends to “fundamentally transform” the United States of America – as he promised in his campaign. Now we are beginning to get a picture of the nation he intends to build. The picture is frightening.

Virtually everything Obama has done since taking office has expanded both the size and power of the federal government. The federal government our founders constructed is a government limited to the specific powers enumerated in the Constitution. Those powers not enumerated are expressly reserved to the states and to the people.

Obama can’t comprehend any limitations on his power. The moment Arizona enacted a law that empowered state law enforcement officers to check for citizenship, Obama bad-mouthed the state legislature and Governor – without even reading the law. There have been arrogant presidents before, but none that can compare to the sickening self-centered narcissism that exudes from this man.

Obama’s declaration that America must end its addiction to oil misses the point entirely. America is not addicted to oil at all; America is addicted to the life-style made possible by the most efficient, abundant energy source yet discovered. Americans would be delighted to move to any energy source that will provide the same or better life-style at less cost.

In a capitalist society such as America, government's role in the market is limited to providing a level playing field for the entrepreneurs who risk their own assets to provide a product or service in hopes of making a profit. Only in totalitarian systems are markets managed by government.

The reason the nation has not switched to solar or wind, or other alternative energy sources has nothing to do with our addiction to oil; it has everything to do with cost and convenience.

Obama has decided that cost is irrelevant. He wants to wean America from oil and bond the nation to exotic alternatives, regardless of the cost. When Obama speaks, he expects people to obey. He is ready to artificially and unnecessarily increase the cost of carbon fuels in the form of taxes and fees, in order to fund subsidies for wind and solar energy sources. It doesn't matter to Obama that the environmental disaster that will be created by the solar farms and wind farms is much greater than the Gulf oil spill.

The Gulf oil spill will eventually be capped and cleaned; once a solar farm is built to supply energy to a community, it will never go away; it will only expand. The biodiversity that once flourished where the solar farm now is will never be restored. The land area will be devoid of biodiversity.

Obama and his Congressional comrades absolutely refuse to consider allowing the development of oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Of the entire 19-million acre area, only 2,000 acres would be disturbed, an area of 3.125 square miles. But they have no problem condemning [25,700 square miles](#) of America to be paved over with solar panels. This is the area required to replace electricity use with solar energy. This is an area roughly equal to the states of Vermont, New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware and Rhode Island. To replace the carbon energy used by transportation with electricity, at least Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina would need to be added to the land area forever lost to agriculture, housing, or biodiversity.

Nevertheless, Obama has spoken. He expects people to obey.

What's most dangerous about this man is his restructuring the government to be operated by a collection of appointed czars, who are not accountable to Congress, who can exercise powers not granted to the government to achieve nearly dictatorial authority over the citizens of the United States.

This is a limited look at only a few areas of domestic policy; his vision for the rest of the world is even more frightening. That's for another day.

Playing politics with disaster

By Henry Lamb

Instead of taking charge and mobilizing the resources of the United States to assist British Petroleum in stopping the environmental disaster in the Gulf, weeks after the event occurred, our Administrator-in-chief has his Cabinet Secretary tell the nation that the government's foot is on BP's neck, and that he meets with experts in order to discover whose ass to kick.

Consistent with his administration's philosophy of never letting a crisis go to waste, the Obama crowd is ramping up this disaster as a reason to stop drilling for oil. As bad as this accident is, it is no reason to stop gathering oil from existing wells, or to stop drilling new wells. This accident is the result of one or more mistakes. We should learn from these mistakes, make sure they don't happen again, and improve our procedures for acquiring the most affordable, most efficient energy we can produce.

Had Obama been President on January 28, 1986 when "Challenger" exploded 73-seconds after launch, would he have said "stop launching spacecrafts?" He most certainly would have – if by so doing he could gain some political advantage. That's the kind of guy he is proving to be.

The hideous Cap & Trade bill he is promoting under the guise of "energy policy" will force the nation to pay exorbitant prices for energy that includes taxes and fees for carbon emission certificates designed to penalize everyone except the [people who earn commissions](#) on every transaction. These include Al Gore, Goldman Sachs, the Joyce Foundation, and a host of Obama's political cronies.

For two decades, the reason given to move from oil and coal has been to reduce carbon emissions in the atmosphere that cause global warming. This so-called scientific conclusion, like Eugenics, the scientific conclusions about Aryan superiority, is now crumbling in the face of real science that is showing many of the previous U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPPC) studies to be nothing short of trash.

Now, the new reason to move from oil is this environmental disaster in the Gulf.

Think about it for a moment. Consider the environmental disaster that would result from an effort to replace oil and coal with wind and solar. According to The Solar Review, to replace just the electricity used in the U.S. with solar panels would require a land area equal to a square 160 miles on each side, or about 25,700 square miles, (about equal to the states of Vermont, New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware and Rhode Island.) What happens to the biodiversity that cannot live under solar panels? Isn't that a disaster similar to the impact on biodiversity that the Gulf oil spill has? The difference is that the Gulf will eventually get cleaned up. The 25,700 square miles of solar panels will never go away; it will only expand as the demand for energy increases.

Now add to this 25,700 square miles of land area, an additional chunk of land, roughly equal to Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, needed to produce the electricity required to replace the fuel for transportation.

Environmentalists have succeeded in blocking oil production in 3.125 square miles of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge because, they say, it will destroy the environment. But they have no objection to absolutely destroying all biodiversity in thousands of square miles covered with solar panels.

Imagine that Obama is successful in stopping the use of oil in this country. Every person would have to buy an electric car of some sort, and hundreds of thousands of square miles of land area would have to be covered with solar panels or wind turbines. This would be an environmental disaster much greater than the current BP accident and the Exxon Valdez combined.

Government has no business trying to force citizens to move from carbon based fuel to more expensive exotic, solar and wind energy. The market will move energy users to new fuels when demand motivates entrepreneurs to develop new fuels. When government controls the market with artificial taxes and fees on some products and provides subsidies as incentives for other products, it distorts the market, penalizes the people who must pay extra, and rewards people who are politically powerful enough to get into position to capitalize on the government's power.

Look again at Al Gore and the Chicago Climate Exchange.

Obama and his Democrat majority are not content to just force the market to move from oil to exotic alternatives. They are making noises about actually taking over the entire oil industry, to nationalize it, as Hugo Chavez did, and as other communist and socialist leaders have done throughout history.

Why can't these people understand that the problem in the Gulf is not the fault of capitalism, or of a profitable privately owned company, or of George Bush? It was an accident caused by one or more mistakes made by real people. The response should be to fix the leak, clean up the mess, find out what caused the problem, and fix it so it can't happen again.

To use the event to try to move the nation away from using oil is the worst kind of political maneuvering and - just plain stupid as well.

How do you spell incompetence?

By Henry Lamb

“O” is his logo, with dramatic red and blue swirls that are supposed to imply some sort of connection to the nation over which he now presides. After observing more than a year of performance, it is clear that his connection to his Muslim roots is far greater than his appreciation of the U.S. Constitution.

“B” is his background, rich with influence from Marxists and loony leftists who guided his early years and followed him through his initial training in Chicago thugocracy. Now that he is in Washington, he has selected an incredible team of Marxist sympathizers and leftists to advise his every move.

“A” is the arrogance that exudes from his every movement. It appears that he believes he was endowed by his Creator with not only the right to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” but also with total infallibility of thought, word or deed.

“M” is the Messiah complex which compelled him to stand before a German audience and declare that “...I am a citizen of the world” and allows [school children to sing](#) his praises: “[Obama can, mmm, mmm, mmm.](#)” Watch the indoctrination of “[Obama Scholars.](#)”

“A” is the attitude that is always condescending. When he speaks, everything is about “Me, my, and I.” He thinks his opponents are either stupid people who “cling to their guns and religion,” or are one exercise away from being domestic terrorists.

How do you spell incompetence?

Obama said he would post bills on the Internet for five days before he signed them. He lied.

Obama said his stimulus plan would keep unemployment below 8%. He was badly mistaken.

Obama said his would be the most transparent, open administration in history. Hahahahahaha!

Obama swore he would “...preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.” Instead, he created a health care law that requires citizens to purchase a product; there is no Constitutional authority for Congress or the President to impose such a requirement on its citizens.

Obama’s incompetence is most graphically revealed by his handling of the tragedy in the gulf. Eager to appear to be in control, nine days after the accident (April 29), he mentioned the oil leak for the first time, saying he had ordered Secretary Salazar to complete a report within 30 days.

His first visit to the area was May 2, when he tried to convince the nation that he had been in charge of the entire operation since day one. Once Obama became aware that the gulf event was a problem, he

tried to get in front of it by appearing to be in control. Actually, he was competing with BP officials for TV face-time in order to convey the appearance of being in control.

Actually, he was grasping for ideas. On May 21, his friends at the Center for American Progress, a George Soros-funded think tank, suggested that he name a “Point Person” to coordinate the government’s action. Obama complied within a few days.

On May 26, the same people told Obama to demand that BP set up an enormous fund to cover future obligations. It didn’t matter to his friends at the think tank, or to Obama, that the President does not have the authority to demand such a thing from a private corporation. It didn’t matter that BP had already accepted full responsibility for damages, and had already set up a claims process.

To gain the appearance of being in control, Obama summoned BP officials to the White House so that he could claim to have forced the corporation to obey his command. This is not competence; this is childish.

On March 10, 2009, BP [applied for a permit](#) to drill the Deepwater Horizon well. The application was approved on April 9. The environmental review, however, required by the National Environmental Policy Act was “categorically excluded.” This means that the Obama administration knew everything there was to know about BP’s drilling plan, and approved it. After the plan was approved and the permit issued, BP could take no action outside the plan without additional government approval. Therefore, Obama’s administration knew, or should have known, in advance, every decision that resulted in the April 20, 2010 explosion. Still, [Obama blamed Bush](#). This is not competence; this is childish.

If, as he claims, Obama has been in charge of the clean up since day one, requiring BP to get his administration’s permission before taking any action, then the failure of all the efforts to stop the flow of oil must be laid at Obama’s doorstep. The failure to prevent the oil from reaching the wetlands and beaches must also be laid at Obama’s feet.

OBAMA clearly spells incompetence throughout the administration and the programs it has tried to impose. This incompetence can be contained, somewhat, on November 2, and completely erased in 2012.

The cause of, and cure for economic woes

By Henry Lamb

The Washington leadership never misses an opportunity to blame the last eight years of Bush policies for the economic problems that have befallen the nation. CNN news touts a poll that says 53% of the people blame Republican policies for the mess. Both are wrong. Republicans certainly contributed over the years, but the cause of the economic problems must be laid squarely at the doorstep of the Democrats.

The root cause of the economic problem is government interference with the free market. The root cause of the near-collapse that occurred in the last year of the Bush administration can be traced to the Democratic Socialist idea that everyone has a right to adequate housing.

Before President Carter, private lenders in a free market often refused to fund mortgages in certain parts of cities where the neighborhoods were so bad that lenders considered the investment to be unsafe. Democrats and socialists called this practice “redlining.” Carter, and his Democratic colleagues, enacted the Community Reinvestment Act, which effectively outlawed redlining.

This was an enormous intrusion by the government into the marketplace, but it was not enough to satisfy Democrats and socialists. Organizations such as ACORN systematically invaded financial institutions with highly visible public protests, demanding that private lenders fund mortgages for unqualified people in depressed areas. Democrat President Clinton, and his Democratic colleagues, expanded the Community Reinvestment Act, requiring Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to provide guarantees for these mortgages. Private lenders in a free market would never have made these loans without the intimidation and extortion from ACORN-type organizations and the interference of the federal government.

[Intimidation and extortion continued](#) well into the Bush years. When Republicans tried to rein in the loose lending practices at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, their [efforts were blocked](#) by Democrats, particularly by Rep. Barney Frank and Senator Charles Schumer.

In their effort to meet the socialist goal of providing adequate housing to all people, whether qualified or not, Democratic interference with the free market caused an enormous artificial bubble in the housing market. This housing bubble produced secondary markets in derivatives (packages of government-guaranteed mortgages) and Credit Default Swaps (insurance against default of derivatives). When unqualified borrowers began to default in staggering numbers, the government had to make good on the mortgages it guaranteed, and the insurance companies – like AIG – had to make good on the insurance policies they had issued.

In 2008, under the reign of George W. Bush, the Treasury Department suddenly realized that neither the mortgage companies nor the insurance companies could make good on their commitments, and that unless the federal government came to the rescue, much of the financial marketplace would collapse.

Obama, and his democratic colleagues, immediately blamed Bush and his policies, when it was the Democrats who bore the ultimate responsibility. Obama, and his democratic colleagues, are still riding the “blame Bush” train, and apparently, are fooling the majority of Americans. The facts, however, may be misrepresented, but they cannot be altered. The same democratic socialist philosophy that caused the economic meltdown is guiding the Obama administration as it constructs what it is calling a cure.

Obama’s plans for the future offer no cure to the economic doldrums; they most assuredly promise even greater economic disaster.

Obama’s view and his every action so far, reflect the socialist vision of government control and management of the market, and of every individual.

The cure for economic problems is freedom from government interference and management in the marketplace. Get government out of the way. The free market will find its way to profit and prosperity if government will simply get out of the way.

Democrats are quick to say that the absence of government regulation is what caused the economic meltdown. This diagnosis is incorrect, and the medicine they are prescribing will only worsen the malady.

The Constitutional requirement that the Congress “regulate” interstate and foreign commerce is a source of continuing tension among lawmakers: what, exactly, is the right balance between government regulation and market freedom? Government’s regulatory goal should maximize competition; assure equal access to markets; prohibit punitive taxation – and little else.

Problems that occur in a free market, such as faulty products, inappropriate pricing, false advertising – are all self-correcting. Informed consumers penalize unscrupulous merchants far more effectively than government can. Democrats and socialists, on the other hand, believe that government should decide which GM dealers must go out of business and which may continue; that government must force lenders to fund mortgages for unqualified borrowers; that there should be a punitive tax on carbon dioxide to force people to use alternative fuels. This is the kind of government interference that kills a free market economy.

The cure for the current economic condition is to get government out of the marketplace, and out of the lives of individual citizens. Government’s correct role in society is to assist – not hinder - free people in their pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. Democrats and socialists believe that government’s role is to create an egalitarian society by managing markets, redistributing wealth, and forcing people to live where and how government dictates.

We should never forget: “That government is best that governs least.”

Selective enforcement

By Henry Lamb

Federal law currently prohibits the use of marijuana. California spit in the face of the feds and enacted a law that makes “medical” marijuana available to anyone who wants it. Now, a ballot initiative in the November election will remove the “medical” requirement and allow any adult to grow and use marijuana at will.

The Obama administration has indicated that it will not waste Department of Justice resources by trying to challenge California’s rejection of federal drug laws.

The Obama administration, however, is wasting Department of Justice resources by challenging Arizona’s law that affirms the federal immigration law and authorizes police officers to ask for proof of citizenship from suspects who have been detained for infringement of any law.

The Obama administration is flatly failing to enforce federal law in both cases. It has deliberately chosen to not enforce the federal drug laws in California, and it has deliberately chosen not to enforce the immigration law in Arizona (and other border states), even though the Constitution requires the President “...take care to see that the laws be faithfully executed.” Why is he threatening to challenge Arizona’s immigration law in court, while ignoring California’s marijuana law?

It’s called selective enforcement.

In a nation based on the rule of law, the law is supposed to apply to every person equally, regardless of race, sex, financial condition, or political affiliation. Obama and his administration have made a mockery of this concept.

The Department of Justice [chose not to prosecute](#) the Black Panthers who stood in front of a Pennsylvania polling place brandishing nightsticks. Do you think the Department of Justice would take the same action against two white dudes dressed in camouflage outfits brandishing nightsticks in front of a polling place?

These are fairly small examples of selective enforcement, but they do shine a spotlight on this administration’s disregard for their responsibility to uphold and enforce the law - and apply it equally to all people.

Far more important are the examples of Obama’s complete and utter disregard for limitations of power placed on the federal government by the U.S. Constitution. There was not the least bit of hesitation before Obama ordered the chairman of General Motors to step down, to be replaced by a puppet of Obama’s choosing. There was not the least bit of hesitation before Obama’s people chose the auto dealers who would be put out of business. It makes no difference at all to Obama that the Constitution does not give the president the authority to take these actions. Incidentally, it was purely coincidental

that the majority of auto dealers put out of business had supported Republican candidates. Yeah, that's their story, and they are sticking to it.

This propensity to act despite the law, to achieve objectives that Obama wants to achieve, makes Barack Hussein Obama the most dangerous president the country has ever known. He has said he fully intended to [fundamentally transform the United States of America](#).

He has forced through Congress his brand of universal health care, a precursor to complete socialized medicine. There is no way private insurance companies can continue to operate under the requirements placed upon them by the health care legislation. Suppose the auto industry were told that they had to insure auto owners after an accident – and repair the automobile - but could not charge a penny more than they charged people who had no accident. No private company can stay in business paying out more than they take in. The health care law forces insurance companies into this position.

Through his appointments and [support of legislation](#) to give the president emergency control of the Internet, Obama has exposed his disregard for the First Amendment. This administration is actively seeking ways to control the free flow of information, especially from critics and those who oppose the Obama agenda.

Expect to see Obama and the Democrat majority in Congress push through as much of Obama's "transformative" agenda as possible before the November election. Then watch out, especially if the Republicans happen to gain significantly.

The lame-duck session between the election and the seating of the new Congress will likely see the Democrat majority use every hook and crook they can contrive to enact every bill possible to advance Obama's agenda. This current maneuver –[deeming the budget to have passed](#) - is further evidence that Obama and his Democrat leadership will go to any length to get what they want, regardless of the law or procedure.

Obama's defeat must begin in November by unseating the majority that now runs Congress. Then, perhaps, Congress can begin to repeal some of Obama's agenda, or at the very least, refuse to provide funds needed for implementation. Immediately after the November election, every person who loves America – as the founders created it – needs to begin a private campaign to remove the last of the Marxist-leaning people who now dominate the federal government.

\$8 gas – if you can find it

By Henry Lamb

[Click here to listen](#)

Following Rahm Emanuel's advice, the Obama administration is certainly not letting the Gulf oil crisis go to waste. The BP catastrophe is just what Obama needed to justify pushing his irresponsible energy policy on a weary nation. Obama wants to stop using fossil fuel in favor of more exotic alternative energy sources. He doesn't seem to know, or care, that there is no alternative energy technology that can meet the current energy demand. His actions suggest that if enough tax-generated government subsidies are applied, the technology will emerge.

His recent visit to [Smith Electric Vehicles](#) in Kansas City proved to be a dog and pony show to try to convince the nation that his \$32 million grant to the firm to produce 500 trucks was well spent. This is a direct subsidy from taxpayers of \$64,000 per truck, which, when offered in the marketplace will still cost twice as much as a comparable non-electric vehicle. This comes on the heels of a \$2 billion grant to subsidize [two solar plants](#).

So strong is his desire to wean Americans off fossil fuel that he immediately issued a six-month moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. The order was issued as a safety precaution even though the 50,000 well holes drilled in the Gulf since 1947 have [leaked far less oil](#) than has been released through natural seepage. As tragic and expensive as the BP spill may be, its impact on the economy can't be compared to the loss of oil production from the Gulf.

Obama was only 12 when OPEC decided to turn off the oil faucet to the United States in 1973. At the time, OPEC supplied only about seven percent of our oil. Nevertheless, gasoline prices more than doubled, and supplies were sporadic, at best. Long lines formed at every gas station; cars with license plates that ended with odd numbers were allowed to purchase gas on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. Cars with plates ending in even numbers could buy only on the other days of the week.

Oil from the Gulf supplies nearly ten percent of our petroleum requirement. By turning off this faucet, the price of gasoline will skyrocket, perhaps doubling, as it did in the 1970s.

Despite two court rulings against Obama's moratorium, he continues to insist that no drilling will be allowed. By [refusing to issue permits](#), the Obama administration has effectively stopped Gulf oil production regardless of the courts' rejection of his moratoria.

The first wave of economic impact is already spreading across the 35,000 families that are directly employed by the Gulf oil industry. Each oil rig worker provides employment for three additional people who work in supporting industries. These jobs, too, are evaporating. The deepwater rigs cannot simply sit and wait in hopes that Obama might change his mind. The daily cost for a rig to sit and wait is about \$600,000. Diamond Offshore has already announced that its Endeavor rig is moving to Egyptian waters. More will surely follow. Once these rigs are out of the Gulf, they will not soon return.

The second wave of economic impact will begin when prices at the pump begin to rise. Remember the spike in gas prices when hurricane Katrina shut down a few rigs for a few weeks. Now, imagine what the effect will be when there are no rigs in the Gulf, for the foreseeable future.

Currently, more than 60 percent of our oil is imported. With no oil from the Gulf, nearly 75 percent of our oil will have to come from abroad. Canada and Mexico now supply only about 15 percent of our oil. This means that most of our oil will have to come from countries that really want to do us harm. It makes no sense at all to deliberately become dependent upon our enemies for our energy needs.

A responsible administration and Congressional leadership would do whatever is required to fix the BP problem in the Gulf without shutting down domestic oil supplies. Next, they would open domestic reserves, on land and in the oceans, to environmentally safe development. A president who is more interested in his citizens' well being than in advancing his own agenda, would not try to force his citizens to use exotic alternative energy that costs much more than petroleum. It is apparent, of course, that Obama's first concern is his own agenda, regardless of what the people or the courts may say.

If America is to survive as the land of the free, it is imperative that the current leadership in Washington be removed and replaced with people who believe in the principles of limited government, free markets, private property, and individual freedom. Two years of leadership by the Obama-Reid-Pelosi trinity demonstrates contempt for these principles. The only reward worthy of their service is early and absolute retirement.

Incumbents: meet Horatio Bunce

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

Sounding more like a campaigning candidate than a proud President, Obama said that voters will have to choose whether to go backward to the failed policies of the past, or to go forward to the future with him. Wait a minute: where's the choice? The failed policies of the past are precisely the same policies that Obama and his Marxist majority have rammed down America's throat since the last election, which he promises to continue until he has totally "transformed" the United States of America.

Let's see now, what are the most egregious failed policies of the past? No doubt, the most egregious policies are those that ignore the limitation of power imposed upon government by the U.S. Constitution. Many presidents, and both political parties, have ignored the Constitution at various times throughout our history. The champions of this ignorance, however, are Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and now the grand champion, Barack Hussein Obama.

None of them ever met Horatio Bunce. If they ever read Davy Crockett's [speech to Congress](#) on charity, they either forgot it, or simply chose to ignore its truth.

Congressman Crockett was with a group of friends in Washington one night when they saw a massive blaze lighting the sky over Georgetown. The men raced to the fire and worked hours helping to put it out. Crockett and his colleagues initiated an effort to appropriate \$20,000 for the victims of the fire. He was bitterly disappointed when the bill failed.

A few months later, while campaigning for the next election, he stopped a farmer who was plowing his field to ask for his support. The farmer politely told him that he had voted for Crockett in the last election, but that he would not do so again. Crockett begged the man to tell him why not.

"Did you vote to appropriate \$20,000 for the victims of that fire in Georgetown?" the man asked.

Crockett said that he had voted for the appropriation, and that he thought that would be the last vote anyone would find fault with.

The farmer said: "Well, Colonel, where do you find in the Constitution any authority to give away the public money in charity? The Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred, and rigidly observed in all its provisions."

The farmer was Horatio Bunce.

Wilson, Roosevelt, and now Obama and his Marxist majority in Congress ignore this question: "...Where do you find in the Constitution any authority to...?" The American people asked this question about the authority to take over privately owned automobile and insurance companies.

The American people asked where do you find in the Constitution any authority to take over the entire health care industry? The American people are asking where do you find in the Constitution any authority to shut down the fossil fuel industry in order to force people to buy exotic alternative energy products that are outrageously and unnecessarily expensive? The American people want to know where do you find in the Constitution any authority to make direct grants to so-called “green” alternative energy companies, or to activist organizations such as ACORN, or to National Public Radio, or to subsidize the media, as is being proposed by Obama cronies.

These are the failed policies that have been imposed in the past with disastrous consequences. These are the same policies that Obama unapologetically declares that he intends to impose in the future. These are not the policies the American people want.

Fortunately, there is another choice.

Since the last national election, a rebellion – no, it is better described as a revival – has swept across this nation. People are sick and tired of seeing their freedoms trampled by a government that ignores the Constitution in order to impose Marxist ideas and socialist policies. People want no more of the *quid pro quo* shenanigans that pursue political perpetuity rather than the people’s prosperity.

This year, the people have raised a new crop of candidates, most of whom agree with Horatio Bunce: “The Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred, and rigidly observed in all its provisions.”

This year, voters are looking for candidates who agree with Horatio Bunce. Voters are getting organized and volunteering to help in campaigns, and they are getting informed. They are learning how their elected representatives voted on past issues, and they are painting a target on the backs of incumbents who don’t share Horatio Bunce’s reverence for the Constitution.

This year, voters intend to reject Obama’s plans to “transform the United States of America” into a socialist nation entrapped in a system of international Marxist governance. This year, voters intend to raise the American flag over Washington, and declare anew that by God, this nation will remain a nation under God, and under the Constitution He ordained.

Obama complies with Agenda 21 and expands federal power

By Henry Lamb

[Listen here](#)

President Obama's Executive Order 13547 issued July 19, further extends federal power, embraces global governance, diminishes the rights and privileges of individuals, and brings the United States into compliance with [Agenda 21, Chapter 17.6](#), which says:

“Each coastal State should consider establishing, or where necessary strengthening, appropriate coordinating mechanisms (such as a high-level policy planning body) for integrated management and sustainable development of coastal and marine areas....”

The National Ocean Council created by the Executive Order creates this mechanism - and much more.

The genius of the American system of governance created by the U.S. Constitution is the delicate balance of power between the federal government, state and local governments, and the people. The founders recognized the people as the source of power; the people came first. It was the people who organized states. The states created a federal government and through the Constitution, limited the power of the new government to those specific powers set forth in Article 1, Section 8. All unspecified powers were explicitly retained by the states or the people.

In the first 200 years, the United States of America produced greater wealth and prosperity than the rest of the world had produced in 2000 years. Why? Because individuals were free to pursue their own individual happiness.

Throughout its entire history, however, there have been those who believe that government is, or should be, the source of power; that the people are, or should be, subjects of the state. Since the 1970s, these people have used “environmental protection” as an excuse to expand the power of government. They argued that free people, in their pursuit of personal happiness, were polluting the environment. Therefore, government had to restrain free people in order to save the earth.

Their arguments prevailed in Congress, in the schools, and throughout society. The result has been ever-expanding government power that continually diminishes individual freedom, which results in less investment in the pursuit of individual happiness and a gradual slowdown in the growth of prosperity for everyone.

Once, Americans could do whatever they could conceive, restrained only by the possible consequences of infringing their neighbors' right to do the same. Now, Americans must get permission from multiple layers of government to do anything that produces income, pay multiple taxes on whatever income is generated, and comply with expensive regulations that govern every activity that might be pursued. Consequently, the individual entrepreneurial spirit is steadily being replaced by the ever-expanding reach of government's ambition to manage society.

President Obama's most recent Executive Order is another example of government's ever-expanding reach. First, Obama created an Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force in June of 2009. This group worked a year to produce a [report](#) that recommends how government can better protect the environment relating to the oceans and the Great Lakes. The Executive Order essentially adopts the recommendations in the report as national policy, and creates a new bureaucracy called the National Ocean Council to implement all the recommendations in the report.

The two most egregious recommendations are: controlling activities on land that affects the ocean, and ratification of the Convention on the Law of the Sea.

Before America became a nanny- state subject to the tyrannical decrees of the federal government, people were subject to laws that forced polluters to make whole anyone who was harmed. People who used their own property in the pursuit of their own individual happiness who inadvertently, through negligence, or deliberately polluted water that harmed a neighbor could be brought to court and forced to pay damages.

Now, the federal government ignores private property rights by requiring government approval of any proposed use of private property, payment of fees for the privilege, and payment of penalties for any infraction of a myriad of rules that govern the activities that government may allow.

The trampling of private property rights is not as bad, however, as the subjugation that would result from the ratification of the [Convention on the Law of the Sea](#). This treaty was rejected by Ronald Reagan in 1982. Despite the so-called improvements to the treaty boasted by the Clinton administration, the U.S. Senate rejected it in 2000. President Bush tried to have it ratified, but the Senate rejected it again in 2004. Now Obama is trying again to force this horrible treaty down America's throat.

This treaty would give the U.N. power to regulate activity within our territorial seas (Article 2, (3)); it would give the U.N. the power to levy taxes in the form of application fees (\$250,000) and royalties; it provides no benefits that the United States does not already enjoy. Yet, the Obama administration has set up this new National Ocean Council to convince the Senate to ratify the treaty.

This treaty is another expansion of global governance, which is defined by the U.N. to be that "framework of rules, institutions, and practices that limits the behavior of individuals, organizations, and companies" (U.N. Development Report, 1999, p. 34).

Obama's expansion of government is taking the nation in the wrong direction. The federal government should be reduced in size, scope, and function. The federal government should be pushed back inside the bottle of those limited powers defined in Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution. States and individuals should reclaim the power given to them by the Constitution and guaranteed by the 10th Amendment. No elected official – including President Obama – is immune to the power of the ballot box. Those in power who support Obama's brand of foolishness should be forced to find a new career path next November.

The wolves are at the door!

By Henry Lamb

[To listen, click here](#)

America is not a democracy. It was never intended to be a democracy. The founders worked hard to see that the new government they created was not a democracy, but a growing segment of the population seems hell-bent on transforming this great nation into a democracy in which the rights of the minority are systematically ignored.

The United States of America was quite deliberately designed to be a federal republic. The founders recognized the highest governing authority on earth to be the individual. They realized that they, as individuals, had the authority and the intelligence to create a new system of government, empowered by the consent of the governed to do only those specific chores that the people stipulated in a written Constitution.

They recognized that in such a government, there would need to be direct accountability to the electorate for every official empowered to make laws that restricted the freedom of individuals. This new federal republic had to recognize and honor the state governments that were already constructed, and the local governments within these states, if the new federal republic were to have any chance of succeeding.

The Constitution these men formulated contained two provisions to ensure that the new government would forever remain a federal republic: a Senate chosen by state governments; and a President chosen indirectly by what came to be known as the Electoral College. The 17th Amendment destroyed a major safeguard of the federal republic by allowing Senators to be chosen by the public, rather than by the states.

The 17th Amendment was a significant part of the wave of progressivism ushered in by the Wilson administration in 1913. Imposition of the income tax, the Federal Reserve, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, began the attack by progressives on the federal republic the founders had so carefully constructed.

The Electoral College is the last and only element of the Constitution that keeps the United States of America from being formally transformed into a direct democracy. Now, the progressives have taken aim, and are attacking this last bastion of the federal republic.

Direct election of Senators came as the result of a Constitutional Amendment, which can be reversed as was the prohibition amendment - another progressive-era mistake. The war on the Electoral College is taking a different path: states are enacting legislation that authorizes all the state's electors to be awarded to the national winner of the popular vote, regardless of the how the people voted in the state.

Hawaii, Illinois, New Jersey, Maryland, and now Massachusetts have all enacted legislation that pledges to assign their state's electors to the winner of the national popular vote in the presidential election, regardless of how the voters in the state voted.

Prior to this new war on the Electoral College, in all states except Nebraska and Maine, all the state's electors were assigned to the candidate who received the most votes in the state. This is the winner-take-all system. This system assures that small states have a say in the selection of the President.

Progressives argue that the winner-take-all system is not democratic. So be it. It was not designed to be democratic; it was designed to help balance the power between and among the states and the various branches of government. It was designed to make government function as a federal republic rather than a democracy.

Few people understand the importance of the Electoral College because schools have all but erased the subject from the curriculum. The Electoral College is cumbersome, it is confusing, it is frustrating for the supporters of Al Gore who saw the Electoral College bestow the presidency on George W. Bush who received fewer popular votes than did Al Gore.

Consider the effect of eliminating the Electoral College: direct democracy.

The president would be chosen by urban population centers. There would be no need to campaign in rural states. There would be no need to be concerned about the needs and cares of rural people. There would be no interest in the minority.

The genius of the American system of governance is the carefully developed balance of power between the states and the federal government, the various branches of government, and between conflicting philosophies of governance. When the minority is driven from the debate, or ignored, tyranny reins.

The first 18 months of the Democratic regime in Washington has demonstrated how the majority can ignore the minority and the Constitution. In the cycle of governance, democracy is the last phase before anarchy. The founders wanted no part of a democracy; they created a federal republic.

A democracy is often described as two wolves and a sheep voting on what to have for dinner. The wolves are at the door of our federal republic.

Senator Dodd bows to global governance

By Henry Lamb

[Click here to listen](#)

There is nothing ambiguous or uncertain about this statement:

“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.” (10th Amendment)

Where in the Constitution does Senator [Christopher Dodd](#) find any authority to even propose his “Livable Communities Act?”

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 authorizes Congress “to lay and collect taxes for the common defense and general welfare” of the United States. The next 17 paragraphs define the specific area of activity the founders considered to encompass the “general welfare.” To ensure there was no misinterpretation, or misunderstanding of their intention to limit the power of the federal government, the founders included the 10th Amendment in the Bill of Rights.

There is no Constitutional authority for the federal government to be involved in how state and local communities organize themselves.

[Global governance](#), however, says that:

“All countries should establish as a matter of urgency a national policy on human settlements, embodying the distribution of population, and related economic and social activities, over the national territory.”

[Agenda 21, Chapter 10](#) declares that:

“Expanding human requirements and economic activities are placing ever increasing pressures on land resources, creating competition and conflicts and resulting in suboptimal use of both land and land resources. If, in the future, human requirements are to be met in a sustainable manner, it is now essential to resolve these conflicts and move towards more effective and efficient use of land and its natural resources.”

Why is Dodd proposing legislation to comply with global governance requirements rather than honoring the limitations of Congress imposed by the Constitution? Organization of local communities should be a local issue; the federal government should get its nose out of local affairs.

Anyone who reads Chapter 10 of Agenda 21, and then reads Dodd’s bill, will immediately conclude that the bill is designed to comply with the recommendations of this United Nations document.

Typically, the actual authors of such legislation deny any connection at all the U.N., and claim that those who try to make a connection are just black-helicopter conspiracy theorists. Their denial assumes that the average person will never take the time to read Agenda 21, chapter 10, or the other U.N. documents that recommend comprehensive land use planning and the creation of sustainable (or “livable”) communities.

This is how global governance overwhelms the Constitution. We have elected a majority of Senators and representatives who have abandoned the idea of limited government, who believe that their election entitles them to [do whatever they wish](#).

The Executive branch is worse than Congress. The EPA, DOI, HUD, and other federal departments, have been implementing “sustainable development” directly from Agenda 21 for the last 15 years. Sustainable development is sold to local communities as the way to protect the environment and ensure that future generations have the resources they need.

What is not discussed is the fact that the transformation of local communities into sustainable or so-called “livable” communities removes the decision-making process from individuals and gives it to the government. A sustainable community is defined by a comprehensive land use plan, developed by “stakeholders” who limit land use to achieve the goals set forth in Agenda 21. Again, the folks who are involved in this process quite often deny that their activities have anything to do with the United Nations or Agenda 21. But compare virtually any local comprehensive land use plan to the requirements of Agenda 21 and you will see that the similarities could not possibly be an accident, especially when you find the same similarities in community after community.

Dodd’s “livable communities” is nothing more than legislating Agenda 21 which is a process that erodes individual freedom and replaces it with top-down tyranny. The dreams of thousands of people have been crushed by comprehensive land use plans, devised by busy-body stakeholders, and forced down the throat of community after community. Read about some of them [here](#). Here are [three free instructional videos](#) that will show you exactly how sustainable development has permeated domestic policy.

America must reject global governance, and every elected official who promotes it. America must remain a sovereign nation and protect the individual freedom our Constitution guarantees. Senator Dodd and his ilk are only too willing to bow to politically-correct claims of the international community. Freedom cannot survive global governance; Americans must decide whether they want to control their government, or be controlled by it.

Global currency coming

By Henry Lamb

[To listen, click here](#)

If the International Monetary Fund gets its way, the U.S. dollar will be replaced by the “bancor” as the world’s reserve currency. According to a [report published April 13](#), the IMF would like to adopt a [plan of action](#) that would expand the use of SDRs (Special Drawing Rights) to replace the U.S. dollar as the storehouse of value, and eventually create a global currency called the “bancor.”

“Bancor” is the name suggested by John Maynard Keynes, the British economist who headed the World Banking Commission that created the IMF during the Breton Woods negotiations, which preceded the United Nations.

The new global currency would be issued by a new global central bank that would have the authority to levy taxes for various infractions. The bank would have to be, according to the report writers, “accountable to member nations, but remain independent.” This statement sounds much like the defenders of the Federal Reserve which was created by Congress, and is supposed to be accountable to Congress, but refuses to allow Congress to audit its activities or [even to answer Congressional questions](#) about to whom it lends U.S. dollars.

A global central bank has long been a goal of those who advocate global governance. America’s school system has failed to teach students about the century-long conflict between those who want a [global governing authority](#) and those who do not. Schools barely teach that Woodrow Wilson and his colleagues created the League of Nations, or why this institution failed. Schools never explain that many of the same people who promoted the League of Nations continued their efforts through non-government organizations such as the Council on Foreign Relations until Franklin Roosevelt was elected President.

Schools do credit Roosevelt with helping to create the United Nations, but they never explain that Roosevelt brought into his administration dozens of people from the Council on Foreign Relations to draft his “New Deal,” as well as plans for the United Nations.

Schools do not teach that President Kennedy planned to turn over U.S. military power to the United Nations in order to give the emerging global government the power to enforce its global governance policies. People who refuse to accept this statement are encouraged to read “Freedom from war: the United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World,” [Department of State Publication 7277](#), released September, 1961.

The people who believe the world should be governed by a global authority have been working toward this goal for more than a century. They are relentless; they are driven; they are convinced that they know best how people should live. They believe that all nations and all societies should be controlled by an elite, benevolent intelligentsia that can ensure social justice by enforcing what has now become

known as sustainable development. These people are closer to achieving their goal than at any previous time in history.

Woodrow Wilson assumed his political power would be sufficient to impose the League of Nations. He underestimated the determination of freedom-lovers such as Henry Cabot Lodge and other Senators who refused to ratify the treaty that created the League. Roosevelt assumed that the devastation of World War Two would be sufficient to usher in the era of world government under the authority of the United Nations- and he was right, until political reality crushed his utopian socialist dream of a global community.

Kennedy's 1961 plans for complete disarmament evaporated in 1962, when the USSR began building missile launching sites in Cuba. It became abundantly clear that despite all the warm and fuzzy global neighborhood talk, the Soviets fully intended to gain the military power to crush the United States. Fortunately, President Kennedy confronted Soviet military power with U.S. military power, and the Soviets backed down.

This historical fact is a powerful lesson that should teach current and future leaders that this nation cannot risk meeting military threats with anything less than superior military strength. Those who seek to dissolve threats with rhetoric and double-barrel tele-prompters are a more dangerous threat to America than any external enemy.

Those who advocate global governance have changed their tactics, but not their goal. They have made great strides through a variety of treaties, and particularly through the implementation of Agenda 21 and the concept of sustainable development. The erosion of freedom that is inevitable under any system of global governance has been painted green, packaged in a bundle labeled social justice, and sold to a generation of Americans eager to make the world a better place.

The global currency proposed by the IMF is just the latest step toward that ultimate utopian vision pursued for so long by so many. The freedom that powered America's rise to greatness cannot exist in a system of global governance. Individual freedom, granted by the Creator and guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution is, at best, diminished by global governance, and at worst, completely denied.

Global governance in any form must be rejected.

A nation divided

By Henry Lamb

[To listen, click here](#)

To see the nation divided, watch the people who gather on August 28th at the Lincoln Memorial to hear Glenn Beck and the people who gather at Dunbar High School to hear the Rev. Al Sharpton.. Beck and his group want to restore the principles of the founders; Sharpton and his group want to transform America into a progressive utopia.

Beck's demonstration, dubbed "Restoring Honor" was planned months ago to celebrate the 47th anniversary of Martin Luther King's 1963, "I Have a Dream" speech. Sharpton's coalition was outraged by the audacity of a white man – especially Glenn Beck – attempting to hijack King's dream. They immediately sent out a call to black organizations to come to Washington to out-demonstrate Beck's event with their own competing event they named "Reclaim the Dream."

Beck has used his national television program to promote King's idea that all people should be measured by the content of their character, not by the color of their skin. Were Sharpton and his colleagues following King's teachings, they would be attending Beck's event, not trying to belittle it by scheduling dueling demonstrations. King worked to achieve a color-blind society; Sharpton and his followers are working to secure special status for blacks. King worked to remove the social bonds that enslaved black people; Sharpton and his colleagues are working to enslave black people to ever-more government handouts.

Skin color, however, is not what divides Americans. Americans are divided by different visions of how society should be organized. Glenn Beck's "Restoring Honor" demonstration seeks to restore the vision held by the founders of this great nation. Theirs was a vision of sovereign individuals, voluntarily selecting representatives from among their neighbors to create a government to do only those chores enumerated in the Constitution they wrote.

Sharpton and his crowd see another vision. They see a government empowered to take whatever resources it wants from the people who have resources, to make sure that all people have at least a home, adequate food, a job with a livable wage, health care, and an education.

The founder's vision celebrates individual responsibility, hard work, and successful accomplishment. Sharpton's vision assumes that an individual's success was gained unfairly by taking advantage of others. The founders' vision expects people to be responsible for their own needs and to give freely of their resources to help those in need. Sharpton's vision expects government to ensure that the earth's resources are distributed equitably to everyone.

Sharpton's vision, or what he and others like to call the "progressive" agenda, is actually a holdover from the philosophy of folks such as Thomas Hobbes, Jean Jacques Rousseau, and Karl Marx. [Hobbes believed](#) that "The control of power must be lodged in a single person, and no individual can set their own private judgments of right and wrong in opposition to the sovereign's commands." This is the

same philosophy that Sharpton displays when he wants the control of power to be lodged in the federal government against which no private judgments of right or wrong may be lodged against the government's command. This is why it is so terribly important for Sharpton's Democrat party to be in control of the government. When Democrats control government, the Hobbes-Rousseau-Marx philosophy always prevails. When Republicans control government, the Hobbes-Rousseau-Marx philosophy prevails only some of the time.

Glenn Beck is looking far beyond Democrats and Republicans, all the way back to the founders who constructed this nation on the principles of freedom they considered to be essential: (1) recognition that the right to life, liberty, and property is a gift from the Creator; (2) that government is a creation of free people and is empowered only by the consent of the governed; and (3) government is best that governs least.

From these great unshakeable principles flow behaviors that respect, even honor the accomplishments of individuals, and refuse to allow government to steal their resources through progressive taxation to redistribute to others. Sharpton's idea of "progressive" taxation to implement his "progressive" vision is nothing more than legalized theft; if taxation is necessary, it should be applied to all people at the same rate.

President Obama, king of the progressive agenda, uses this analogy for the November elections. He says that to go forward, put the shifter in "D." By selecting "R," we will go backward.

The nation selected "D" in 2008, and have watched the "Ds" accelerate toward a brick wall of economic and social disaster. The people who gather with Al Sharpton bury their head in the sand and say "step on it!"

The people who gather with Glenn Beck have been shouting warnings for more than a year. They say America must slam on the brakes, stop the lunacy the "Ds" are delivering, and shift to a different gear.

The nation is sharply divided. The upcoming elections provide an opportunity to reject the Hobbes-Rousseau-Marx-Sharpton-Obama vision of a society enslaved by an omnipotent government. It may be our last chance.

Celebrate Constitution Day

By Henry Lamb

[To listen, click here](#)

On September 17, 1787, the Constitution Convention meeting in Philadelphia adopted the greatest document on self governance ever written: the Constitution for the United States of America. For the first time in history, representatives of we the people, created a government empowered by the consent of we, the people, to exercise only those limited powers specifically enumerated in the Constitution.

The government created by this document allowed the people governed by it to achieve prosperity and longevity way beyond the wildest imagination of the 39 men who signed that original document. The key to these accomplishments is “the government created by the document allowed the people...” This magnificent document recognized that people are free as a condition of birth, and that their freedom could only be restricted by laws enacted by representatives chosen by the people. This document provided the opportunity for the people to change their representatives on a regular basis to ensure that government always reflected the will of free people.

Not everyone agreed with the Constitutional concept of free individuals with the power to limit the power of government. Woodrow Wilson did all he could do to impose the concept of omnipotent government with the power to grant or deny freedom to individuals. Wilson’s efforts, epitomized by his plan for a League of Nations, failed. Free people fought through a horrible depression, made worse by Franklin D. Roosevelt’s resurrection of Wilson’s dream of omnipotent government. One of the many laws pushed by the Roosevelt administration was the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945. It authorized a five-member Redevelopment Agency to take private property and lease or sell it to other private parties.

This authority to take private property for a purpose other than “public use,” as set forth in the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution vastly increased the erosion of freedom. Roosevelt appointed eight of the nine members of the Supreme Court which reviewed the case and held in [Berman v. Parker, 348 U.S. 26 \(1954\)](#), that:

“...the acquisition and the assembly of real property and the leasing or sale thereof for redevelopment pursuant to a project area redevelopment plan . . . is hereby declared to be a public use.”

This ruling destroyed private property rights. Redevelopment by private parties is not a public use, even if eight Roosevelt appointees said it was. This horrible decision was upheld in [Kelo v. New London](#) in a 5-4 decision. In her dissent, Justice Sandra Day O’Connor said:

“...a law that takes property from A. and gives it to B: It is against all reason and justice,... economic development takings "for public use" is to wash out any distinction between private

and public use of property--and thereby effectively to delete the words "for public use" from the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment."

Since this 1954 decision, the federal government has expanded the envelope of power, taking private property without just compensation by prohibiting owners from using private property the government designates as wetland or as critical habitat or as a historical site or within the viewshed of a scenic highway or waterway.

In recent years, government has forgotten that the Constitution [limits its power](#). The Constitution does not authorize the government to require lending institutions to extend loans to NINJAs (No Income, No Job, or Assets). Yet, the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977, and particularly the revisions of the Act promoted by the Clinton administration required banks to make what came to be called "subprime" loans to people who had no means to repay.

These examples of Government ignoring the Constitution are the reasons why the nation's economic progress has slowed in recent years. These examples of government's abuse of power barely scratch the surface, but the consequences of these violations are all around us. The current economic situation is directly related to the Community Reinvestment Act, and all the subsequent attempts to correct the problems the government created.

The only solution is to return to the Constitution. Learn what it says. Know how your representatives vote on issues. Make sure that your representatives – at every level of government – honor the Constitution.

Attend one of the many Constitution Day celebrations planned around the country during Constitution Week. [Utah's Freedom Conference](#) on September 18 will address directly the Constitutional authority of the federal government's land ownership. Take advantage of [Hillsdale College's free webcasts](#). Get a copy of "[A More Perfect Union](#)," and view this dramatization of how the Constitution was made with your family.

Every parent should make sure that their family knows how the Constitution protects individual freedom. Without this knowledge, government will continue to take individual freedom until there is none.

Constitution Day is September 17th; celebrate it.

Separate the wheat from the chaff

By Henry Lamb

[To listen, click here](#)

Within moments after the second plane hit the World Trade Centers on that fateful day nine years ago, the nation knew that the world would never be the same. No one knew what the world would look like today, but everyone knew it would never be the same.

How soon we forget: when we could arrive at the airport, buy our ticket, check our bags, and board our plane without ever seeing a security guard; when we had never heard of an IED; when Islam was a religion for foreigners. It is a new, more dangerous world than it was on September 10, 2001.

Within hours after the attack, [pictures and responses](#) began pouring in. Pundits, politicians, and ordinary people speculated on the meaning of the attack. Who would do such a thing, and why?

Muslims knew who did it, and [they celebrated](#).

If we have learned nothing else in the nine years since the attack, we must recognize that radical Islamists take seriously that portion of the Koran that orders Muslims to [kill the infidels](#).

- Kill the Jews and the Christians if they do not convert to Islam ([9:29](#))
- Any religion other than Islam is not acceptable ([3:85](#))
- Maim and crucify the infidels if they criticise Islam. ([5:33](#))
- Punish the unbelievers with garments of fire, hooked iron rods, boiling water; kill the infidels wherever you catch them ([9:5](#))
- Do not hanker for peace with the infidels; behead them ([47:4](#))
- Behead those who believe in scriptures other than the Qur'an ([8:12](#))

If you have not see *Fitna*, the short video produced by Geert Wilder, you must [view it now](#). It provides a convincing look at the enthusiasm with which radical Islamists seek to kill infidels, especially Americans.

No amount of tolerance, political correctness, or wishing will change these radical Islamists from their deadly course of destroying infidels, especially Americans. Not all Muslims, however, are radical Islamists. The question is, how do you tell the difference? Where do you draw the line?

Muslims want to build a mosque two blocks from Ground Zero. Why there? They already have more than 100 mosques in New York City, and can build anywhere they can get a permit. Why do they insist on this proximity to Ground Zero? Because they want to erect a monument to their victory at the site of their victory over the United States.

New York Mayor Bloomberg, and Muslim apologists, insists that the Muslims have a “right” to build on this site because they own it. Really. [Ocie Mills](#) owned the property where he wanted to build a house for his son, but the federal government said he could not build a house because construction would alter a wetland that might harm the rest of society. The harm Ocie may have done to the rest of society

by dumping 19 loads of building sand on property he owned can't be compared to the harm that will be done to the victims of 9-11 - and all Americans - if a monument to radical Islam rises above and despoils Ground Zero forever.

Muslims are quick to say that the monument is meant to be an outreach to demonstrate diversity, to show that all religions are represented and respected here. Hogwash! These guys who want to build their mosque near Ground Zero should be ashamed of that element in Islam that commands death to non-believers. They should be so embarrassed by the crimes of their brethren in the name of Islam – their own religion - that they would not dare even speak the name Islam in the vicinity of Ground Zero.

Any so-called religion that commands death to non-believers is not worthy of being recognized as a religion. Any person who believes his religion gives him the right to kill another person who chooses a different religion is either sick or mentally deficient, and should be the object of pity.

Sadly, there are Muslims in America who believe they have the right to kill infidels. There are Muslims in America who believe they have the right – no, the duty – to kill Americans just because they are Americans. Until the Muslim community assumes the responsibility of sorting out and eliminating radicals from the regulars, American must be suspicious of all Muslims.

Muslims who have become American citizens have the responsibility and legal obligation to become Americans, honoring, respecting, and obeying American law regardless of what the Koran may command. Muslims who cannot denounce and reject and disavow the Koran's commands to kill infidels should leave the United States.

Muslims are welcome if they recognize that by exercising their right to choose their own religion, they must be willing to grant that same right to every other person, even if the person chooses a different religion or no religion at all. Muslims who accept this first responsibility of freedom are certainly welcome; these are not the people who piloted airplanes into the World Trade Center nine years ago.

Muslims who want to celebrate the 9-11 victory of radical Islamists are not welcome in the United States. When they are identified, simple deportation is much too kind. Americans should not see all Muslims as radical Islamists, but it is up to the Muslim community to separate the wheat from the chaff by showing the rest of us which Muslims subscribe to America's principle of religious freedom - and which Muslims are radical Islamists.

Dueling demonstrations

By Henry Lamb

[To listen, click here](#)

The progressive world was shocked by the throngs of people who gathered at the Lincoln Memorial on August 28th in response to Glenn Beck's call to attend his "Restoring Honor" rally. Crowd estimates ranged from 87,000 to more than 500,000, which liberal media talking heads discounted as little more than the number of tourists in Washington on any given day.

Across town, the Rev. Al Sharpton complained about Beck's attempt to hijack Martin Luther King's dream - to a few hundred of his faithful followers.

Within hours of Beck's event, the progressive world announced its bigger and better demonstration to be held at the Lincoln Memorial on October 2nd, one month before election day. Their event is called "One World Working Together." More than [150 organizations](#) are promoting this event. Even a casual review of the mission statement of these groups, and the "[what we stand for](#)" statements, reveal that these organizations are the people who are promoting a socialist agenda in this country.

Rarely has there been an opportunity to see so vividly the political and philosophical division in this nation.

Glenn Beck's rally called for a return to God and the principles of freedom set forth in the Constitution.

The "One Nation" rally, according to their website, will call for government to adopt a socialist agenda to control the [work force](#); to control [education](#), and to achieve [social equality](#).

Compare what the "One Nation" organizations advocate with the [Socialist Party USA platform](#).

Socialists in America have made great gains in recent years because they are far better organized than are non-socialists. Socialists have re-labeled themselves as "progressives," rather than the socialists they are. Americans are discovering that even though it may be politically correct to call a skunk a *Mustelidae*, when it begins to spew, there is no question about what it really is. There can be no question that the groups aligned with "One Nation" are working to implement a socialist agenda.

It is interesting, and perhaps instructive, to know that the One Nation Working Together website was registered by PowerPac.org on June 23, 2010. PowerPac.org was formed in 2004 as a not-for-profit corporation (501(c)(4)), located at 44 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, headed by Steve Phillips, Chairman, and Andrew Wong, Executive Director. Their revenue for 2008 was \$8.5 million.

The PowerPac Foundation was formed in 2007 by Steve Phillips, President, and Andrew Wong, as a 501(c)(3) tax-deductible not-for-profit organization, located at 44 Montgomery Street, San Francisco. Their revenue in 2008 was a little more than \$2 million.

The “One Nation Working Together” event is a project of the [Tides Center](#), a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization with 2008 revenues of \$97 million. The Tides Center is headed by [Drummond Pike](#), whose compensation is \$275,000. Pike is also a Director and CEO of the [Tides Foundation](#), whose 2008 revenue was \$114.4 million.

Take a look at the organizations behind this event: the AFL-CIO, with a 2008 revenue of [\\$150 million](#); the SEIU, with a 2008 revenue of [\\$277 million](#), or any of the other organizations flush with money from foundations and federal grants.

Now examine the organizations that supported the Glenn Beck event: The Tea Parties are so new and disorganized that no IRS 990 tax returns are available yet. Most of the Tea Party and 9.12 groups are not incorporated; they are truly grassroots organizations funded out of the pockets of participants. One group promoting the “Restore Our Constitution” event in Washington on the 9-11 weekend is fairly typical. The group reserves a bus, charges riders an amount sufficient to cover the costs, and the people who can afford the fare and the time go. There are no big organizations chartering buses for their membership.

The purpose of the demonstration on October 2 is to convince America, and the world, that there are more people in American who prefer a socialist agenda than there are people who prefer the principles of freedom set forth in the U.S. Constitution.

Regardless of the number of people who show up at the Lincoln Memorial on October 2nd, it will prove only that the socialists have more money and are better organized than plain old everyday Americans. What really matters, however, is not the number of socialists who go to Washington on October 2nd, but the number of everyday Americans who go to the polls on November 2nd.

Glenn Beck did not awaken everyday Americans nearly as much as did Barack Hussein Obama. Beck just helped everyday Americans see the socialists Obama brought into the administration and the socialist agenda Obama is imposing.

The socialists’ October 2nd rally is calling for an even more radical transformation of America; the November 2nd rally at election booths across the nation will echo Beck’s call to restore honor to America by returning to God and to the principles of freedom enshrined in the U. S. Constitution.

U.N. calls for sustainable development, global governance

By Henry Lamb

[Click here to listen](#)

The 65th meeting of the U.N. General Assembly kicked off this week with a call from its new president, Joseph Deiss, for the 192-nation body to reclaim the “[center of global governance](#),” in order to achieve sustainable development and the Millennium Development Goals adopted in 2000.

Pundits and politicians who pooh-pooh [global governance](#) are finding it increasingly difficult to pretend that the U.N. is not on an aggressive mission to create a:

“...framework of rules, institutions, and practices that set limits on behavior of individuals, organizations, and companies.” (U.N. Development Report, 1999, page 34)

Specifically, the Convention on the Biological Diversity; the Convention on the Law of the Sea; and the realization of sustainable development through the implementation of Agenda 21 are high on the priority list for the year. The standard agenda items will get the usual lip service: remove the permanent membership status from the U.S., the U.K., France, China, and Russia; and find independent funding for the U.N.

Sustainable development goals are most appealing, and, perhaps, easiest to achieve. Sustainable development results from the implementation of Agenda 21, which is a non-binding policy document. Nations are free to implement these recommendations on a voluntary basis – as far as the U.N. is concerned. In the United States, however, it is a different story.

Sustainable development is appealing because it claims worthy goals with which few can disagree. What is most disagreeable is the method employed to achieve those goals. Sustainable development, as defined in Agenda 21, cannot be achieved without the loss of individual freedom, private property rights, and free markets. [Sustainable development](#) and sustainable freedom cannot coexist.

The goals of sustainable development are quite worthy and can be achieved much more efficiently through free market forces. This approach, however, eliminates the need for the bureaucracy that defines, implements, and enforces sustainable development through the U.N. plan.

The U.N.’s version of sustainable development requires government to define what constitutes sustainable development in a given community through the adoption of a comprehensive land use plan and related international codes. Citizens are required to comply with the plan or face serious fines, penalties, and even the loss of property.

People – especially politicians – need to step back and consider this question: is the function of government to dictate the behavior of its citizens by limiting their individual freedom? Marxists must

reply with a resounding “yes.” This is precisely the effect of the U.N.’s version of sustainable development.

Many Americans, on the other hand, believe that the legitimate function of government is to do precisely what the citizens who created it and the Constitution instruct it to do – and nothing more. Many Americans believe that they should be able to live where they choose, and can afford to live. This fundamental choice is taken away from people subjected to comprehensive land use plans that dictate where, and under what conditions, people must live. Freedom and sustainable development are mutually exclusive.

Across the nation, private property rights advocates, and increasingly, Tea Party groups, are discovering that they can stop and reverse the sustainable development process that has permeated virtually every community. Until now, local officials have been coerced and intimidated by federal agencies, and fed the sustainable development Koolade by U.N.-accredited NGOs, such as the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), Now, however, local organizations are showing up at city council and county commission meetings, and challenging the assumptions of sustainable development,.

For example, a couple worked years to save the money to buy 38 acres ten miles from town, to build their dream home in the country. They discovered that their county’s comprehensive land use plan required no less than 40 acres per home. Why?

There can be no perceived “common good” to be gained by this rule that is more important than the exercise of individual freedom to do what the owner wants to do on his own land. Marxists strongly disagree. This is not a Marxist nation – yet. Sustainable development is rapidly transforming community after community into a system of governance that is Marxist and a perfect reflection of the system of governance the U.N. General Assembly wants to impose on the entire world. They call it global governance.

It is imperative that local groups learn about [sustainable development](#) and about [global governance](#). It is even more important that informed citizens elect officials at the local, state, and federal level who understand sustainable development and global governance. There is a wealth of material available and it is being distributed by local organizations to their elected officials and to their friends and neighbors.

Now is the time to stand up to government and let every governmental entity know that their first responsibility is to the citizens who elect them, and not to the policies adopted by the United Nations.

Look out for a lame duck

By Henry Lamb

[To listen, click here](#)

As the calendar rushes toward the November 2nd elections, prospects increase for a bloody “lame-duck” session. There is a laundry list of bills stacked up for passage that have not yet made it to the floor for a vote. After the elections, Democrats who lost will have nothing further to lose, and will be eager to get as much of Obama’s radical agenda enacted as possible.

Lurking in the shadows is Senator Chris Dodd’s [Livable Communities Act](#) (S-1619). This bill will essentially write into domestic law the recommendation set forth in [chapter 10 of Agenda 21](#).

Since the Clinton era, the federal government has been enticing and coercing local governments to transform their communities into “[Sustainable Communities](#),” as defined by Agenda 21. The Dodd bill brings down the heavy-hand of government to force communities to conform. The implementation of Dodd’s “livable” or sustainable communities forces the loss of individual freedom, serious reduction of private property rights, and the erosion of a free market in real estate.

If enacted during the lame duck session, it must be repealed by the new Congress.

Senator Feingold’s [Clean Water Restoration Act](#) (S-787) is high on the priority list for passage. This bill would give to the federal government virtually every drop of water that falls on the United States to the federal government, regardless of whether it winds up in a river, a lake, a stream, a wetland, a prairie pothole, a mudhole, or backyard fish pond on private property. Moreover, the bill also gives to the federal government authority to control all activity that may affect these waters, whether the activity occurs on private or public property.

Should this bill become law, it will have to be repealed by the new Congress.

Representative George Miller’s [Employee Free Choice Act](#) (HR-1409), also known as “Card Check” is sure to be on the list for emergency passage. In the House, this bill has 240 co-sponsors; the Senate companion bill (S-560) has 40 co-sponsors. This bill eliminates the right of businesses and workers to conduct an election to determine whether a particular business will become unionized. Card Check allows union bosses to secure a signature on a card from workers in a target business any way they wish. When more than 50 percent of the workers have signed a card, [then the business is unionized](#).

This bill is important to President Obama, and to the Democrats, to repay the unions for their financial support during the 2008 election cycle. The unions poured millions of dollars into Democratic campaigns and provided countless workers in well-organized, get-out-the-vote programs. Labor unions expect, no, demand, Card Check as repayment for their efforts.

This bill would certainly have to be repealed were it enacted in a lame-duck session.

Senator Richard Durbin's [FDA Food Safety Modernization Act](#) (S-510) is another candidate for the lame-duck session. This bill has absorbed several other bills from both the House and Senate and is still undergoing some final tweaking. The goal of this horrible piece of legislation is to give the federal government absolute control over the production, processing, marketing, and transportation of virtually all food products. While a few "exemption" amendments are being considered for very small farmers, the thrust of the bill is to ultimately put every backyard garden, and every food-handling business, under even tighter control of the federal government.

Buried within this bill is the authority for the federal government to force food producers to register the premises of their farm or ranch into a federal database, and provide inventory records as well as a record of the movement of any livestock animals. This is the kind of government intrusion that transforms the land of the free into the home of the enslaved.

Obviously, this bill must be repealed if enacted.

These are only a few of the long list of transformative policies Obama and the Democrats plan to impose on an unsuspecting people. Fortunately, there are enough people watching and reporting that these bills have been blocked so far. The lame-duck session is another matter, however.

In addition to repealing these bills – should they be enacted- Obama's health care fiasco must be repealed. There's only one way to accomplish this feat: change the control of Congress.

There is a strong possibility that the Democrats can lose control of the House, and perhaps the Senate, in the elections November 2nd. This result is far from a sure thing. Every eligible American must make every effort to vote this year, and vote for the best conservative candidate available. Family, friends, and neighbors need to be reminded of the importance of voting this year.

We are just a little more than a month away from the opportunity to save the nation from a generation of Marxist policies now being forced down the nation's throat by a radical Democrat majority.

Let's change that majority.

Feds say global governance at “critical juncture”

By Henry Lamb

[Click here to listen](#)

Pundits and politicians who giggle and point fingers at people who dare refer to global governance display their ignorance, or their duplicity. The United States National Intelligence Council, and the European Union’s Institute for Security Studies has just released a report called: [Global Governance 2025: At A Critical Juncture](#).

This 82-page document discusses quite openly the current status of global governance and the likelihood of global governance maturing into full-fledged global government. [Those who scoff](#) at the reality of global governance are to be pitied for their ignorance or despised for their duplicity. As [Gustave Speth](#), former director of the World Resources Institute, and head of the U.N. Development Program, said in 1997:

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

Speth’s belief was confirmed in November, 2009 by [Herman Van Rompuy](#), President of the European Union Council, who said “Global governance is the global management of our planet.”

The new U.S.-E.U. report defines global governance to be: “the collective management of common problems at the international level,” and says that global governance is at a critical juncture.

The United Nations Development Program, in its 1999 report, defines global governance to be: “...the framework of rules, institutions, and practices that set limits of the behavior of individuals, organizations and companies.”

Both the U.N. and the new U.S.-E.U. report are quick to say that global governance is not global government. The new report describes global government as the exercise of sovereignty through a hierarchical system of authority, while global governance is a voluntary arrangement of shared sovereignty among nations.

If global governance has the power to “limit the behavior of individuals, organizations, and companies,” then such actions are, indeed, the exercise of sovereignty, even if that sovereignty has been voluntarily surrendered to an international institution such as the World Trade Organization, or to an international treaty.

Dancing around the semantics is simply a diversion in an attempt to appease, distract, or discredit the opponents of global governance. The indisputable fact is that global governance has advanced dramatically in the last two decades, and is moving forward even faster under the Obama administration.

The new report says: “[the] EU has sought to export its model of regional integration and sovereignty-sharing and has devised a distinctive discourse on global governance and priorities.” The report also quotes a Chinese participant: “Global governance requires giving over significant sovereignty to others—that is the view in China....” Any way you look at it, as global governance advances, national sovereignty evaporates. The report identifies three areas in which more effective global governance is badly needed and is likely to materialize: climate change and the environment; opening of the Arctic; and the global economy.

Proponents of global governance expected the Kyoto Protocol to the Framework Convention on Climate Change to provide the structure required to impose global governance over global energy use. Their plan has not yet materialized, even though the proponents continue to work toward a treaty and an international mechanism with the power to control energy use.

The Convention on the Law of the Sea, and its International Seabed Authority, was supposed to be the treaty and the mechanism to control the use of the sea and its resources. Recent discoveries of enormous petroleum reserves in the Arctic region are sure to prompt ownership battles between the United States and Russia, unless proponents in the Obama administration and the Senate can get the treaty ratified.

The global economic meltdown in the last few years has forced the U.N. and other global governance enthusiasts to shift into high gear their plans to take over the global economy. First proposed publicly by the U.N.-funded Commission on Global Governance in 1995, it is their ultimate goal to have all international trade, international transfer of currency, and international money flows under the direct control of a U.N. agency. Inherent in this dream is the authority to rake-off a percentage of the money flow as a global tax that would provide independent funding for the United Nations operation.

Whether it is recognized or not, global governance is here, here to stay and it is expanding rapidly. At the very least, global governance is the transitional step to unabashed global government. One of the most important obstacles that have yet to be overcome is the creation of an independent revenue stream. So far, the Obama administration has been very supportive of the U.N.’s plans to create this global economic regulatory mechanism.

In fact, the Obama administration supports the creation of a global system to control energy through a climate change treaty. The Obama administration supports the ratification of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, as well as the global economic regulator mechanism.

No wonder the new U.N.-E.U. report forecasts global governance. They claim the prospects for global governance are at a critical juncture because despite Obama’s support, their agenda has met significant opposition within the U.S. and in other countries. It is clear that the governments of the U.S. and the European Union are eager to continue expanding global governance. No combination of nations can stop the U.S. and the E.U. in their quest.

The only power sufficient to stop this agenda is the power of American voters who care enough to turn out the current majority in Congress, in a dress rehearsal for turning out the current administration in 2012.

Birds of a feather flock together

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

The recent gathering at the Lincoln Memorial was nothing less than an enormous, nationally televised coming-out party for closet Marxists. Washington watchers have long known about the love affair between the Marxists in America and other major political forces. Here are a [few of the organizations](#) that are marching, lock-step, in support of the Democratic majority that is advancing a Marxist agenda:

Communist Party USA (CPUSA)
Democratic Socialists of America
Committee of Correspondence for
Democracy and Socialism
Sierra Club
National Wildlife Federation
Friends of the Earth
Center for Biological Diversity
NAACP
Rainbow PUSH Coalition
AFL-CIO

UAW, International Union
SEIU: Service Employees International
Union
American Federation of Teachers
American Association of University
Professors
AFGE: American Federation of
Government Employees
[\(And more than 300 other
organizations\)](#)

The Democrats, and their coalition of Marxist organizations, say the Reid-Pelosi Marxist majority must be returned to Congress because the Republicans will return to the “failed policies of the past” and run the “economy into the ditch” again.

Any honest analysis of why the economy ran into the ditch has to begin with the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977, promoted by the Carter administration and many of the organizations that “came out” last weekend. The purpose of the law was to make it easier for low-income families to get mortgages.

Marxists, of course, believe that adequate housing is a right, and that government has the responsibility to see that every person has adequate housing. The Clinton administration, goaded on by many of the organizations that “came out” last weekend, lowered the credit requirements to the point that NINJAs (No Job, No Income, No Assets) were buying upscale houses all over the country with what were called “sub-prime” mortgages. To his credit, George Bush [tried in vain to tighten the regulation](#) of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, but Democrats Charles Schumer and Barney Frank led the charge to defeat tighter controls.

It was clearly the failed policies of the Democrats and their Marxist buddies who ran the economy into the ditch, not eight years of the Bush administration.

Speaker after speaker last week, railed against corporations that out-sourced jobs to foreign countries. They fail to recognize that it is their failed policies that force corporations to find less expensive production costs.

Environmental organizations such as the Sierra Club, and the Center for Biological Diversity, and hundreds of others, constantly force production costs upwards by lobbying for ever stronger environmental regulations that virtually stop land use, require reams of scientific and technical reviews to meet Environmental Impact Statement requirements. These regulatory costs rarely improve the environment, and since they are not required in other countries, corporations are drawn away from America.

Labor unions drive wage and benefit costs up year after year, without concern for the cost, or whether there are sufficient sales to cover the costs. This is what killed the U.S. auto industry. This, along with excessive environmental and social regulatory costs, is what has killed the entire American manufacturing industry. These are the failed policies that are dragging the American economy into the ditch, not eight years of the Bush administration. This ever-increasing cost of production doesn't exist in other countries; these Marxist policies force industry to leave the U.S.

Marxists claim they believe in non-discrimination, equality for everyone. That is, everyone but the rich.

Marxists believe in discrimination against the rich. Marxists believe that the rich should be penalized and forced to pay a higher tax rate than everyone else.

Marxists believe that the government should provide to the poor adequate housing, health care, education, and a job that pays a decent wage. They believe the rich should be forced to pay the costs, whatever the costs may be.

It is morally wrong to tax one segment of the population at a higher rate than another segment of the population. Progressive income tax is nothing more than legalized theft. Marxists also believe that the end justifies the means. Therefore, to Marxists, nothing is immoral if it achieves the desired outcome. The only thing that is immoral to a Marxist is failure to achieve the desired outcome.

Marxists influenced the direction of government excessively during the Wilson administration, the Roosevelt administration, and since the Clinton administration. Obama and his cadre of Marxist czars and Democratic majority in congress have turned up the heat on advancing his Marxist agenda. The Democrats and the Marxist organizations gathered at the Lincoln Memorial last week will do whatever is necessary to prevail in every election they can, and then enact every Marxist scheme they can during the lame duck session of Congress.

Never have the Marxists been this close to completely "transforming the United States of America," as Obama so proudly predicted. Never has it been so important to turn out the Democrats in Congress and replace them with candidates who honor and respect the U.S. Constitution, free markets, private property, and individual freedom.

“A Republic, ma’am, if you can keep it”

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

Except for a brief period during the Reagan years, America has been moving steadily toward becoming a social democracy rather than the republic our founders gave us. There is a very good reason why this is happening.

Since 1933, [Democrats have had complete control](#) of government – Presidency, House and Senate – for 34 years. Republicans, on the other hand, have had control of government for a total of four years (108th and 109th Congress). Democrats controlled both houses of Congress for 56 years, while Republicans controlled both houses for only 12 years. For 22 years, the Democrats had a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate; none for the Republicans.

Clearly, Democrats have steered the ship of state since the Roosevelt era. While Democrats loudly blame the Republicans for all the nation’s woes, it is the Democrats who must accept responsibility for the state of the nation.

As bad as things are in the United States at the moment, the United States is in far better shape than most of the rest of the world. But the nation is nowhere near as good as it would have been had the republic - and its free market – been allowed to prosper.

The “Progressive” era that arose from the writings of Marx, Lenin, and others, embraced fully by Woodrow Wilson’s administration, infested the Democrat Party, and since Franklin Roosevelt, has promoted policies that advance Marxism and erodes the republican form of government designed by our founders.

The republican form of government created by our founders consists of three primary pillars: the election of representatives who make policy; the election of a president through the Electoral College; and the election of Senators by state legislatures.

All three of these pillars are under severe attack. Increasingly, state and local policies are being decided by direct vote of the people, instead of by representatives elected by the people. This is direct democracy, not the way a republic functions. Our founders carefully avoided the possibility of a direct democracy, well aware of the inevitable anarchy that always follows democracy.

The Electoral College is under severe attack. In addition to Constitutional amendment proposals being introduced into Congress that provide direct vote of the people to elect the president, there is also a [powerful movement afoot](#) at the state level to award electoral votes to candidates on a percentage basis rather than on a winner-take-all basis. This proportioned vote distribution is certainly more democratic than the winner-take-all basis. But our founders were not trying to create the most democratic process. They were creating a republic, not a democracy.

The Woodrow Wilson crowd erased one of the three pillars altogether, when it promoted and adopted the 17th Amendment. This amendment took from the states the power to elect Senators and put that power into the hands of the public. Again, singing the progressive song of advancing democracy, the voters adopted the amendment in 1913, right after the 16th amendment which gave the federal government authority to tax income. These two amendments leave the republic a faint shadow of what our founders created. Marxist-driven progressives in the Obama administration are hell-bent to completely destroy what is left of the republic.

The philosophical foundation of a republic includes the idea that people are sovereign, and the government which people create derives its power from the consent of the governed. A social democracy thrives on the idea that the government is sovereign, and may grant or deny freedom to the people as it may please government.

In a republic, the primary function of government is to protect the rights endowed to people by their Creator and to defend the people from all enemies foreign and domestic. In a social democracy, the function of government is to manage the people's behavior and activities to achieve whatever goals the government defines.

A republic recognizes that the less involvement government can have in the market place, the more prosperous that market place will be. In a social democracy, government manages the market place to achieve social objectives rather than prosperity.

Since Woodrow Wilson, the Democrat Party has led this nation further away from the republic our founders created, and steadfastly toward the Marxist utopia embraced by communists, socialists, and social democrats around the world.

The only way to retain what's left of the republic our founders gave us is to rid Washington , and state and local governments of the progressives - and replace them with people who respect, understand, and embrace the Constitution.

The U.N. at 65

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

October 24 is the 65th birthday of the United Nations; a great age for retirement. This institution has consistently failed to achieve the objectives for which it told the world it was created, and has just as consistently drained the coffers of developed nations under the guise of eliminating poverty and maintaining the peace.

What a joke.

Global poverty is just as rampant today as it was in 1945 – probably worse. U.N. Peacekeepers are routinely [caught exploiting](#) the very people they are supposed to protect. Corruption flourishes at the U.N. from the [oil-for-food program](#) to the ongoing procurement scandals throughout the entire institution. What’s worse is that this joke continues, from administration to administration because there is no oversight or accountability.

Despite these blatant failures, the United Nations has been remarkably successful in achieving the purpose for which it has consistently told the world it was *not* created: that is, [to govern the world](http://sovereignty.net/p/gov/gg-2.pdf).

The [League of Nations](#) was a product of the Woodrow Wilson administration which made no apology for its desire to create a world government based on Marxist principles. Fortunately for the world, the U.S. Senate rejected Wilson’s dream – three times – and the League withered, but did not die.

Many of the same people who created the League of Nations created, and gathered in, the Council on Foreign Relations in America, and in the Royal Institute for International Affairs in Europe. When Franklin Roosevelt reclaimed the federal government for the Democrats in 1932, his administration was filled with Wilson cronies and other progressives who longed for the global government Wilson failed to create.

Two weeks after Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt appointed a 14-member Committee on the Post War World. Ten of the members were members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Two weeks later, Roosevelt issued a “Declaration of United Nations,” the first time the term was used officially by any government.

Global government remained a distant dream of the progressives and Marxists on both sides of the Atlantic until the 1970s. The new environmental movement absorbed the young war activists who were left with nothing to protest after Vietnam. Maurice Strong created the U.N. Environment Program in 1973, and pushed through several environmental treaties. The U.N.’s Man and the Biosphere Program was created during this period, which was not a treaty, but a simple agreement between the U.S. State Department and UNESCO, to manage 47 U.N. Biosphere Reserves in the United States according to the recommendations of UNESCO.

In 1976, the U.N. adopted its first [policy position on land use](#). The preamble says “public control of land use is indispensable.” Two of the people who signed the document for the United States were members of the Council on Foreign Relations: Carla A. Hills, who became George Bush’s Trade Negotiator responsible for the WTO, and William K. Reilly, who became Bush’s administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Progressives in both parties have promoted the United Nations and worked to advance global governance. The Clinton administration was especially supportive of the U.N. global governance agenda. The 1992 U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro produced the Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and Agenda 21. All of these U.N. documents were embraced by the Clinton/Gore administration and implemented administratively, as much as possible.

Obama and his team bring an even stronger admiration for the United Nations, and determination to subject the United States to global governance. He went to Copenhagen to personally try to seal a deal for the Kyoto Protocol. He wants the Senate to ratify the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on the Law of the Sea. He is participating in the G20’s efforts to create a mechanism for controlling the global flow of currency, and has said nothing in opposition to the development of a [global currency](#).

For sixty-five years, the U.N. has publically abused the world’s poorest and most vulnerable people, while almost without public notice, building its own power through a global web of international laws, regulations, and recommendations. The U.N. paints itself as a noble institution, redistributing the wealth of the West to the needy elsewhere – while raking off an administrative fee and scamming whatever else they can.

Congratulations U.N., on reaching 65; now retire - and good riddance!

Vote for freedom, or government control

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

Regardless of the outcome of the mid-term elections, the nation will suffer – not from the election results - but from the lame-duck session of Congress that follows. The greater the Republican victory in the elections, the greater the damage the Democrats will do during the lame-duck session. And there is much damage to be done.

Obama and the Democrats have already begun to lay blame for the largest tax increase in history should the current tax rates be allowed to expire on January 1. Obama and the Democrats have refused to bring a bill to the floor that will extend the current tax rate because the Republicans, and at least 31 Democrats, have insisted that the current tax rate be extended for all tax payers.

Obama, and the Democratic leadership, appear to be ready to let the tax rate increase dramatically for all tax payers, in order to increase the tax rate for the “rich.” Economists across the political spectrum agree that the worst possible response to a depressed economy is to increase taxes.

In a lame-duck session, Republicans cannot advance a bill that the majority doesn’t want advanced. The Democrats can, however, advance any bill that they wish – unless a few Democrats in the Senate can be convinced to join a filibuster to block final passage of a bill.

If Democrats, and a complicit media, can lay the blame on Republicans for letting the current tax rate expire, they will do it, hiding behind the press of other important legislation they want to push through the lame-duck session, while they still have the power to do so.

Among the many measures the Democrats want to push through Congress, is the FDA [Food Safety Modernization Act](#) (S-510), which will essentially bring the agriculture industry under the control of the federal government.

From day one of this administration, the goal has been to “[transform the United States of America](#)” into a socialist-like system in which formerly-free people must get government’s permission to exercise their liberty or pursue their happiness.

Another measure that makes Democrats drool is the Clean [Water Restoration Act](#) (S-787). This bill would give to the federal government jurisdiction over every drop of water in, on, and under the United States. Moreover, this bill would give to the federal government jurisdiction over any activity by any person that “may affect the waters of the United States.” Simply put, this bill would give the federal government the power to stop any person from doing anything, anywhere that water may be. These two bills would effectively control all the people who live outside cities.

Senator Chris Dodd's [Livable Communities Act](#) (S-1619) would control the people who live in towns and cities. This bill will write into U.S. law the so-called "smart-growth" provisions of Agenda 21, the U.N.'s vision of planned communities popularly called "sustainable development."

Sustainable development gives the government the authority to tell people where they may – or may not – construct a home or business, what materials may be used in the structure, and what plants and vegetation may be planted. By drawing lines on a map, government may strip private property of all value by simply declaring it to be a "conservation zone" where no development is allowed. Conversely, the same government can designate an Urban Boundary Zone, inside of which property values skyrocket - because that's the only area where development can occur.

The integrity of the people who draw the lines on the map is always above the temptation to accept gratuities for making sure that the lines on the map include the property of the people offering the gratuity. Ha!

This Obama-Pelosi-Reid administration is convinced that they know best how everyone should live, and they are hell-bent on giving government the power to dictate how everyone should live. The lame-duck session could be their last chance to force their brand of progressive-socialist-Marxist government on the nation.

Of course, a Republican sweep could undo the damage done by this administration to date, beginning with ObamaCare. A Republican sweep could reinstate the current tax rate if it is allowed to expire, repeal Obama's health care monstrosity, reverse whatever mischief the Democrats are able to do in their last days in Washington, and under the watchful eye of the Tea Parties, begin to return the nation to the Constitution and the principles of Freedom our founders wrote into it.

Each vote cast in this midterm election will be either a vote for freedom and free markets, or a vote for more government control over the lives of every American.

Vote your conviction, but vote.

Tea Parties' next challenge

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

Americans can do whatever they decide to do. Witness the politiscape littered with the careers of Democrats deposed by determined Americans who have had enough big-government socialism forced upon them. The next challenge for Tea Parties – and other organizations – is local and state governments that are systematically implementing freedom-robbing policies in the name of comprehensive planning, smart growth, [sustainable development](#), and environmental protection.

If the word “freedom” is to have any meaning at all, it must mean that people are free to live wherever they choose, and free to use their property as they choose. For nearly 150 years, no one questioned this fundamental freedom. Then, in 1916, the Equitable Life Insurance Company built a 38-story building at 120 Broadway in lower Manhattan. The controversy about the building’s effect on the neighborhood resulted in the first zoning laws. In 1924, the Department of Commerce issued The Standard State Zoning Enabling Act, which many states adopted. Zoning simply allowed elected officials to establish areas within a city that were reserved for industrial, residential, municipal, or recreational use. People were still free to build what they wanted within these zones.

By the 1970s, however, zoning fell out of favor, and the new fad became planning. The American Planning Association emerged in 1978 to advance the “science” of planning. Planning gave the government the power to control the use of land. Control of the use of any asset is the first evidence of ownership. But this new “science” of planning allowed government to disavow ownership of the land, continue to force the owner to pay taxes on the land, and still dictate to the owner how the land might be used, or to prohibit all uses whatever.

The first purpose of government is to secure the unalienable rights of the people who created the government. Among these rights are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. So says the Declaration of Independence and most state constitutions. The U.S. Constitution requires that just compensation be paid to any person whose property is taken for public use.

The new science of planning allows government to take from the owner the privilege of ownership - without compensation, while forcing the owner to bear all the responsibilities of ownership. State and local governments have lost their way, just as the federal government lost its way. The Tea Parties – and other organizations – started last week on a path to put the federal government back on track to protect the unalienable rights of the people who created it. Now it is time for these same determined Americans to focus on state and local governments, and put them back on the right track to protect the rights of their citizens as well.

The first policy statement in a Missouri county’s comprehensive plan says: “The County shall work to prevent urban sprawl....” Considering the first purpose of government, would it not be more appropriate for the first policy statement to be something like: “The County shall work to protect the

private property rights of its citizens...” The words “property rights” do not appear anywhere in the entire plan. Local and state governments, as well as the federal government, have forgotten the first purpose for which they were created. They must be reminded at each and every election, and on a regular basis between elections.

Tea Parties – and other organizations – should now take aim at local governments. Every community has a comprehensive land use plan, or has such a plan under development. These plans inevitably destroy private property rights and property values. Local citizens must hold their elected officials accountable by attending public meetings and asking why it is more important for the county to prevent urban sprawl than to protect the private property rights of its citizens.

Throughout Florida, Tea Party organizations are beginning to accept the challenge of preventing local government from crushing their property rights under a comprehensive land use plan. In Amarillo, Texas, a group of everyday citizens has formed to learn how to convince their elected officials to reject the plan that stifles property rights – and economic development. In city after city, and county after county, local citizens are discovering that they can change the direction of their government.

Tea Parties will have a few months before the battles for the 2012 elections heat up. There’s no better training ground, or more productive enterprise than to persuade local and state governments to abandon the socialist idea of controlling land use, and return to the practice of protecting the rights of the people who created the government – especially the rights inherent in private property ownership. If freedom is to be restored to the American people, it must be restored at home, as well as in Washington.

Repeal Obamacare – and more

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

While there are hundreds of political parties and even more political initiatives seeking support, when all of the hoopla is striped away, there are only two political philosophies. One philosophy embraces the notion that government is omnipotent, and grants rights to individual citizens. This philosophy is demonstrated by the United Nations’ Declaration of Human Rights and more pointedly in the U.N. [Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#). Article 19, for example, guarantees everyone has the right of free expression, but then goes on to say that “The exercise of these rights ... carries with it special duties and responsibilities. It may therefore be subject to certain restrictions”

The other philosophy is demonstrated by the founding documents of the United States: the Declaration of Independence; the Constitution; and the Bill of Rights. This philosophy recognizes that individuals are the omnipotent power, that government is the creation of individuals, and is empowered by, and subject to the wishes of the individuals who created it. America’s founders realized that not all individuals could possibly know about, nor exercise a vote on every issue that needed a decision. These founders also believed that individuals choosing a representative from their midst, would choose wisely and send a person to legislate in their behalf who would truly represent their interest.

This new nation, however, was not a single nation, it was a confederation of thirteen states, each inhabited by a different number of individuals. The most contentious issue confronting the founders was how to achieve fair and equitable representation among the various states, and among the individuals within those states. Connecticut delegate, Roger Sherman, came up with the “Grand Compromise”: the lower chamber, the House of Representatives, would consist of representatives based on population, while the upper chamber, the Senate, would represent the states, and would consist of two representatives chosen by the state legislatures.

This arrangement provided the balance needed to protect the interest of the states, while providing equal representation for the individuals. The tension created by the competition among the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Executive offered the best system of checks and balances the founders could create.

Had this system been in place when Obamacare was presented, the bill would likely have failed. The bill passed the House with only a [two-vote margin](#). Had the Senate been comprised of individuals chosen by the states, the bill would have never seen the light of day. At least 14 states immediately filed lawsuits to have the new law declared unconstitutional. Had the Senators from these 14 states been chosen by the state legislatures – according to the original design – there would be no Obamacare now.

The explosion of progressive thinking unleashed by Woodrow Wilson and his cronies produced the Federal Reserve, the income tax, and the 17th Amendment which removed from the states the right to choose their Senators, and put the election of Senators in the hands of the people.

This amendment was sold as a more “democratic” way to choose Senators; but the founders did not create a democracy, they created a republic - and fair and balanced representation of individuals and of the states was their goal. Enactment of the 17th Amendment expanded the power of political parties and opened a whole new avenue of influence for well-funded special interest groups.

The procedures used in the Senate to force Obamacare through the system, was a masterful exercise in negotiating the labyrinth of legality. Had the Senators been chosen by state legislatures, there is no way they would have allowed the shenanigans that Harry Reid and his pals perpetrated on the nation.

The framers knew what they were doing when they made the Senators accountable to the state legislature. This accountability prevented progressives from advancing their agenda prior to the Wilson administration. By putting the election of Senators in the hands of the public, special interest groups could buy the votes they needed to advance their agenda. A good exercise might be to track the contributions to Senate candidates from labor unions and other special interest groups.

Obamacare is perhaps the most dramatic departure from the founders’ philosophy of government that has been seen since the days of Franklin Roosevelt. If Obamacare is allowed to stand, the United States of America will no longer be a capitalist nation, constructed on the belief that individuals empower government. Obama will have succeeded in overwhelming the sovereignty of individuals with the sovereign power of government. Once unleashed, there is no stopping governmental power.

A government that can force its citizens to buy health insurance can force its citizens to buy anything the government dictates.

Obamacare must be repealed. Perhaps the 17th Amendment should be next on the list to repeal.

Platform for the 21st century

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

Pundits, politicians, and even ordinary people are mystified by the rise of the Tea Parties' protest of the Democrats' agenda. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi called the spontaneous uprising from the grassroots "Astroturf" - just before she lost her gavel to the Republicans. King George imposed his agenda over the objections of subjects – just before he lost both his subjects, and his colonies, to the power of people in pursuit of freedom.

Once again, people are rising up in defense of freedom against a "...Marxist-like takeover of Congress in 2008...that launched audacity and intimidation to new heights..." says [Beverly Eakman](#) in her latest book, titled "[A Common Sense Platform for the 21st Century.](#)" Eakman contends that the nation may well be at a point in history quite similar to the days leading to the revolution, in which the people had to decide whether to accept the *status quo*, or to risk treasure, and even life, to enjoy the freedom endowed by the Creator.

Her concise 120-page book uses the first chapter to analyze the state of the nation and the reasons for it. Eakman, herself an educator, takes direct aim at the nation's education system for training generations of people to focus on the collective, rather than the individual, and on government largesse, rather than individual responsibility. This emphasis has taught too many people that freedom is less important than comfort. Consequently, she says, "Our nation is devolving into just one more overbearing, top-heavy bureaucracy that controls through intimidation, red tape, paperwork and redistribution under some convenient pretext." Eakman further observes:

"Thanks to 40 years of watered-down schooling, most of today's adults do not recall exactly how we got where we are now. Consequently, many of us have become closet Marxist-socialists without even realizing it."

The rise of the Tea Parties is evidence of a growing rebellion among the people unwilling to accept this current reality. This is a time of great opportunity, or great danger. It is a time to realize that the future cannot be left to any political party, but must be guided by solid, proven principles. Eakman examines these principles in the context of current issues. Chapter two categorizes America's most pressing issues: Constitutional powers; founding ideals; national sovereignty; criminal justice and law enforcement; national defense; economic stability; health care; research; environment; and education. These issues must be addressed from the perspective of Constitutional principles, not political expedience.

Chapter three is devoted to identifying specific examples of the "train of abuses and usurpations" imposed by a federal government that has been allowed to grow well beyond the size and power ever intended by the founders. As an example of the federal government's ridiculous misuse of power, Eakman offers the required pat-down or x-ray of every air traveler to protect against terrorists, while

abandoning a 32-mile stretch along the Mexican border where law enforcement officers are not allowed, for fear of damaging an endangered species. This makes the entire area a safe-zone for smugglers and terrorists and illegal immigrants to enter anytime they wish. Additional examples of current abuses fill Chapter four. In a very few pages, Eakman provides solid evidence of a government run amok.

The principles that must guide the development and implementation of a 21st century platform must include: fiscal responsibility; Constitutionally limited government; free markets; and an environment of integrity, decency, and self control. Chapter five gets more specific in its identification of the principles that must be honored: private property rights; non-intervention in the market place by government entities; reversal of entitlements and redistribution policies; rededication to America, as opposed to self-defeating “globalization” policies.

The “[Common Sense Platform for the 21 Century](#)” is spelled out in Chapter six. From such obvious elements as term limits, earmarks, and control of perks and compensation, to sun-setting every government program to force a periodic evaluation, Eakman has spelled out a people’s platform that government must be required to respect. Her platform attacks “political correctness” and “multiculturalism” as enemies of freedom. The use of eminent domain by government for the benefit of other private citizens is condemned, as is government’s rush to erase any trace of Christianity from public life.

The book concludes with an insightful discussion of the political party system in the United States, and particularly the effectiveness and potential of third-party initiatives. Eakman examines the role the media plays in advancing or destroying political agendas, noting that it is common practice among socialists to ignore the opposition agenda, and destroy people who advance an opposing agenda. This tactic was especially successful in the Delaware and Nevada Senate races where the opposition candidates were unmercifully demeaned personally, with no attention paid by the media to the issues the candidates advanced.

This platform for the 21st century could not have arrived at a better time. With the new Congress convening after the holidays, and the next Presidential election cycle already underway, this book should be required reading for every elected official, every candidate, campaign worker, and, indeed, for every American.

What is a sustainable community?

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

The term “sustainable community” sounds warm and fuzzy. Who could possibly oppose a sustainable community? “Sustainable” means something that lasts – or is sustained - forever. When the term is applied to “community,” one might conclude that a sustainable community is one that will last forever. One who draws such a conclusion in today’s world would be wrong, terribly wrong.

The term “sustainable community” is an offspring of the term “sustainable development,” which was coined by the World Commission on Environment and Development back in 1987, and refined in Agenda 21, adopted by 179 nations (including the U.S.) at the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in 1992. Among the first recommendations found in Agenda 21 is the recommendation that each nation establish its own program of “sustainable development” to implement all the recommendations in the 40 chapters of Agenda 21. President Bill Clinton complied with this recommendation when he issued an Executive Order to create the President’s Council on Sustainable Development.

What the term “sustainable development” really means is development that is dictated by, or otherwise approved by government. The term “sustainable communities” means communities that are dictated by, or otherwise approved by government. Those who doubt this reality are invited to read Chris Dodd’s Livable Communities Act (S-1619) and then read Agenda 21. There will be no doubt where Mr. Dodd got the ideas for his Bill.

Since the Clinton years, federal agencies have enticed and coerced states and local communities to transform their cities and towns into “sustainable communities” as defined by government. Just last month, three federal agencies doled out \$100 million in their “Regional Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program. The East-West Gateway Council of Governments in St. Louis got \$4.6 million; 45 other regional areas also received healthy grants.

Social engineering by the federal government goes beyond regional government and reaches into counties, cities, and towns. Often encouraged by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), the National Council of Mayors, the National Association of County Commissioners, and the promise of federal grants, local communities are falling all over themselves to become politically-correct sustainable communities.

Sustainable communities present three problems: (1) the initiative for a community to become a sustainable community almost always comes from outside the community; (2) the comprehensive plan through which a community is transformed into a sustainable community always infringes, and in many instances completely destroys, private property rights; and (3) the local community rarely knows anything about the plan until it reaches the final stages of adoption.

This process, of course, is by design. In communities that have been transformed, individuals may discover that they cannot build a house for grandma on five acres of their own land because the county's comprehensive plan requires no more than [one home per 40-acres](#). Many communities discover that their comprehensive plan includes a provision to incorporate by reference the entire set of 13 different codes developed by the [International Code Council](#). Each of these codes amounts to government dictating human behavior.

These codes go far beyond building and fire safety codes. They include: residential, property maintenance, energy conservation, wildland interface, and other behavior modification codes.

A sustainable community is a community around which government draws an Urban Boundary Zone (UBZ) and forbids city services to be delivered outside the UBZ, prohibits new construction outside the UBZ, and requires residents within the UBZ to live in housing that meets the size and cultural integration standards set forth in the code or comprehensive plan. Sustainable communities are high-density communities where automobiles are discouraged, and bikeways and walkways are the alternative to public transportation.

Obviously, property outside the UBZ has no commercial value and very limited use options. Property inside the UBZ is extremely valuable because it is the only place commercial activity may occur. Unfortunately, many communities have discovered that their plan includes a [little known U.N. recommendation](#) (D-3) endorsed by the U.S. back in 1976, which calls on governments to:

“... exercise a controlling effect on the land market and to redistribute to the public at large the benefits of the unearned increase in land value.”

This means that the increased value of land within the UBZ gets taxed away from the owner, and profits from the sale of land are considered an “unearned increase in land value,” and recovered through taxation in order to “redistribute to the public at large,” as the government sees fit.

Sustainable development is coming to your community, or is already there. Your property rights have been diminished, or soon will be. The only way to protect your community and your property and profit is to reject the entire concept of government-dictated land use and behavior codes. Tea Parties across the nation are joining this battle at the local level. Ultimately, local officials may need to be sent packing like Congressional Democrats. Learn more about sustainable development and sustainable communities [here](#).

Progressives crave control

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

Progressives are the unintended consequence of the collision of ideas offered by Karl Marx and those of Adam Smith; the product of pure Communism colliding with Laissez-faire capitalism. Free market capitalists see government regulations as a detriment to profit; progressives see government regulations as the way to control the behavior of both profit makers and largess-takers.

For most of the last century, Progressives in both major parties have controlled the federal government. The current administration's quest for control exceeds even the remarkable efforts of the Wilson and Roosevelt administrations. The Obama administration – supported by Progressive allies in Congress – intends to control virtually every facet of human activity.

Capitalists were appalled when Obama took over General Motors; Progressives, Socialists and Communists applauded. Capitalists could not believe that Obama's czar had the audacity, and the power, to dictate the salary of top executives of companies that took federal bail-out money; Progressives, Socialists, and Communists danced with glee.

Ordinary citizens stood up and screamed "hell no" to Obamacare. Obama ignored them. He twisted arms and Senate rules to ram it through anyway, with provisions that require private insurance companies to insure people with pre-existing conditions, and to keep costs and profits to 20 percent of gross sales. Progressives, Socialists, and Communists knew they were in control.

These are a few highly visible examples of expanding government control. The more insidious expansions of government control do not make the news. All along the coastlines of the United States, for example, the federal government is taking control over the lives of citizens who depend upon fishing and tourism for their livelihood.

The National Marine Fisheries Service is preparing to stop all fishing for red snapper off the southeastern coast, claiming that the species is nearing extinction. Government-paid scientists provide reports to justify this action. Scientists from private universities, however, the [Southeastern Fisheries Association](#) and more than a thousand citizens presented evidence to the federal bureaucrats demonstrating that the government reports were flawed; that actually, the number of red snapper is increasing. Obama's bureaucrats ignore the citizens' concerns.

On the outer banks of North Carolina, entire communities are being shut down because the federal bureaucrats have listed the [Piping Plover](#) as a threatened species. Tourists can no longer even walk on

the beaches that have been closed. The National Park Service told Bob, who for 32 years has owned and operated the Red Drum Tackle Shop, that he was still young enough to go find something else to do.

It's not only the National Park Service, but the Bureau of Land Management and the Department of Agriculture, the EPA, and the Corps of Engineers as well, all have been systematically forcing people off their land. [Kit Laney went to jail](#) because he tried to keep the feds from confiscating his cattle. [Ocie Mills](#) spent nearly two years in jail for dumping sand on his own property. [Bob Brace](#) fought for more than 12 years in federal court for the right to convert his own pasture into a cabbage patch. Progressives in government – at every level – continue to expand the scope of control over how people live.

Progressives now dominate many local governments where, behind the guise of sustainable development, comprehensive land use plans – with the force of law – ignore private property rights and force private citizens to behave as government dictates. The first purpose of any government is to protect the rights of its citizens and defend them against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

The planners in Amarillo, Texas do not think of themselves as enemies of the citizens of Amarillo. A land owner whose property is devalued as the result of an arbitrary line drawn on a planning map may disagree. Amarillo is typical of thousands of cities that have bitten the bitter biscuit labeled sustainable development. Examine what Amarillo planners have determined to be "[Action Priorities](#)." Here is a laundry list of action items the planners – not the citizens of Amarillo – have determined should be done.

Many cities that have fallen victim to this "politically correct" sustainable development planning are now confronting "Environmental Police" and a whole new "Code Enforcement" Department that use taxes to pay enforcement officers to ensure that people water their lawns on schedule – or not water their lawns, as may be dictated by the government. Some "planned" communities require homes to be painted a color dictated by government; square footage dictated by government; and building materials and landscape vegetation dictated by government. Progressives, Socialists, and Communists believe this is exactly the way it should be.

Progressives were served notice on November 2nd. There is a growing number of Americans who want Progressives – and their Marxist philosophy – ousted from government at every level. The last election was a start; the next election will be another step. Victory will not occur until the Progressives are sent packing, and the vast majority of our elected officials – from the courthouse to the White House – understand and believe Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," the Declaration of Independence, and the U.S. Constitution.

Hands off the First Amendment!

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

“Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press...” but the progressives on the Federal Communications Commission think their job is to do just that – regulate the speech of individuals, and of the press. Speaking to the Columbia School of Journalism, FCC Commissioner Michael Copps, spelled out his idea for a “community values test” to be applied to media outlets with every license-renewal application.

This is not a new idea from Copps. In 2007, at a [Walter Cronkite Awards dinner](#), he told journalists that license holders should be required to meet a laundry list of standards that the FCC dictates. What happened to the idea that in a free market, consumers set the standards? If the market does not like what the broadcaster is producing, the broadcaster will soon be out of business.

The FCC’s only legitimate function is to see that broadcasters comply with laws enacted by Congress. It is certainly not the function of the FCC to dictate the content broadcasters are required to air. Copps is also bent out of shape because there are not as many black and Latino owners of broadcast stations as he thinks there should be. He wants the licensing process to insure that the distribution of ownership opportunities meets his requirements, even if it means taxing successful broadcast stations to provide a subsidy for new minority operators.

Could it be that Copps believes that the FCC is not limited by the First Amendment? Could it be that Copps thinks that requiring broadcast outlets to present content dictated by the FCC is not really “abridging” the freedom of the press? Or, could it be that he just doesn’t give a damn what the Constitution says?

Since the Fairness Doctrine was abandoned during the Reagan de-regulation era, progressives have been trying every way they can to regain control over the flow of information. Talk radio flourished when the Fairness Doctrine ended, and progressives can’t stand it. Progressives joined forces and launched “Air America” in 2004 to compete with Rush Limbaugh and other conservative broadcasters.

Air America’s most famous personality, Al Franken, tried to compete for three years, but in 2007, Air America went broke, and Franken announced his candidacy for the U.S. Senate. The market continually rejects progressive commentary programming, while embracing more conservative programs. At its peak, Air America reached 1.4 million unique listeners. Rush Limbaugh reaches at least [15 million listeners per week](#), according to Talkers magazine.

In almost every category, [FOX News’ audience is more](#) than CNN, MSNBC, CNBC, and HLN combined.

The market speaks. According to Copps, it is saying the wrong thing. Surely, the message would be different if there were a greater presence of black and Latino owners. If people choose not to listen to

progressive commentary, then Cops and his buddies will force them to listen, by requiring broadcast outlets to meet their “community values” test.

The Reverend Al Sharpton is lobbying the FCC to [ban Rush Limbaugh](#) for what Sharpton considers to be “racist hate speech.” According to Sharpton’s logic, any opposition to reparations is hate speech that should be banned from the airwaves.

In a free society, it is not the job of government to decide what people should hear. In a socialist, communist, or other dictatorial society, deciding what people should hear is the first priority of government.

President Obama’s Information Czar, Cass Sunstein, wants the government to “abridge” free speech even further. In a [radio interview](#) he describes how he wants Congress to require internet websites that post political commentary to also post a link to opposing views. Sunstein says it would be better if people would do this voluntarily, but since they won’t, Congress should mandate it. [Sunstein says](#):

“[F]rom the standpoint of democracy... a heterogeneous society... requires something other than free, or publicly unrestricted, individual choices. On the contrary, it imposes two distinctive requirements. First, people should be exposed to materials that they would not have chosen in advance.”

These people obviously have no respect for the Constitution. While Sunstein does talk about getting Congress to impose his restrictions on free speech, Cops doesn’t hesitate to suggest that his bureaucracy should impose rules and regulations to violate the clear language of the First Amendment.

It’s hard to imagine a more effective way to destroy a free society than to empower government to control the flow of information available to its citizens. The crowd now in power in Washington seems to want this power – badly. They will take it, unless they are stopped. They can be stopped only by making sure that the president who appoints these bureaucrats honors, respects, and abides by the Constitution.

Are “Black Hats” genetically defective?

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)

Some people believe they have a right to take what another has earned. Another distinguishing characteristic of this group is their eagerness to dictate the behavior of others. These people are called progressives, socialists, communists, dictators, kings, and sometimes gangsters. We’ll refer to these people as “black hats.”

The rest of the world knows inherently that it is morally wrong to take anything from another without their permission. They also know that they have no right to direct the affairs of other people. Their unspoken motto is: “any right that I claim for myself, I will gladly grant to all others.” We’ll refer to these people as “white hats.”

Washington is full of both, but since they rarely wear a hat, it is hard to identify them until they open their mouth, or vote.

Consider this scenario: a man is born into this world with nothing. He works hard and becomes a gazillionaire, paying a healthy tax on every penny he earns all his life. Then he dies. One group says his estate must pay 35-percent to the government; another group says, no, his estate must pay 55-percent. These are the “black hats,” regardless of the political party they profess.

Another group says: his estate should pay nothing. There is no moral reason why the estate owes the government another dime. Taxes were paid at the time the person earned his fortune. Why do the “black hats” believe they have a right to take what another has earned?

“Black hats” also tend to believe that the more an individual earns, the higher the tax rate should be on that individual. Put aside all the economic arguments and look at the matter head on: if taxes are to be taken from the population at all, they should be taken only with the permission of the population, and they should be taken at an equal rate. “White hats” tend to believe that the cost of government should be distributed equally among the people who must pay the bill. No one should be penalized simply because he has earned more money than another. When the rate is the same for all earners, the more successful contribute more dollars to the pay government’s bill than do the less successful. When this payment is increased by forcing tax payment at a higher rate than others pay, the excess is nothing less than legal theft.

“Black hats” seem to be eager to dictate the behavior of others. Consider this scenario: a man is born into this world with nothing. He works hard, saves his money, and finally is able to buy ten acres of land overlooking a beautiful valley. He goes to the county’s building department for a permit to build his dream house. He learns that his request will have to be reviewed by the historic society, the local heritage committee, the planning commission, Greenpeace, and Mickey Mouse. “Come back in 60 days,” he is told.

His request was denied because the historic society says no house should be built in the proposed location because Indians once lived in the area and construction could damage precious artifacts; the heritage society says a structure located on the proposed property would destroy the viewshed for people in the valley; the planning commission says that the comprehensive planning map shows the location to be in an area where the minimum lot size is 40 acres; Greenpeace says that a house in this location would endanger the whale, and Mickey Mouse says that it would accelerate global warming.

Where do “black hats” get the right to forbid another citizen to do what he wishes with his own property? Should the actions of this citizen damage the property of another, or infringe the rights of another, existing law provides for the damaged party to recover his damage – providing the alleged loss can be proved to the satisfaction of a jury.

“Black hats” have no moral right to do what they do. They seem unable to see possible alternatives from another’s point of view. They seem not to care about another’s point of view. They seem to care only about implementing their own point of view, regardless of what the “white hats” think or want.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the passage of Obamacare. For the first time “black hats” gladly forced all Americans to buy a product whether they wanted, or needed it. With this precedent established, a “black hat” government can just as easily force Americans to buy Chevrolets, rather than Fords, should the “black hats” so decide.

“Black hats” may not be bad people, they may just have a genetic defect that prevents them from understanding that they are no better than the “white hats.” They may be incapable of understanding that their ideas could be wrong. They may not have the ability to weigh the pros and cons of a proposal. They seem to possess only the desire to prevail, whatever the cost, regardless of how stupid the proposal may be.

The world has always had “black hats,” and always will. The nation should, as a collective New Year’s resolution, resolve to pity the “black hats,” and by all means, to keep them out of government.

For **Range** Magazine, March 2010

Going (for the) green

By Henry Lamb

As green advocacy groups go, the Western Watersheds Project is a fairly small outfit – but they are learning fast. Between 2000 and 2009, they filed 91 lawsuits and 31 appeals against the federal government, and were awarded at least \$1,150,558. During the same period, the Center for Biological Diversity filed 409 lawsuits and 165 appeals. They walked away with at least \$6,709,407.

The amounts could actually be much more, because there is no central record kept by either the courts or the government, of awards to green organizations. The Budd-Falen Law Firm in Cheyenne, Wyoming has devoted countless hours to digging through court records to discover gross abuses of the system.

For example, the Environmental Protection Agency has only 90 days to respond to petitions to list species as endangered or threatened. The Center for Biological Diversity filed a petition to list 225 species. It would take a massive effort for the agency to evaluate 225 species within the 90 day limit. When the Wildearth Guardians filed their petition with an additional 206 species, the agency was completely overwhelmed, with no chance at all of meeting the 90 day response limit. Both green advocacy groups had a field day with lawsuits.

Most of the lawsuits filed have nothing to do with the legitimacy of listing a species; they have everything to do with meeting procedural deadlines. Among green advocacy groups, this is called “strategic litigation.”

According to their website, the highest priority for the Western Watershed Project is: “Get all cows off public lands ASAP.” Their second highest priority is: “Get all cows and sheep off public lands ASAP.” By getting the EPA to list species as endangered or threatened, the government can then declare their habitat as “critical,” and can force cows and sheep off the land – even off of private property.

The more species on EPA’s list, the more land can be locked away from use by humans. As of February, 2010, there were 1967 species listed as endangered or threatened. There were 98 species awaiting a ruling by the EPA, and another 249 candidate species waiting to be evaluated. Every time the EPA misses a deadline, there is at least one green group ready to launch a lawsuit.

It was the Center for Biological Diversity, and other green advocacy groups that first filed a petition for rulemaking that led to the Supreme Court’s ruling that the EPA could decide whether carbon dioxide is a pollutant. This EPA rule could be more potent than the ESA when it comes to controlling the use of land. Despite the near collapse of the global warming scare after U.N. scientists admitted misusing the data, the EPA is moving forward to regulate land use to prevent non-existent man-made global warming.

It’s all about the green agenda. Lawsuits have nothing to do with justice, and little to do with environmental stewardship. Green advocacy groups, for the most part, are endowed with a religious

zeal on par with Muslim jihadists; their vision of the world is correct, and to hell with those who disagree.

Sadly, executives from these green advocacy groups began infiltrating land management agencies of the federal government several years ago. The Clinton era was especially fruitful for the greens. Management positions in Washington and throughout the country were filled with executives from green advocacy groups.

This fact becomes especially important in view of the “strategic litigation” being practiced by these groups. Here’s how it works. A green organization will file some preposterous lawsuit, claiming, for example, that a mud hole in Podunk, Idaho is subject to the 1972 Clean Water Act. Court day arrives and the green advocacy group plaintiff makes its case. The federal agency’s attorney - fresh from his position as council for a green advocacy group – makes a half-hearted defense. The judge asks if they can reach a settlement agreement.

This is precisely the desired outcome for the green advocacy groups: “strategic litigation.” During the negotiation between the green advocacy group and the agency’s former green group attorney, they write up an agreement that satisfies both parties, that the mud hole in Idaho, as well as all other mud holes, become “wetlands” subject to the 1972 Clean Water Act.

The judge reviews the agreement and issues a “Consent Decree” which essentially changes the law without bothering Congress, and entitles the green advocacy group to collect fat attorney fees.

Incidentally, this law is also available to for-profit organizations whose net worth is less than \$7 million. There is no such limitation on the net worth of green groups. The Natural Resources Defense Council, for example, has a net worth in excess of \$167 million, but still collected \$698,695 in legal fees in 2007.

Certain judges also seem to be sympathetic to these green organizations. The Western Watershed Project filed 19 lawsuits in Idaho Federal Court before Judge Winmill. Of these, WWP prevailed in eight cases, with awards of \$746,184. Six of the cases were “settled” providing another \$118,000. The WWP also prevailed in other cases, but the payment amount was not disclosed.

These lawsuits and payments are significant. Consider these statistics over a five year period:

2003	10,595 payments made	Total paid: \$1, 081,328,420
2004	8,161 payments made	Total paid: \$800,450,029
2005	7,794 payments made	Total paid: \$1,074,131,007
2006	8,736 Payments made	Total Paid: \$697,968,132
2007	6,595 Payments made	Total paid: 1,062,387,142

This totals (\$4,716,264,730) nearly a billion dollars per year to green advocacy groups for litigation paid from the “Judgment Fund.” Under the Equal Access to Justice Act, the Forest Service paid an additional

\$998,364 from its budget to green advocacy groups in just five western states. During the period studied, a full 80 percent of the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) cases paid by the Forest Service went to green advocacy groups.

The money paid to these green advocacy groups is money that cannot be used by the agencies for real environmental enhancements, such as providing more fire-fighting resources. It's not just the money the greens get, however. These lawsuits cost inestimable amounts of staff time, bloating bureaucratic agencies and budgets unnecessarily. And perhaps worst of all, these lawsuits nearly always result in infringing on private property rights or forcing a business enterprise to forego an opportunity to provide jobs and expand the economy.

Green advocacy groups are experts at thwarting economic growth and stamping out private property rights. They are equally expert at grabbing green from the federal government to finance their massive fund-raising campaigns and lobbying blitzes.

None compare to The Nature Conservancy when it comes to getting tax dollars. Their IRS tax statement reveals that in 2008, they were awarded \$110,616,412 in grants from the federal government. This is in addition to the \$317,490,396 they received from the sale of land to the federal government. What a racket: TNC hires an army of professionals to talk people into donating their land to the Conservancy so it can be sold to the government at enormous profit.

To put The Nature Conservancy in its proper perspective, look at their cash flow since 2002, according to their tax returns and the Office of Management and Budget grant audits:

Government grants: \$589,303,090

Land Sales to Government: \$2,900,618,368

Total receipts for the period: \$13,432,536,073

This is the supreme example of corporate welfare, their reward for going green.

Congress should have stopped this abuse years ago, but it continues. Green advocacy groups have not only permeated the agencies of the federal government; they maintain an army of lobbyists and political activists as well.

By hook or crook, green advocacy groups have exercised enormous and unwarranted influence over public policy for decades. To a very large extent, taxpayers have unwittingly funded their mischief. Congress must revisit the Equal Access to Justice Act, and prevent the green groups from abusing its use. Congress must tighten the money belt and make it impossible for the former managers of green advocacy groups who now occupy management positions in government agencies, to approve massive grants to their former employers.

It's time to stop going green, and begin going after the green advocacy groups that have used their tax-free status to advance their agendas at the expense of taxpayers.

For **Range** Magazine. March 2010

Tea Parties

By Henry Lamb

The Tea Party movement may be able to finish what the Sagebrush Rebellion started. Ordinary cowboys became giants when they stood up against the “comprehensive planning” ideas that the federal government tried to impose. The best that they could do was to force the government-control types in Washington to back up and find different ways to strip freedom from the very people who can’t live without it.

Like termites chewing through timber, the government-control types continued to take freedom from cowboys by “adjusting” grazing allotments, declaring that certain weeds and bugs needed the range more than the cattle, fencing out cattle from water, and shipping in wolves to wipe out calf crops.

For decades, cowboys fought this senseless government tyranny with little notice east of the Mississippi.

No more. The people in the east are no more concerned about the plight of the cowboys than they ever were, but now, the government has decided to take away their freedom as well, and that has stirred up a tempest that won’t stay in the teapot.

It wasn’t the election of the first black President, as some TV pundits claim. It was the coming together of Harry Reid, Nancy Pelosi, and Barack Obama, to form an “unholy trinity” hell-bent to transform America into what looks, to a growing number of Tea Party participants, very much like a Marxist nation.

Tea Partiers will have none of it.

Revival of the rebellion really began several years ago when the Department of Agriculture announced that by January 2009, all animal owners would be required to register their premises, tag all their livestock, and report any off-premises movement of livestock to the government within 24 hours.

Cowboys and animal owners east of the Mississippi would have none of that. They began networking, and showing up at “listening sessions” and flexing their political muscles just like the Sagebrush Rebels did a generation ago. The USDA was forced to abandon its plans and is still trying to figure out how to impose its animal identification scheme on people who are tired of government imposing its ridiculous schemes.

Instead of a National Animal Identification System emerging in 2009, a Tea Party movement emerged. It sprouted spontaneously across the country. On February 19, 2009, CNBC’s Rick Santelli expressed his outrage on live television about the government’s subsidizing all the firms that made loans to NINJAs (No Income No Job Applicants). He said: “We’re thinking of having a tea party at Lake Michigan.”

The following day, Twitter, Facebook, and other social networking websites lit up with posts by people who thought a tea party was perfectly appropriate to protest the monstrous response to the financial

crises government was planning. About 20 of these people decided to have a conference call to see what could be done. They decided to stage a tea party the next week. According to Amy Kremer, one of the people on the initial conference call, and founder of Tea Party Express, about 30,000 people showed up at Tea Parties in 20 cities. This was early March. Then they decided to march on Washington on Tax Day – April 15. Washington was awash with people who agreed that we’re “Taxed Enough Already.”

Speaker Nancy Pelosi was quick to get in front of a TV camera to announce that these people were not grassroots organizations, but were instead, “Astroturf,” funded by greedy corporations.

Concerned citizens stormed Town Hall meetings during the August recess, and put the fear of Election Day in the heart of their representatives.

Then came the September 12 Tea Party march on Washington that brought more than 1.5 million Tea Partiers to the Capitol. The November elections put Republicans in the Governor’s Mansions in both Virginia and New Jersey – despite President Obama personally campaigning for the Democratic candidate. Then came Massachusetts. Scott Brown came from 30 points behind the Democrat in 60 days to win the Senate seat held by Ted Kennedy for decades, again, despite President Obama personally campaigning for the loser.

Newsflash for Nancy: the Tea Party movement is not Astroturf, funded by greedy corporations. The Tea Party movement is a genuine, grassroots rebellion, a hundred times stronger than the Sagebrush Rebellion. It has attracted people from every walk of life in every state, who are fed up with a government that routinely ignores the Constitution, arrogantly ignores the expressed wishes of the people, and is insisting on imposing more government control on people who insist on being free.

These Tea Partiers are not targeting grazing allotments, wilderness expansion, endangered species, or any of the specific issues that have plagued the West, or any other single issue. They are targeting the founding principles of freedom which the federal government has forgotten. They are targeting the Constitution which the federal government has ignored. They are targeting a restoration of the values that guided our nation’s founders: the belief that “...all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

Fantasize for a moment, about a Senate, a House of Representatives, and a White House, all occupied by people who actually believe that the Constitution limits the power of Congress to the 17 enumerated powers set forth in Article 1, Section 8. Nowhere in the Constitution is there authority for the federal government to even own land other than the District of Columbia, and other land that may be purchased – with the approval of the legislature within the state – for “...forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings...”

There is no constitutional authority for the federal government to require ranchers to register their premises and identify and register every livestock animal and report its movement.

There is no constitutional authority for the federal government to require ranchers to sit by and watch as wolves destroy their private property.

There is no constitutional authority for the federal government to jail private land owners for cleaning a stream bank on private property.

There is no constitutional authority for the federal government to do many of the things that have now become the norm, simply because the people have sat back and allowed the government to do it.

“Forgetaboutit” - as they say in some quarters. The people are no longer content to sit back and take it. They have said enough is enough. They have been awakened. They are on the move. They are not just waving signs and marching on Washington. They are changing the shape of government.

The Tea Party movement is not an organization; it is hundreds of organizations working to restore the Constitution, to force the federal government to live within its revenue, to adopt a minimal tax rate that is fair to all, and to defeat America’s enemies – not Miranda-ize them.

The Tea Party movement is not simply a political movement; it is a freedom movement. In America, freedom is won or lost at the ballot box. In recent years, the ballot box has produced a government that believes government knows what is best for its citizens. The Tea Party movement intends to replace those representatives with people who believe that the people know what’s best for government.

The Tea Party movement is not a “Third Party,” that will put candidates on the ballot. It will, however, strive to identify and promote candidates – regardless of party affiliation – who have a track record of honoring the Constitution and practicing the principles of freedom.

Existing political parties that insist on choosing candidates – at any level of government – are in trouble if they try to prevent an open primary in which the people choose their candidate. Already, the Republican Party structure in Nevada has been completely revamped by Tea Party types who refused to accept the business-as-usual approach of the party leadership.

The National Precinct Alliance is just one of the organizations that comprise the Tea Party movement. Its sole purpose is to assist Tea Partiers in the organization of the precincts to assure that only candidates are elected who will support the goals of the movement. Literally hundreds of organizations in communities in every state are working to train candidates, to train campaign workers, and precinct workers. Other organizations are working to train voters in how the Constitution is being abused by various laws and federal programs, and how to stop this abuse.

This Tea Party movement is not all about fun and games. It’s about working to put the federal government in its place – under the control of the Constitution and the people who pay the bills. The Tea Partiers want to change the majority in Congress in 2010, and to find a President in 2012 who honors the Constitution by living it, rather than by talking about it.

If the Tea Party movement is successful, many of the rules, regulations and laws that have stifled the West in the past can be repealed; finally realizing the goals that the Sagebrush Rebellion fought for a generation ago.

Sustainable Development or Sustainable Freedom?

By Henry Lamb

Betty Perry was at home, minding her own business, when an officer of Orem Utah's Neighborhood Preservation Unit knocked on her door to issue a ticket for failing to water her lawn. The officer asked her name; she said she wanted to call her son. The officer said no, a scuffle ensued, 70-year-old Perry fell, was handcuffed, and hauled off to jail.

Moss Dalrymple told his neighbor, Drexel Phillips, that he was a veteran of three wars and had been captured four times, but none of it phased him as much as this. "This has come nearer to driving me crazy than anything I've ever had," he told his friend, Drexel. After the war, Moss chose to live in rural Marshall County, Alabama. Over the years, he had collected "treasures" that were important to him.

One day, the Marshall County "Junk Police," showed up on Moss' property, and told him that he had 10 days to clear the junk from his property, or the county would come in and clear it for him and send him the bill. The day after the visit, Drexel found Moss dead. He died from a heart attack.

Rondel Keith Jervis failed to mow his grass the way the Code Enforcement Officer in Corbin, Kentucky thought it should be mowed. Jervis was fined \$100. A dispute arose between Jervis and the enforcement officer, and Jervis' fine rose to \$2,250 for high grass and debris on the Jervis property. A phone call to the code enforcement office resulted in a shouting match, and Jervis was charged with "third-degree terroristic threatening."

The common denominator here is sustainable development; the consequence here is the loss of freedom.

Sustainable Development washed across the nation during the Clinton administration. The term arose from the 1987 report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland. The report defines sustainable development to be:

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

This rather meaningless definition was given real meaning in 1992 at the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. Heads of state from 179 nations adopted Agenda 21, a 40-chapter non-binding policy document that provides step-by-step procedures for transforming communities into "Sustainable Communities," by implementing its recommendations. Agenda 21 addresses virtually every facet of human life. Sustainable development requires that government manage virtually every facet of human life.

To comply with an Agenda 21 recommendation, President Bill Clinton avoided Congressional involvement by issuing Executive Order #12852 June 29, 1993, which created the President's Council on

Sustainable Development. The Council consisted of 12 Cabinet Secretaries, top executives from six major environmental organizations, including The Nature Conservancy, the Sierra Club, and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, as well as top executives from Enron, Browning Ferris, and S.C. Johnson.

Using its enormous grant-making powers, the federal government extended sustainable development consciousness throughout state and local governments, and created a whole new community of sustainable development non-government organizations. Grants were made to NGOs and to state and local government to launch a “visioning” process leading to the adoption of a new comprehensive plan to codify the recommendations in Agenda 21.

A good example of how this process works is provided by Florida’s Heartland Rural Economic Development Initiative (FHREDI), which is an NGO created in 1993 to coordinate the sustainable development of Florida’s six-county heartland. The Executive Committee consisted of one County Commissioner from each county, and the rest of the directors were officials from municipalities in the region, and a few other selected businessmen and NGO leaders.

To facilitate the project, the group turned to Florida State University’s Conflict Resolution Center which specializes in consensus-building projects. The first “visioning” session was held in Glades county; 35 people attended. At the end of the three-hour meeting, the facilitator had solicited 129 “visions” of what the county should look like in 2020. Surprisingly, most of the “visions” were quite similar to what Agenda 21 recommends. Here are just a few of the “visions” suggested by the group:

- Preserve natural environment
- Save our wetlands
- Improve our wetlands
- Restrict development in sensitive areas
- Sustainable Agriculture & Farming
- Comprehensive resource preservation
- Never compromise wetlands or wildlife
- Preservation of scenic views
- Designate scenic highways
- Development should be clustered
- Rural village concept
- Smart growth, planned developments
- Increased density can spur walkability
- Utilize impact fees that limit mobile homes
- Zoning should encourage infill
- More codes to be enforced

These 129 “vision” items were selected by consensus, not by vote. Consensus is not necessarily agreement; consensus is the absence of stated objection. To insure that no objection was heard, the participants were asked to visit eight stations where visions items were suggested. Each person was asked to write his vision on a note pad and post it at the station. The facilitator collected the “visions”

compiled them, and announced the consensus. Those visions not consistent with Agenda 21 could have easily been trashed with no one the wiser.

Two additional meetings were held before the final report was issued. Eight very bland recommendations were published. Here's a sample:

- We would like the county to develop in a way that enhances our quality of life, while maintaining the rural character of the county.
- We would like future generations to be able to enjoy our beautiful natural environment, with clean waterways and picturesque natural areas.

Who could possibly object to such mush? Not one of the "visions" or the recommendations mentioned the protection of private property rights.

Once the "vision" statement is compiled by a group of local stakeholders, the next step is to develop a plan of action. This step is most often done by a smaller committee, or by the professional staff of a planning department. It becomes the "Comprehensive Plan" for the county, or for the designated planning area.

To make sure that these sustainable community plans had teeth, the federal government awarded more than \$4 million to the American Planning Association to create model legislation for the states. Their work product is titled "Growing Smart: Legislative Guidebook." Three model laws and two model executive orders provide the basis for states to create laws that make county plans legally binding.

These plans can sometimes be downright ridiculous: Betty Perry's violation of a grass-watering code, for example. What's worse, these plans pay no attention to private property rights, or the U.S. Constitution.

The 4th Amendment, for example, guarantees 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, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

When the "Junk Police" entered the property of Moss Dalrymple, they had no warrant issued by a judge. Moss was not secure in his person, his house, or his effects. The county adopted a plan that included a definition of junk that completely ignored Moss' right to his property and to his possessions.

These comprehensive master plans often bring more than development prohibitions and higher taxes. These plans bring detailed restrictions on human activity. The plans almost always include International Building Codes. The International Code Council is a not-for profit organization created in 1994 – one year after the creation of the President's Council on Sustainable Development – to provide the following uniform codes to government:

International Building Code
International Energy Conservation Code
International Existing Building Code
International Fire Code
International Fuel Gas Code
International Mechanical Code
ICC Performance Code
International Plumbing Code
International Private Sewage Disposal Code
International Property Maintenance Code
International Residential Code
International Wildland Urban Interface Code
International Zoning Code

Comprehensive plans may even ignore the 5th Amendment by stipulating that if private property is not brought up to code within a specified time, the government may either bring the property to code and place a lien on the property and sell it at auction to recover the costs, or “take” the property by eminent domain. The 5th Amendment requires that private property be taken only for public use, and then only when just compensation is paid. The Constitution does not authorize the taking of private property for failure to comply with an international code.

Two decades after all the hoopla and ballyhoo about how wonderful sustainable development is, people are beginning to see the painful consequences of government-management. They are finding ways to resist and to fight back.

Alabama’s Alliance for Citizens Rights is a group of concerned citizens that has been providing educational materials for its members and for elected officials. Their work is beginning to bear fruit.

A citizens group in Houston County, Minnesota has been trying to reverse its county’s onerous plan for more than two years. They have adopted a new strategy that offers promise to other groups across the nation. The Houston County citizens group drafted a petition that said, essentially, that any county plan should be constructed on the principle of protection for private property rights. More than 700 land owners in the small community signed the petition. Scores of private land owners also filed written comments about the plan as it was being developed.

County officials ignored the comments and the petitions and adopted the plan anyway.

The citizens group quietly set out to document instances in which the county plan infringed the constitutional rights of private citizens. Hundreds of examples were collected and documented. The group then engaged the Budd-Falen Law Firm from Cheyenne, Wyoming to notify the county of its intention to sue.

The group offered to withhold the lawsuit if the county would sign the petition affirming the principle that the county’s plan should be constructed on the principle of protection for private property rights, and work with a small committee appointed by the group to rewrite the plan.

The county is in the position of publicly rejecting the value of private property rights, or working with the group to rewrite the plan, or defending a lawsuit that has hundreds of documented instances where the county has violated the constitutional rights of its citizens.

Citizens groups who have become well informed about sustainable development and Agenda 21 are now participants in Tea Party organizations and the Glenn Beck 912 groups, and are building momentum that local election officials cannot ignore.

These people are firmly convinced that the most important value this generation can leave for the next is not sustainable communities or sustainable development, but sustainable freedom. All across the nation, citizens groups are demanding that freedom be recognized as more important than government-mandated sustainability. Citizen groups are demanding that private property rights and the principles of freedom be recognized and declared the most important heritage to be passed on to subsequent generations.

For **Range** magazine— Winter, 2010

Taking aim at the predators

By Henry Lamb

Charlotte's fourth child was due any day. But it was a beautiful crisp spring day, and Jose and the kids wanted to enjoy the spectacular scenery in Cibola National Forest, not far from their home near Albuquerque, New Mexico. Jose carried the baby, one-year old Javier, on his shoulders; Jose Jr. five, and Teresa, three, frolicked on the trail a few feet ahead of their parents. Teresa stopped to look at some flowers and Jose, Jr. ran ahead around a bend in the trail.

Screams pierced the peaceful forest; blood-curdling screams. Jose thrust the baby into Charlotte's arms and ran to find his son. He saw a cougar dragging Jose, Jr. by the head through the brush down the hill beside the trail.

"Don't lose sight of him," Charlotte yelled. "I knew if it got away I'd never see my son again," Charlotte later told reporters.

Jose stumbled and nearly fell, but was able to lunge at the cougar enough to make it turn loose of the child before scampering off into the wilderness. Jose shredded his shirt and wrapped his son's bleeding head. "His scalp was laid back," Jose told reporters. If not for Jose's daring rescue of his young son, it would have been a tragedy. Jose, Jr. spent a week in the hospital, and in time recovered, as much as anyone can recover from such a horrifying experience.

Charlotte was told that cougar attacks were "extremely rare" but after the shock of a second and third cougar attack that summer in New Mexico, one resulting in death, Charlotte started asking questions about the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish's wildlife management policies and started researching the state's history of wildlife attacks. She discovered that in the last ten years there have been 9 cougar attacks and 14 bear attacks in New Mexico. And these attacks have significantly increased in frequency in the last 2 to 3 years.

Something had to be done.

Mark Tiemann had been bow hunting for elk in the Apache National Forest. It was night time, but not dark; stars and the moon provided plenty of light for Mark to follow the trail out of the forest – and to catch a glimpse of the cougar stalking him. Mark was not a five-year old child; he was a well-trained special ops officer, hardened by combat and ready for anything. It's a good thing, because the cougar attacked Mark. Mark won. The cougar measured ten feet from tip of the nose to the tip of the tail.

Environmental extremists blame the victims, claiming that humans have no right to be in the habitat of the animals. Victims, and most reasonable people, believe that the population of wild predator animals should be controlled. Charlotte Salazar and Mark Tiemann are both victims, and both are reasonable people.

Last August, two years after her son was attacked, Charlotte announced the formation of a new organization: New Mexicans for Proactive Wildlife Predator Management (NMPWPM). Within a week, more than 400 people joined the organization. Mark's attack was ten years ago, but etched in his memory as if it were yesterday. He is dedicated to helping Charlotte and her new organization get the rules changed to bring about a better balance between the needs of wildlife and the needs of humans who must share the same habitat.

Charlotte was shocked by the number of calls she received from other states from people who reported similar problems, who wanted to help, and perhaps get a similar organization started in their state.

The fledgling group presented testimony to the New Mexico Game Commission on August 28, urging the commission to lessen the hunting restrictions on predator animals, and lengthen the hunting season as a way to find a better balance between predators and human prey.

These measures seem reasonable in view of the state's recent inventories that reveal an 11% increase in bears, and a 72% increase in cougars.

Charlotte's new organization has adopted worthy goals:

- Reach out to wildlife attack victims from across New Mexico.
- Educate New Mexicans on the current alarming trends of human/wildlife predator encounters in our state.
- Educate New Mexicans on the importance of controlling wildlife predator populations to mitigate human safety risks, predator nuisances, and depredation issues.
- Educate New Mexicans on the importance of sport hunting and trapping as a necessary and effective wildlife management tool.
- Advocate proactive New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF) policies and decisions based on the best science available, and actual wildlife predator data collected in New Mexico.
- Advocate proactive wildlife predator management decisions to the New Mexico State Game Commission and the State Legislature.

Not everyone thinks these are worthy goals. Environmental organizations, particularly Wild Earth Guardians; Animal Protection of New Mexico; and the Sierra Club, have launched a massive phone, email, and letter-writing campaign aimed at getting Governor Bill Richardson to overturn any decision made by the State Game Commission that allows more hunting or less protection of predator animals.

These are the people who believe that animals have the right to roam in human habitats, but humans should not have the right to roam in the animals' habitat – or to proactively defend themselves from the predator animals.

Charlotte's organization can't compare with these well-funded environmental organizations, in staff, budget, or experience. In fact, she currently operates on no funds at all. But the environmental organizations can't compare with Charlotte's organization when it comes to determination. Hunting regulations and environmental regulations are, ultimately, the result of political decisions. Governor Richardson has long been associated with environmental organizations and has appointed all seven members of the State Game Commission.

Commission Chairman, Jim McClintic, says that the Commission relies on the advice of several scientists who carefully monitor populations of predator animals. Their current recommendation is to reduce the population of bears and cougars. Normally, animal populations and the hunting season are evaluated every two years, unless there is reason to review more frequently. The lobbying success of environmental organizations in recent years is why the predator population has increased so rapidly.

Perhaps Charlotte's new organization, with its rapidly expanding membership, can keep the environmentalists in balance, as the Game Commission tries to keep the predator animals in balance.

Utah's quest for its own land

By Henry Lamb

Why does the federal government own 49% of the land in 12 western states, and only 8% of the land in eastern states? This question has been asked by every generation for more than a century, but no one has yet produced a satisfactory answer.

There is no satisfactory answer. And there is no legitimate reason why the federal government should own any land other than the land that is authorized by the Enclave Clause (Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17) of the U.S. Constitution. The so-called Property Clause (Article 4, Section 3) of the Constitution authorizes the federal government to dispose of land within its territories; it does not authorize the federal government to preserve land – and the resources it contains – in perpetuity.

The state of Utah is trying once again to get the federal government out of the land-holding business.

Utah State Representative, Christopher Herrod sponsored legislation authorizing the state to exercise its eminent domain power – against the federal government. The Utah legislature is not just whistling Dixie; it also appropriated \$3 million to take the case to the Supreme Court. Utah is willing to pay the federal government fair market value for certain lands that the legislature believes will produce badly needed revenue for state coffers.

This is a unique approach to an old problem. Few people believe the state will be successful. Even the legislature's own research staff concluded that "there is a high probability that a court would hold that the federal government is the sovereign of public lands."

They could be wrong. In 1987, the Utah Division of State Lands challenged the federal government's decision to claim the land – and resources – under Lake Utah, a navigable waterway. The court held that "Title to Utah Lake's bed passed to Utah under the equal footing doctrine upon Utah's admission to the Union. (482 US 193 Utah Division of State Lands v. United States Pp. 200-209)."

Utah, and all western states, entered the union under the "Equal Footing" doctrine. The idea of "Equal Footing" for new states originates with the 1784 "Report of Government for the Western Territory." The "Western Territory" described in this report was the land which became Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The report established that when states from this territory were admitted to the Union, it would be "...on an equal footing with the original states in all respects whatever...."

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, that followed this report, established another important principle: the withholding of certain unclaimed lands for disposal by the federal government. The Ordinance authorized the federal government to retain unappropriated lands to be sold as a way to get money to pay the debt incurred by the Revolutionary war.

It is significant that the federal government owns only 5.2 percent of the five states carved from this territory, and most of this land is held by the federal government consistent with the Enclave Clause, not the Property Clause, of the U.S. Constitution.

All the states admitted to the Union after the Northwest Ordinance, entered the Union on an "...equal footing with the original states in all respects whatever..." That is - until 1850 - when California entered the Union.

California's admission into the Union was at the center of a much larger debate about slavery. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the war with Mexico, was signed in 1848. Representative David Wilmot, a Pennsylvania Democrat, attached the "Wilmot Proviso," to a \$2 million appropriation bill, which required all the territory acquired through the treaty to be designated as slave-free.

California was a part of that territory, and southern Congressmen wanted it to be a slave state. Two separate attempts to admit California failed before President Millard Fillmore worked out the "Compromise of 1850" which allowed California to be admitted as a free state. The retention of federal land was of little concern at the time.

The Compromise of 1850 was actually a group of bills that included two very important historic events. On September 9, 1850, one bill allowed California to be admitted into the Union; another bill created the Utah Territory, which included all of what is now Utah, about one-third of what is now Colorado, almost all of Nevada, and a small portion of southwest Wyoming. Brigham Young was named governor.

It went largely unnoticed at the time, but as a condition of statehood, Californians were required to forever disclaim any interest in or title to the land (45 percent) that had not already been appropriated." California quickly accepted the terms and became the first state that was actually a half-state, half-federal entity.

The people who lived in the states affected by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo were guaranteed by the treaty to retain their property and all property rights. Perhaps the most important property right conveyed by this treaty was the right to water. Under the doctrine of prior appropriation, both the water, and all the adjacent land required to put the water to beneficial use, remained under the exclusive control of the owner.

Virtually all the western states that joined the Union after 1850 were required, as a condition of statehood, to disclaim all interest in and title to the land still held by the federal government, while at the same time, agreeing that the state was being admitted on an "Equal Footing."

Utah's Enabling Act says: "...the proposed State of Utah shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union, under and by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the original States, from and after the date of said proclamation (Section 4). " The same Act says: "...the people inhabiting said proposed State do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the boundaries thereof...(Section 3)."

The federal government saw the unappropriated land only as a valuable resource that could be converted into non-tax revenue. In fact, the Utah Enabling Act grants four sections in every township to the new state to support schools (Section 6). The Act also stipulates that five percent of the revenue generated from the sale of federal lands will go to the state to create a permanent fund, “the interest of which will be expended in support of the common schools...(Section 9).”

Neither Utah nor the other 11 western states were admitted to the Union on an “Equal Footing” with the original states. This fact alone should be ample reason for the Supreme Court to rule that federal ownership of nearly half the 12 western states is unconstitutional. This is not a new argument, however. It has been argued in the courts repeatedly, and so far, the federal government has won.

However, just because the federal government has won in the past, doesn’t mean that it is right.

Originally, the federal government retained the land because it could produce badly needed revenue. Federally owned land has produced revenue in the past, and can produce a ton of revenue now and in the future.

An honest reading of the Constitution reveals that the founders intended the federal government to own only the land authorized by the “Enclave Clause.” The Property Clause is necessary only to authorize the disposition and regulation of territories acquired by conquest, treaty, or purchase. Political influence, rather than Constitutional intent, has governed federal land in western states.

Utah’s bold new approach is a novel attempt to solve the age-old problem of federal encroachment into what should be state property. The new argument puts the sovereign power of a state on a collision course with the sovereign power of the federal government.

If the federal government was created by the states, does it not follow that the federal government’s power should be inferior to the power of its creator, the states? The counter-argument quickly arises that the Civil War settled this question in favor of the federal government. Again, just because the federal government won, doesn’t mean that it is right.

If the state of Utah has the power of eminent domain, why should that power stop at the property of the federal government? The state of Utah needs certain land for a public purpose; it could take that land, with just compensation, from any other owner. What possible reason could there be to nullify this state power, simply because the land is owned by the federal government?

Whether argued publicly or not, the reason Utah will be viciously attacked is to prevent a run on the bank – so to speak. If Utah were to prevail, every western state with federal land would follow.

If Congress truly believed that the Constitution is of greater authority than their collective opinion, and if they truly wanted to make public policy that serves all people equally, then Congress would do well to take a serious look at eliminating the disparity of federal land ownership, by disposing of all its land held under the Property Clause.

Although this land was originally retained for its cash value, it is now held because environmentalists have convinced the majority in Washington that the world will come to a cataclysmic end if this land ever falls under the control of private owners.

This idea is, of course, nonsense, but it is deeply engrained in the Washington bureaucracy and especially in the community of non-government organizations that draw their lifeblood from those bureaucracies and from lawsuits filed against anyone who fails to wipe their feet before treading on what they consider to be their (private) sacred domain.

Were the federal government to return this land to the states, it could immediately close the Department of Interior, with its 67,000 employees. States' budget problems could be solved immediately from disposition of lands, or from the sale or lease of resources. This would let the people in the state make the important land use decisions that affect them, rather than have those decisions made by eastern politicians, and NGOs.

There is no legitimate reason for the federal government to own half the land in 12 western states. Utah's novel approach to regaining use of some small portion of this land will be monitored all the way to the Supreme Court. The real solution, however, lies not with the courts; it lies with the Congress of the United States, charged with the responsibility of managing federal lands, and sworn to protect and defend the U.S. Constitution.

Since 1850, the federal government has failed to dispose of all the land within the territories acquired by conquest, treaty, or purchase. Until the nation elects a majority of statesmen to Congress, and a President to the White House who actually do respect the Constitution and the free market it requires, the people in the western states will be deprived of half the land that should rightfully be theirs, and the nation will continue to be deprived of the prosperity it offers.