SPECIAL REPORT

Dawn of the Era of Common-*ism*

By Tom DeWeese

Published by:

The DeWeese Report

For more information, contact:

THE DEWEESE REPORT

70 Main Street • Suite 23

Warrenton, VA 20186

Tel: (540) 341-8911 • Fax: (540) 341-8916

The lines used to be so clear. On one side were free markets, free societies, and openly elected representative governments, normally defined as democracy. On the other was the force of totalitarianism choking off individual initiative, private ownership of property, and cynically providing a ballot box with but one choice, normally defined as Communism.

The ideological lines were drawn as a titanic battle ensued across an iron curtain. The Western world united in a mixture of proud, independent, sovereign nations to fend off the creeping black communist plague that swallowed whole nations and erased their identities. In the end, the world of free societies won out over the communist "Evil Empire" as it disintegrated under the weight of its own ignorance of human nature. Or did it?

Conservatives hailed the victory, dispatching Communism to the "ash-heap of history." Since then, many Conservative leaders have fomented the idea that we are living in a "Conservative era," using as proof the worldwide movement toward democracy and free trade. The demise of Communism, some say, now allows a spirit of cooperation among nations that will usher in the benefits of worldwide prosperity and a universal increase in the standard of living.

Yet many Americans are concerned that those same leaders who trumpet that American ideals are spreading across the globe are failing abysmally to protect constitutionally guaranteed liberties here at home. The assaults on property rights and personal privacy along with the transformation of local schools under federal programs, and above all, the seeming lack of concern for national sovereignty and protection of the nation's borders are obvious contradictions to the proposition that Conservative ideas (defined as individual liberty, limited government and private enterprise) now reign supreme.

Other agendas seem to be taking center stage. The Rule of Law in our Republic, designed to insure individual rights from intrusive government, is being replaced by a new ideology -- one that allows the concerns of interest groups to supersede the inherent rights of the individual. Further, the interests of the United States of America now seem to take a back seat to something called the "Global Commons." National identities and individual religions appear to be morphing into an unexplained and unfamiliar unidentified whole. Even science seems to be morphing into little more than a convenient political tool to promote specific political agendas. Self-determination is being replaced with group-think.

What is happening to our way of life and to our once great nation? Communism is dead. Capitalism is fading. We have begun a new era called Common-ism.

A NEW THREAT FOR A NEW CENTURY

There's no doubt that when the walls of Soviet Communism fell almost two decades ago, the world changed. Once-proud nations, that had been swallowed up by the Soviet empire, reemerged as a new "democracy movement." Western forces were expected to rush forward and promote their democratic ideology and bring Communism's formerly oppressed victims into the fold of free markets and freely elected representative government.

For the most part, that didn't happen. In the few cases where it did, there were two very glaring omissions left out of the equation of the version of freedom offered to the emerging nations – the most important components - private property ownership and protection of individual liberty. None of the new constitutions of the emerging Eastern European democracies contain a word about recognition of private property rights, nor does the new American-designed constitution of Iraq. As "Social Democracies" have sprung up around the world, those glaring omissions have become a standard pattern.

Worse, communism didn't fade away to the ash heap. Instead, international Communists refused to hang their heads in defeat and leave the world stage. Rather, with the "death" of Communism, they were now freed from its negative baggage. They could begin a new movement able to reach across national boundaries – even into the West. As long as the title "Communist" was not hung around their necks to

raise Western fears, the ideologues of international Socialism could move forward unhindered. The world has responded in almost thunderous support. Thus, Common-ism was born.

The distinctive feature of Common-ism is its intention to transform private intellectual property, privately owned land and sovereign nations' natural resources into common property in the name of the "common heritage of mankind." The UN's Commission on Global Governance refers to the Earth and all of its natural resources --seas, air, and space as the "Global Commons." The ideology of Common-ism is based on political concepts and New Age spiritual values, such as the global commons, global village, global spirituality, equalitarianism, social democracy, disarmament, environmentalism, interdependence, interconnectedness, and participation in world peace.

Common-ism is a political ideology containing both a doctrine and a device for its expansion. Common-ism advances on the idea that problems cross local and national boundaries. Using this rationalization, natural and political boundaries are conveniently traversed via treaties, legislation, and policy statements, all under the guise of improving the global common good.

When President Bill Clinton boldly announced in the 1990s his new initiative to "reinvent government" that reinvention was Common-ism (although it wasn't given a name). Under Clinton's direction, the Federal Government began implementing Common-ism policy. The promise of the reinvention was that "certain tools, approaches, and strategies… could result in more environmental protection, less economic cost, and … greater opportunity for the poor and disadvantaged."

The core program of the reinvention, publicly presented as a way to protect the environment, also mysteriously involved itself in racial, economic, and equality issues. This is no accident. It is a tactic of Common-ism to meld together a seemingly unconnected array of issues into one cause. It allows the formation of partnerships among a long list of interested parties while also allowing government intrusion into even more aspects of our lives.

The Clinton Administration explained how these partnerships were to be a first step. *"Learning to use new approaches to achieve interrelated goals simultaneously will be an evolutionary process. It needs to build on the strengths and overcome the limitations of current economic and regulatory systems and recognize the interrelationships between economic and environmental policies."* In describing "Intergovernmental Partnerships," the Administration explained, "*Federal, state, and tribal governments need to work together in partnership with local communities to develop place-based strategies that integrate economic development, environmental quality, and social policymaking with broad public involvement."*

In other words, local or state elected officials were no longer considered to be capable of making development decisions for their community. It was now necessary to expand the process through common "consensus" via an endless number of private organizations with their own political agendas – in partnership with government. In this way the boundaries of government are blurred along with the clear definition of the rule of law. That then was the new invention of government: Top-down control in partnership with private advocacy groups and international corporations.

The doctrine of Common-ism is promoted through a restructured education system where old ideas of schools as centers of academic learning are replaced with systems designed to modify the behavior of our children so they will grow up accepting the aspects of the new Common-ism. The very meaning of Outcome-based Education (OBE) is that students will leave school fully indoctrinated with, and sensitive to, the Common-ism agenda. The "outcome" of OBE is the final transformation of a thinking, moral being into an unquestioning, obedient worker for the state.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Throughout the doctrine of Common-ism one rarely finds the words "freedom" or "liberty" as they would pertain to individuals. Instead, there is a constant clamor about the need for justice. Economic justice.

Environmental justice. Racial justice. Social justice. Rights, too, are important. The rights of the child. The rights of women. The rights of indigenous populations.

All of these rights and calls for justice serve a very important purpose; the need for more laws, with rules and regulations to enforce them. Of course, recognition of "individual rights" which would eliminate the need for such international "guidance," is not considered.

Since these urgent needs cross international borders, there must be some sort of international power with the ability to keep it all under well-ordered control. The United Nations, of course, is the chosen power to organize and maintain that control on an international level.

The UNs' Millennium Summit held in New York City in 2000, began a process that will eventually transform the UN from what many perceived as an international organization of sovereign nations to that of a global government of subservient regional entities. In the spirit of Common-ism, UN power, according to internal planning guides, will steadily be transferred to an "Assembly of the People," populated by selected NGOs, giving international scope and power to partnerships in local communities. The 2000 UN Millennium Assembly was the culmination of efforts started in 1974 by a band of international socialists that sought to stress Common-ism rather than revolutionary Communism.

The process is called social and economic democracy. Democracy is a positive term in the West. However, understanding the use of this word by international socialists is the key to understanding Common-ism and today's changed world. To Conservatives, democracy means civil and political decisions made within the framework of a free society and a free market. It means moving from closed elections (or none at all) to free and competitive elections among multiple parties. In the United States, democracy particularly means that defense of individual rights and property is paramount to government dictate.

To the Socialist or Communist, democracy primarily means economic or social equality with or without parliamentary means. Social democracy requires that property, wealth, choice, or communication may to be taken from one group in order to create "equality" for another. In Socialist philosophy, law becomes an instrument to advocate the redistribution of and intrusion on rights, riches, privacy, and property, all under the guise of economic equality in order to "enforce" a new international economic order.

COMMISSIONING COMMON-*ISM*

During the early and middle part of the Twentieth Century, international Socialist David Multrany pioneered the path to Common-ism using the common cause approach to find global "common security" and "common future." His ideas were fully entrenched in international policy through a series of four UN-sponsored international commissions in the early 1980s. The four international commissions were led by prominent European international socialists and dealt with the interconnection, integration, and "democratization" of economic development, disarmament, environment, and communications.

In 1980, West German Chancellor Willy Brandt chaired the commission on international development. The Commission report, entitled "North-South: A program for Survival," stated: *"World development is not merely an economic process, [it] involves a profound transformation of the entire economic and social structure ...not only the idea of economic betterment, but also of greater human dignity, security, justice and equality ... The Commission realizes that mankind has to develop a concept of a 'single community' to develop global order."*

That same year Sean MacBride, a recipient of the Lenin Peace Prize, headed up a commission on international communications which issued a report entitled, "Many Voices, One World: Towards A New, More Just And More Efficient World Information And Communication Order." The Commission, which included the head of the Soviet news agency, TASS, believed that a "New World Information Order" was prerequisite to a new world economic order. The

report was a blueprint for controlling the media, even to the point of suggesting that international journalists be licensed.

In 1982, Olof Palme, the man who single-handedly returned socialism to Sweden, served as chairman of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. His report, entitled "Common Security: A Blueprint for Survival," said: "*All States have the duty to promote the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control . . .*" The report went on to call for money that is saved from disarmament to be used to pay for social programs. The Commission also proposed a strategic shift from "collective security," such as the alliances like NATO, to one of "common security" through the United Nations.

Finally, in 1987, came the granddaddy commission of them all, The Brundtland Commission on Environment and Development. Headed by Gro Harlem Brundtland, Vice President of the World Socialist Party, the commission introduced the concept of "Sustainable Development." For the first time the environment was tied to the tried and true Socialist goals of international redistribution of wealth. Said the report, "*Poverty is a major cause and effect of global environmental problems. It is therefore futile to attempt to deal with environmental problems without a broader perspective that encompasses the factors underlying world poverty and international inequality.*"

These four commissions laid the groundwork for the Common-ism agenda. A controlled media would dictate the flow of information and ideas and prevent dissent. Control of international development manages and redistributes wealth. Full disarmament puts the power structure into the hands of those with armaments. And tying environmentalism to poverty and economic development brings the entire socialist agenda to the level of an international emergency.

One world, one media, one authority for development, one source of wealth. One international army. Envisioned was the construction of a "just society" with political and social equality - rather than a free society with the individual as the sole possessor of rights. It's all wrapped up in nothing more that Orwellian single-think and double-talk - exclusive and universal power in the newly reformed United Nations. Welcome to the world of Common-ism.

FALL OF THE SOVIET UNION
END OF COMMUNISM
BIRTH OF COMMON-ISM

The plans were laid for the new Common-ism order, but one major obstacle stood in the way. The West was united in the war to contain Communism. In the eyes of the international Socialists, Western capitalist ideology was a knee jerk negative reaction to their grand schemes for order. Enter on the international stage a Soviet leader named Mikhail Gorbachev, hailed as a new kind of Soviet leader with "whom the West could deal."

Under his leadership, Soviet strategy changed from confrontation with the West, instead advocating that the USSR and the U.S. pool intellectual and scientific resources "in order to solve the most diverse problems for the benefit of human kind."

Gorbachev then turned to World Communists and urged them to form a fraternal alliance with the Socialist International to advance the cause of peace and international democracy. In 1990, Communist parties throughout Europe and elsewhere hid their identities by renaming parties as Labour parties and the Democratic Left Alliance. Thus aligned with the socialists, they could move to advance the "New International Economic Order."

Said Gorbachev, "*We have to develop the process of democratization in all areas – political, economic, and in the sphere of reconstructing federalism. We have to move ahead democratically in all areas and this movement toward greater justice and greater liberty, that is the same thing as the movement to socialism and to the implementation of the socialist idea.*"

All the magic words were there: democracy, liberty, reorganizing the hated "evil empire." And the West bought it. President Reagan toasted him and said, "*freedom and democracy are the best guarantors for peace*." Gorbachev smiled and said, "*peace(ful)*

coexistence and maximum democracy are the guarantors of freedom." Little did the West understand that the same words could have such different meanings depending on who spoke them.

It took Gorbachev less than a decade to rid himself of the albatross of the appellation of "soviet" and set the stage for international Socialism and world-wide Common-ism. The West, swallowing the double-speak, no longer stood in the way.

Was it just a lucky accident or was the fall of Communism Gorbachev's goal all along? Nothing has ever been admitted, but today he stands as a major leader in the environmental movement, firmly entrenched in comfortable splendor in the United States. Is it another lucky accident that the environmental movement uses the exact same language as the international socialist movement that Gorbachev helped unite in the 1980s?

A NEW AMERICA IN THE NEW GLOBAL ORDER

In the wake of the euphoria following the fall of both the Soviet Union and the Berlin Wall, Socialists wasted little time implementing their plans. The former Soviet Empire gave birth to a hoard of Socialist democracies. These "democracies" do not operate under the idea that political decisions are made within the framework of a free society and in a free market, as we define democracy in the West. To the contrary, they operate under the scheme that if property, wealth, choice or communications need to be taken from one group in order to create "equality" for another, then that is social democracy. The concept is right out of the Brundtland Commission and the other defining Common-ism commissions of the 1980s.

Western Europe fell in line, discarding the sovereignty and individual identities and currencies of once-proud sovereign nations, and forming the European Union with its common regulations, common currency, and common Socialist agenda. The former president of Germany says 84% of his nation's laws now come from the European Union.

Like NAFTA in the United States, the European Union was sold to that continent as a means to unite each nation's economic power to allow greater competition with the United States and Asia – just a simple trade agreement. However, today those nations have given up their national identity, forfeited their borders and now see the creation of a European Union parliament, a central tax system with the means to enforce collection and a court system. In short, the EU has become the government of Europe.

Today, in the United States the Common-ist agenda is moving forward in the same direction, faster than any Socialist could ever have hoped. Of course the effort was greatly advanced under President Clinton's Executive Order pen as he began the full implementation of Common-ism as official U.S. policy. That brought the United States into much closer compliance with the UN's Agenda 21 agreement, first signed by former President George H.W. Bush in 1992 at the UN Earth Summit in Rio.

Republicans too, have embraced the agenda, all the while proclaiming that the Common-ism brand of free trade was the same as the vision of our founding fathers. Even after the Republicans gained control of the Congress in 1994, Speaker-to-be Newt Gingrich agreed that the lame-duck 103rd Democrat-controlled Congress should reconvene to pass the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

Many freedom-loving libertarians have argued that NAFTA is about free enterprise and universal global liberty. Yet if we compare the NAFTA document to the agenda outlined in the Brandt and Bruntland Commission reports from the 1980s, we see that they are literally indistinguishable. Meanwhile, most Republicans continue to think that the United Nations and its policies of global governance and Common-ism pose no threat to U.S. sovereignty. It seems the soothing positive-sounding double speak of Common-ism lulls them to a peaceful sleep. Only a radical, they say, could oppose world-wide democracy and free trade.

However, as indicated earlier, the "democracy" being imposed on most of the world isn't a democracy that promotes and protects freedom. Freedom is one of the most over-used words in the English language. There is wide confusion over its meaning.

The definition of freedom, as understood by America's Founding Fathers, and therefore, the American version is, simply put, *the ability for individuals to act without hindrance or restraint. Freedom is owning your life, your actions and your labor.*

Politicians, political parties and public spokesmen regularly talk of supporting the "Principles of freedom." Often, however, their proposals and actions lead in the opposite direction, resulting in destruction of freedom.

First, to maintain freedom it must be understood that the principles are not legislated or invented. Principles are discovered. Someone doesn't just come up with an idea and begin to sell it as a principle. A principle exists and one is subject to it, whether known or not. For example, for centuries men were ignorant of the laws of physics, but they were subject to them nonetheless. Man couldn't fly or place two objects in the same space no matter how hard he tried, because the laws (or principles) of physics are fact, whether known or unknown.

"National identities and individual religions appear to be morphing into non-descript and indistinguishable arrangements to some unidentified whole."

The same is true with the principles of freedom. The basic principles of freedom are consistent with man's nature and that's why they work. When the principles of freedom are recognized and adhered to, there is prosperity, justice and happiness. However, when the principles have been ignored or rejected, men have suffered poverty, stagnation and political tyranny.

So, in order for us to obtain freedom it's vital that we know what the principles of freedom are. There are three, actually: Individualism; private property; and free enterprise. They are all necessary for freedom to exist. Leave just one out and freedom is diminished.

Individualism – your personal choices – the ability to pursue your own rational self-interest. Choices, for example the religion one chooses, the size home one builds, the type or size car ones selects to drive; even the kind of spouse selected. In short, individualism is fulfilling a life of one's own choosing.

Private property: the right to own and control certain objects or ideas obtained during the course of life. One's own body is the most important property one will ever own. The idea that someone else can control that is absurd, but from the dawn of time there have been and are those who seek control of another's body and the labor it can produce. Private property is not just land; it is one's thought -- possessions and fruits of personal labor. Without the right to own and dispose of the products of ones own life, the individual is dependent upon the State (or someone) for his very existence.

Thus it is obvious that one can't be individualistic without the ability to own and control private property. It can be argued that one can have no other rights without property rights. George Washington said, "private property and freedom are inseparable." The late property rights activist and rancher, Wayne Hage, said, "either you have the right to own property, or you are property."

And that brings up the third principle of freedom – free enterprise. Free markets, capitalism – the process whereby free men buy and sell and trade the products of their own lives, free from interference.

These are the three principles of freedom comprising the definition of the term "freedom." Any other use of the term is deception perpetrated to falsely lead people into tyranny.

Yet, today, we live in a new world with new terms and policies designed to sound like freedom -- like free trade; open borders; partnerships; global markets; emerging economies; and developing nations. We are told a new order is coming into being to break down barriers, providing opportunities and building freedom around the globe.

However, the noose continues to tighten as three elements are now being promoted for an American Union similar to those that established the European Union. First are efforts to harmonize diplomatic relations in the North American countries of Canada, Mexico, and the United States. Second are steps to homogenize economic relations into a North American Trade agreement. Third is a strategy to dilute traditional concepts of the Rule of Law which protect individuals and their property.

Proponents' Propaganda says this new system would "humanize" or democratize the Americas. However, under that system such things as property and liberty would not be automatically protected, but rather decided by pressure from special interests and international corporations – for the public good, of course.

That is the same rhetoric used in social democracies around the world. But there is just one major difference facing such policy in the United States. The United States was not established as a democracy, but a Republic. There is a vast difference.

A democracy operates under the concept of majority rule. Under such a concept, the idea of rights can ebb and flow with each new vote. A majority which covets the wealth of another simply votes to take what it covets. Many times this is referred to as the "rule of man" or the rule of whim. Another way to put it is "Democracy is three wolves and a sheep voting on what to have for lunch."

In a Republic, such as the United States, rights are considered yours from birth. Those rights are not to be considered "up for grabs" or to be changed by the whim of politicians. The laws of the United States were established to protect those rights under any circumstances. A majority or mob could not take away ones property or ability to travel, for example, by a simple vote of the majority. Government's only job is to protect those rights. This is the "Rule of Law."

"As long as the title 'communist' was not hung around their neck to raise Western fears, the ideas of international socialism could move forward unhindered."

Today, under the Common-ism agenda, the United States is quickly moving away from its Republic toward that of a socialist democracy. The establishment of a North American Union will certainly finish the job.

The effort to create a North American Union took a huge step forward in March, 2005, when President George Bush, Mexican President Vicente Fox and Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin signed an agreement to create common policies concerning various economic and security areas among the three nations. The agreement, called the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP), authorized the creation of twenty tri-national working groups to establish policies leading to a European-style Union.

The blueprint being used to formulate the Union is undeniably a book written by Robert Pastor entitled "Building a North American Community." Dr. Pastor, one of the architects of the Panama Canal Giveaway in the 1970s, has argued that "Countries are benefited when they changed these (national sovereignty) polices, and evidence suggests that North Americans are ready for a new relationship that renders this old definition of sovereignty obsolete."

Once such a union is established and has the full faith and credit backing of the U.S. government and commercial banks, the United States will certainly be less free or independent to act according to its national interests. As the United States forfeits its national sovereignty to the Union, Mexico and Canada will grow more determined to ensure the redistribution of wealth and power between the three nation states, and more within the commonwealth of North America.

The Socialists' dream of a "Global Commons" is quickly nearing completion. Yet Americans, about to lose their national sovereignty, remain surprisingly ignorant to that fact. The policies are being

implemented all around them, by every department of the federal government, but every state government, by every county commission and by every city council in the nation. Yet few alarms are sounding. Politicians never mention it on the campaign trail. Certainly, no vote has been taken by the American people or even by Congress.

How is it being done? Step by step, town by town across the country, through the policies of community development, historic preservation, environmental protection, and school restructuring. The roots of such policies are not locally created, rather they come from a central plan: a blueprint from an international agreement called Agenda 21. It works under many names including Commonism, the Third Way, and the most widely used – Sustainable Development.

ATTACK OF THE NGOs

'Global governance' in our vocabulary does not imply a global 'government', but rather the institution set up for cooperation, coordination, and common action between durable sovereign states…people and nations are beginning to agree to take the next steps together. They are reaching a consensus by practical procedures rather than by formal voting of governmental representatives; many international functions, especially those requiring the most foresight and operational flexibility, and be carried out through non-governmental arrangements." Club of Rome.

One rarely hears of it. Few elected officials raise an eyebrow. The media makes no mention of it. But power is slowly slipping away from our elected representatives. In much the same way Mao Tse-tung had his Red Guards, so the UN has its NGOs They may well be your masters of tomorrow, and you don't even know who or what they are.

Nation-states are now sharing their power with international and intergovernmental organizations and private organizations like the Sierra Club, Nature Conservancy, National Education Association and Planned Parenthood, to name a very few. Rather than focus on the normal issues of government, such as providing and repairing infrastructure, this new power elite focus on political agendas, enforcing the politically-correct dictates of social justice. Instead of votes by the elected representatives of the people, they usually operate in non-elected planning boards and regional commissions.

The Club of Rome, in its document entitled "The First Global Revolution" argues that democracy is weak and voting is an antiquated idea. Instead, NGOs and private think tanks meet and reach consensus on particular issues or subjects. Governments are then used to push the agendas though the power of their ability of enforcement. In this manner, unsubstantiated issues like global warming, water shortages and avian flu become the central basis for policy, without debate or votes of the electorate or its representatives.

There are, in fact, three parallel, complimentary forces at work in the world working together to advance the global Sustainable Development agenda, ultimately leading toward UN global governance. Those three forces are the UN itself, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and international corporations.

Beginning with the United Nations, the infrastructure pushing the Sustainable Development agenda is a vast, international matrix. At the top of the heap is the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP).

Created in 1973 by the UN General Assembly, the UNEP is the catalyst through which the global environmental agenda is implemented. Virtually all of the international environmental programs and policy changes that have occurred globally in the past three decades are the result of UNEP efforts.

But the UNEP doesn't operate on its own. Influencing it and helping to write policy are thousands of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). These are private groups which seek to implement a specific political agenda. Through the UN infrastructure, particularly through the UNEP, they have amassed great power.

The phrase "non-governmental organization" came into use with the establishment of the United

Nations Organization in 1945 with provisions in Article 71 of Chapter 10 of the United Nations Charter. The term describes a consultative role for organizations that are neither government nor member states of the UN.

NGOs are not just any private group hoping to influence policy. True NGOs are officially sanctioned by the United Nations. Such status was created by UN Resolution 1296 in 1948, giving NGOs official "Consultative" status to the UN. That means they can not only sit in on international meetings, but can actively participate in creating policy, right along side government representatives.

There are numerous classifications of NGOs. The two most common are "Operational" and "Advocacy."

Operational NGOs are involved with designing and implementing specific projects such as feeding the hungry or organizing relief projects. These groups can be religious or secular. They can be community-based, national or international. The International Red Cross falls under the category of an operational NGO.

Advocacy NGOs are promoting a specific political agenda. They lobby government bodies, use the news media and organize activist-oriented events -- all designed to raise awareness and apply pressure to promote their causes which include environmental issues, human rights, poverty, education, children, drinking water, and population control, to name a few.

Amnesty International is the largest Human rights advocacy NGO in the world. Organized globally, it has more than 1.8 million members, supporters and subscribers in over 150 countries.

Today these NGOs have power nearly equal to member nations when it comes to writing UN policy. Just as civil service bureaucrats provide the infrastructure for government operation, so too do NGOs provide such infrastructure for the UN. In fact, most UN policy is first debated and then written by the NGOs and presented to national government officials at international meetings for approval and ratification. It is through this process that the individual political agendas of the NGO groups enter the international political arena.

The policies sometimes come in the form of international treaties or simply as policy guidelines. Once the documents are presented to and accepted by representatives of member states and world leaders, obscure political agendas of private organizations suddenly become international policy, and are then adopted as national and local laws by UN member states. Through this very system, Sustainable Development has grown from a collection of ideas and wish lists of a wide variety of private organizations to become the most widely implemented tool in the UN's quest for global governance.

"It took Gorbachev less than a decade to get rid of the old Soviet albatross and set the stage for international Socialism and world-wide Common-ism. The West no longer stood in the way."

The three most powerful organizations influencing UNEP policy are three international NGOs. They are the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), the World Resources Institute (WRI) and the International Union for Conservation and Nature (IUCN). These three groups provide the philosophy, objectives and methodology for the international environmental agenda through a series of official reports and studies such as: *World Conservation Strategy*, published in 1980 by all three groups; *Global Biodiversity Strategy*, published in 1992; and *Global Biodiversity Assessment*, published in 1996.

These groups not only influence UNEP's agenda, they also influence a staggering array of international and national NGOs around the world. Jay Hair, former head of the National Wildlife Federation, one of the U.S's largest environmental organizations, was also the president of the IUCN. Hair later turned up as co-chairman of the Presidents Council on Sustainable Development.

The WWF maintains a network of national chapters around the world which influence, if not dominate, NGO activities at the national level. It is at the national level where NGOs agitate and lobby national governments to implement the policies that the IUCN, WWF and WRI get written into the documents that are advanced by the UNEP. In this manner, the world grows ever closer to global governance.

Other than treaties, how does UNEP policy become U.S. policy? Specifically, the IUCN has an incredible mix of U.S. government agencies along with major U.S. NGOs as members. Federal agencies include the Department of State, Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the National Park Service (NPS) the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and the Fish and Wildlife Service. These agencies send representatives to all meetings of the UNEP.

Also attending those meetings as active members are NGO representatives. These include activist groups such as the Environmental Defense Fund, National Audubon Society, The Nature Conservancy, National Wildlife Federation, Zero Population Growth, Planned Parenthood, the Sierra Club and hundreds more. These groups all have specific political agendas they desire to become law. Through their official contact with government agencies working side by side with the UNEP, their political wish lists become official government policy.

How can this be, one may ask? How can private organizations control policy and share equal power to elected officials? Here's how it works.

When the dust settled over the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, five major documents were forced into international policy that will change forever how national policy is made. More importantly, the Rio Summit produced the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). UNCED outlined a new procedure for shaping policy. The procedure has no name, nor is it dictatorial. It is perhaps best described as "controlled consensus" or better yet, "affirmative acquiescence." Basically it means -- everybody is falling in line.

Put in simple street language, the procedure really amounts to a collection of NGOs, bureaucrats and government officials, all working together toward a predetermined outcome. They have met together in meetings, written policy statements based on international agreements, which they helped to create and now they are about to impose laws and regulations that will have dire effects on people's lives and national economies. Yet, with barely a twinge of conscience they move forward with the policy, saying nothing. No one objects. It's understood. Everyone goes along. For this is a barbaric procedure that insures their desired outcome without the ugliness of bloodshed, or even debate. It is the procedure used to advance the radical, global environmental agenda.

The UNCED procedure utilizes four elements of power: international government (UN); national governments; non-governmental organizations, and philanthropic institutions.

The NGOs are the key to the process. They create policy ideas from their own private agendas. The policy idea is then adopted by one or more UN organizations for consideration at a regional conference. Each conference is preceded by an NGO forum designed specifically to bring NGO activists into the debate. There they are fully briefed on the policy and then trained to prepare papers and lobby and influence the official delegates of the conference. In this way, the NGOs control the debate and assure the policy is adopted.

The ultimate goal of the conference is to produce a "Convention," which is a legally-drawn policy statement on specific issues. Once the "Convention" is adopted by the delegates, it is sent to the national governments for official ratification. Once that is done, the new policy becomes international law.

Then the real work begins. Compliance must be assured. Again, the NGOs come into the picture. They are responsible for pressuring Congress to write national laws in order to comply with the treaty. One trick used to assure compliance is to write into the laws the concept of third-party lawsuits.

NGOs now regularly sue the government and

private citizens to force policy. They have their legal fees and even damage awards paid to them out of the government treasury. Through a coordinated process, hundreds of NGOs are at work in Congress, in every state government and in every local community, advancing some component of the global environmental agenda.

However, the United States Constitution's Tenth Amendment bars the Federal Government from writing laws that dictate local policy. To by pass this roadblock, NGOs encourage Congress to include special grants to help states and communities to fund the new policy, should they want to "voluntarily" comply.

Should a community or state refuse to participate "voluntarily," local chapters of the NGOs are trained to go into action. They begin to pressure city councils or county commissioners to accept the grants and implement the policy. Should they meet resistance, they begin to issue news releases telling the community their elected officials are losing millions of dollars for the community. The pressure continues until the grant is finally taken and the policy becomes local law.

Americans must begin to understand that the debate over environmental issues have very little to do with clean water and air and much more to do with the establishment of power. NGOs are gaining it; locally elected officials are losing it as the structure of American government changes to accommodate the private agendas of NGOs.

Throughout the 1990s, the UN held summits and conferences around the world where NGOs could work their magic, authoring an agenda to completely restructure the world.

- In Vienna, Austria, the focus was on human rights, particularly the rights of children over parents. The conference produced the "Convention on the Rights of the Child."

- In Cairo, forced abortion and sterilization were put forth as solutions for population control -- a major component to the implementation of Sustainable Development.

- In Copenhagen, the United Nations revealed its daring plan for global taxes which would give the international body an independent source of funding. The payment of such taxes would help finance a UN Court, and a UN army for enforcement of its policies.

- As mentioned, at the Earth Summit in Rio, five major documents to define and implement the Sustainabalist agenda were presented for ratification.

- First was the "Convention on Climate Change," to address the issue of Global Warming. It was the precursor to the Kyoto Climate Change Protocol, later adopted in 1997.

- The second document presented was the "Biodiversity Treaty." This treaty would declare 50% of all the land in every state of this nation to be wilderness "off limits" to humans.

- The third document was called the "Rio Declaration" which called for the eradication of poverty throughout the world. Its solution to poverty was the redistribution of wealth from richer nations to poorer "developing" nations.

- The fourth document was the "Convention on Forest Principles" calling for international management of the world's forests, essentially shutting down or severely regulating the timber industry.

- And the fifth document was Agenda 21. This one document contained the full agenda for implementing worldwide sustainable development.

Throughout the 90s and into the 2000s the UN has continued to hold additional conferences and meetings to "retool" and update previous conventions. In 1996, Istanbul, Turkey was the site of the Habitat II conference. This conference focused on minute details as to how towns and cities were to be developed and the kind of materials to be used in building homes. It called for a "remapping" of society, downsizing cities and towns into "urban clusters" where workplaces, housing and nature

would be blended together."

There were more conferences in Mexico to further discuss the implementation of UN taxes; in South Africa to further discuss Sustainable Development; and finally the main event, the Millennium Assembly in 2000, held at UN headquarters in New York City. It was attended by literally every world leader and head of state.

In preparation for this major event the NGOs worked overtime to prepare the most radical, comprehensive wish list to restructure for global governance ever conceived. The working document was called the Charter for Global Democracy. The Charter's twelve principles were taken directly from the blueprint published back in 1995 by the UN's Commission on Global Governance. Now, here in one document, were the plans for full implementation. The Charter for Global Democracy is nothing more than the plan to abolish individual freedom.

- The first principle calls for the consolidation of all international agencies under direct UN authority. These would include the World Bank, the World Trade Organization and the World Health Organization.

- The second principle calls for regulation by the UN of all transnational corporations and financial institutions, requiring an international "code of conduct" concerning the environment and labor practices.

- The third principle demands an independent source of revenue for the UN, such as the "Tobin Tax," which would tax every single international monetary transaction and put billions of dollars in UN coffers. It also calls for UN taxes on aircraft, shipping fuels and licensing the use of what it calls the "global commons. The global commons is defined as "outer space, the atmosphere, non-territorial seas, and the related environment that supports human life."

- Principle number four would eliminate the veto power and permanent member status on the UN Security Council.

- Principle five would authorize a standing UN army.

- Principle six would require UN registration of all arms and the reductions of all national armies "as part of a multinational global security system" under UN authority.

- Principle seven would require individual and national compliance with UN Human Right treaties and declarations, specifically the UN Declaration on Human Rights.

- Principle eight would activate the International Criminal Court.

- Principle nine calls for a new institution to establish economic and environmental security by insuring sustainable development.

- Principle ten called for the creation of an international Environmental Court.

- Principle eleven calls for the declaration that climate change is an essential global security interest that requires the creation of a "high level action team" to allocate carbon emission-based on per capita rights. In other words, the creation of an entirely new economic order based on energy use.

- And finally, principle twelve calls for the cancellation of all debt owed by the poorest nations, global poverty reductions, and for "equitable sharing of global resources" as allocated by the United Nations.

The Charter for Global Democracy was not signed outright by the delegates and world leaders at the Millennium Assembly. Its language was too blunt and forthright to fit in a UN diplomatic document. Instead, a much less direct "Millennium Declaration" was issued after the Summit. While the methods of implementation were vague in the final Declaration, the goals for accomplishment were incredibly specific.

Rather than calling for the outright creation of a UN army, the Declaration called for a dramatic change

in which authority determines the deployment of peacekeeping missions. Traditionally, this authority has been the UN Security Council, a body made up of 15 members, five of which are "permanent members," with veto power, including the United States. The remaining ten members are elected by the General Assembly to serve two-year terms. This allows the major contributing nations to decide whether or not certain deployments are worthy of their contributed resources.

But no longer. Now, under changes called for in the Millennium Declaration, peace keeping decisions will be the sole authority of the UN bureaucracy – specifically the Secretary General. Not called a UN army, it will be called the Rapid Deployment Force (RPF).

Second, the UN's Criminal Court is now a reality. Now the UN has the power to enforce its own rule of law. Nations aren't even required to ratify the Court as a treaty. Once 60 nations signed on, it affected every single nation - unprecedented in international law. The final twelve signatures needed were gained at the Millennium Assembly. Point of fact: the United States is not a signatory to the UN Criminal Court. President Bill Clinton did sign it one hour before he left office. However, in a unprecedented move, President George W. Bush removed the U.S. signature after coming into office.

Clearly the Charter for Global Democracy is well under way toward full implementation. It is the crowning achievement of private organizations to impose their agenda of global governance. In every case, every conference, every document, the NGOs, side by side with their counterparts in government agencies, have worked out the language to create the policy that is to become rules for the rest of us to live by. The UNEP and its web of control had done its job to the fullest.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

The third force pushing world-wide Common-ism – or Sustainable Development -- is international corporations operating with governments and NGOs in what are commonly called public/private partnerships (PPPs). Today, across the nation, state legislatures are busy passing laws to encourage PPPs as a "free-market" approach to provide much needed infrastructure upgrades using private money rather than having to spend tax money. That's the argument, anyway. The reality is much different.

These bonds between government and private corporations are a double-edged sword. They come armed with government's power to tax, the government's power of eminent domain and the government's power of coercion to enforce policy. At the same time, the private corporations use their wealth and extensive advertising budgets to entrench the Common-ism polices into our national conscience.

Further, participating corporations can control the types of products offered on the market. For example, in 2007, General Electric and Sylvania, two of the largest manufacturers of incandescent light bulbs, teamed up to help write a portion of the 2007 energy bill in which incandescent light bulbs were banned in favor of "environmentally-correct fluorescent bulbs.

Why would companies work to ban their own product? Because incandescent bulbs cost about 50 cents each, while the new environmental bulbs costs about $3.00 each. Having government ban the bulbs opened the door to the companies to force purchasing of a product that wasn't selling well, but that was ultimately more profitable to them.

The same thing was done by DuPont in the 1990s when that company helped engineer the banning of Freon. It was little known at the time that DuPont's patent on the Freon formula was about to run out, allowing other companies to make the very valuable and profitable coolant. By getting it banned, DuPont was free to bring a new product to the mark and foil its competition.

In both cases, the banning of valuable products has been aided by the NGOs which trumpeted the environmental dangers of the existing products and praised the "environmental benefits" of the new. It's a perfect partnership.

Other ways PPPs can be used by international

corporations to get a leg up on their competition is by entering into contracts with government to obtain favors such as tax breaks and even obtain store locations not available to their competition, thereby creating an elite class of "connected" businesses. A private developer, which has entered into a PPP with local government, for example, can now obtain the use of eminent domain to build on land not open to its competitors.

The Supreme Court's Kelo Vs New London decision was key to giving private corporations the ability to enter into PPPs with local government in the use of eminent domain. That decision essentially ruled that such use of eminent domain for private development was OK as a means to provide for the common good. That common good is achieved when land, not now producing maximum tax revenue is transformed into a taxing dynamo through an expensive private development. Good for the government and the developer, perhaps. Not so good for the original property owner who is moved from his home. People in communities are now losing control of their infrastructure and voters are losing control of their government as corporations grow more powerful.

The Trans Texas Corridor (TTC) is a project run completely through PPPs. It is being built to provide the cheapest possible transportation of goods from Mexico to Canada. The highway will be more than a quarter mile wide to accommodate as many as ten lanes of traffic, with pipelines, power lines and rail lines down the center.

A Spanish company, Cintra, has been given a 50-year lease to build the highway and run it. Again, the argument put forth by the Texas State Department of Transportation is that the highway won't cost taxpayers to build it. But the lease contains a no-compete clause, which means no one else, not even the State of Texas can build or maintain a parallel highway.

Worse, the lease contains a Comprehensive Development Agreement (CDA) which guarantees Cintra specific returns on its investment. That means, with no alternative route, Cintra can charge whatever it wishes for tolls. In addition, there are few plans to build overpasses across the TTC. Yet the highway is so wide, without the overpasses, entire communities and private property will be cut in two, making it impossible for police, fire ambulance and school buses to get from one side to the other. Property owners could find their house on one side of the corridor while their barn is on the other. They could have to drive for miles to get to the other side.

Local communities which now rely on traffic from the existing Interstate 35 for their hotels, gas stations and restaurants may well lose that revenue because few exit ramps are planned. Instead, as part of the CDA, Cintra may build those facilities down the center of the TTC as one means to collect its promised investment returns.

This, then, is the PPP policy in action. Far from being free enterprise, it is really the creation of government-sanctioned monopolies and corporate fascism. The one thing PPPs are not is free enterprise. It is the future under Common-ism.

STEP-BY-STEP IMPLEMENTATION

On September 19, 2006, the UN moved forward with more plans for global taxes to generate more foreign aid. The taxes will be collected and spent through a new UN organization operating out of Geneva, called UNITAID. In an official UN news release it said, "UNITAID will be funded by innovative financing mechanisms such as a contribution on air tickets…" UN double speak continues to deny these are taxes, calling them "contributions" instead.

To enforce several more of the twelve principles of the NGOs Charter for Global Democracy, the Millennium Declaration created the "Millennium Project." This new operation was assigned the task to (1) eradicate poverty, (2) eliminate debt of poor nations and (3) impose sustainable development world-wide, all to be accomplished by 2015.

Targeting Congress

That process began to take the shape of the rule of law when in September 2007, the U.S. House of Representatives, by voice vote, passed the "Global Poverty Act." The same bill was sponsored in the Senate

by Democrat Presidential candidate Barack Obama. The bill openly discusses that the bill is connected to the Millennium Goals

The Global Poverty Act will impose a global tax on the American people in the amount of 0.7% of the United States' gross national product (GNP). That figure is directly linked to the published Millennium Goals. The bill is touted as America's fulfilled Millennium pledge to help end poverty. Its real purpose is to begin the process of enriching and empowering the United Nations in its goal of global governance.

Targeting Local Mayors

In June 2005, the city of San Francisco was the site of an international conference called "World Environment Day." But the agenda of this conference was much bigger than just another hippy dance in the park. This meeting of the global elite had a specific target and an agenda with teeth. The goal was the full implementation of the UN's Agenda 21 policy and Sustainable Development. This time, the target audience was our nation's mayors. The UN's new tactic on full display at this conference is to ignore federal and state governments and go straight to the roots of American society. Think globally – act locally.

As part of their participation in the conference, mayors were pressed to commit their communities to specific legislative and policy goals by signing a slate of United Nations accords. Two documents were presented for the mayors' signature.

The first document was called the "Green Cities Declaration," a statement of principles which set the agenda for the mayors' assigned tasks. It says, in part, "*Believing as Mayors of cities around the globe, we have a unique opportunity to provide leadership to develop truly sustainable urban centers based on culturally and economically appropriate local actions*…." The Declaration was amazingly bold in that it details exactly how the UN intends to implement a very specific agenda in every town and city in the nation. The document includes lots of rhetoric about the need to curtail greenhouse gases and preserve resources. But the final line of the Green Cities Declaration was the point of the whole affair: "*Signatory cities shall work to implement the following Urban Environment Accords. Each year cities shall pick three actions to adopt as policies or laws.*"

The raw meat of the agenda was outlined in detail in the second document, called the "Urban Environment Accords." The Accords include exactly 21 specific actions (as in Agenda 21) for the mayors to take, controlled by a timetable for implementation.

Here's a quick look at a few of the 21 agenda actions called for. Under the topic of energy, action item number one calls for mayors to implement a policy to increase the use of "renewable" energy by 10% within seven years. Renewable energy includes solar and wind power.

Not stated in the UN documents is the fact that in order to meet the goal, a community would have to reserve thousands of acres of land to set up expensive solar panels or even more land for windmills. Consider that it takes a current 50 megawatt gas-fired generating plant about 2-5 acres of land to produce its power. Yet to create that same amount of power through the use of solar panels would require at least 1,000 acres. Using windmills to generate 50 megawatts would require over 4,000 acres of land while chopping up birds and creating a deafening roar. The cost of such "alternative" energy to the community would be vastly prohibitive. Yet, such unworkable ideas are the environmentally-correct orders of the days that the mayors were being urged to follow.

Energy Actions two and three deal with the issue of reducing energy consumption. Both of these are backdoor sneak attacks by the UN to enforce the discredited Kyoto Global Warming Treaty, which President Bush has refused to implement. Kyoto would force the United States to reduce its energy consumption by at least 30 percent, forcing energy shortages and severely damaging the nation's economy. Kyoto is the centerpiece of the UN's drive to control the world economy and redistribute wealth to Third World nations. It would do nothing to help the environment. Yet the mayors are being pushed to help implement this destructive treaty city-by-city.

Perhaps the most egregious action offered in the Urban Environmental Accords deals with the topic of water. Action item number twenty calls for adoption and implementation of a policy to reduce individual water consumption by 10% by 2020. Interestingly, the UN document begins by stating: "Cities with potable water consumption greater than 100 liters per capita per day will adopt and implement policies to reduce consumption by 10 percent by 2015."

There is no basis for the 100-liter figure other than employing a very clever use of numbers to lower the bar and control the debate. One must be aware that 100 liters equals about 26 gallons per person, per day. According to the UN, each person should only have 10% less than 26 gallons each day to drink, bathe, flush toilets, wash clothes, water lawns, wash dishes, cook, and more.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, Americans need about 100 GALLONS per day to perform these basic functions. Consider also that there is no specific water shortage in the United States. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, annual water withdrawal across the nation is about 407 billion gallons, while consumption (including evaporation and plant use, is about 94 billion gallons. Such restrictions, as outlined in the Urban Environment Accords, are really nothing more than a major campaign by the UN to control water consumption. Yet, the nation's mayors are being pushed to impose policies to take away our free use of water. Why? Because if a power can control the water, it can control everything else. No one can live without water.

"Democracy is a positive term in the West. However, understanding the use of this word by international socialists is the key to understanding Common-ism and today's changed world."

The rest of the Accords deal with a variety of subjects including waste reduction, recycling, transportation, health and nature. Perhaps the most blatant promise of action is Action number sixteen in which the mayors are supposed to agree to "Every year identify three products, chemicals, or compounds that are used within your city that represents the greatest risk to human health and adopt a law to eliminate their sale and use in the city."

There you have it. Every year, our nation's mayors are to promise to ban something! What if there isn't a "chemical or compound" that poses a risk? Gotta ban something anyway. That's not an idle threat. In the 1990s Anchorage, Alaska had some of the most pristine water in the nation. It had no pollution. Yet, the federal government ordered the city to meet strict federal clean water standards that required it to remove a certain percentage of pollution. In order to meet those requirements, Anchorage was forced to dump fish parts into its pristine water so that it could then clean out the required quotas. Your city's mayor may have to ban the ink in your fountain pen to meet his quota – and ban it he will.

And what is the mayor's reward for destroying private property rights, increasing energy costs on less consumption, and banning something useful every year? He gets green stars. That's right. According to UN documents, if your mayor can complete 8-11 of the prescribed 21 actions, the town will get a green star and the designation, "Local Sustainable City." Twelve to 17 actions completed will garner two green stars and the designation, "National Sustainable City." Fifteen to 18 actions completed will bring in three green stars and the title "Regional Sustainable City." Finally, the energizer bunny mayor who gets 19-21 actions completed will get a full four green stars and the ultimate designation of "Global Sustainable City." Certainly he or she will also get a plaque and get to sit at the head table at the next UN Sustainable Development conference.

At the San Francisco summit, the mayors were wooed by the elite, from UN Secretary General Kofi Annan to Maurice Strong, to Senator Diane Feinstein, to Hollywood activists Robert Redford

and Martin Sheen, to Chimp master Jane Goodall. All the usual suspects were there to press the flesh and push the agenda. Businesses like Mitsubishi, which hope to make huge profits from green industry with its government subsidies and taxpayer grants, helped pay for the event. The news media was well represented too, not in a journalistic role to report the news, but as full-fledged sponsors helping to spread their own brand of propaganda. All understood that a new governing elite, elected by no one, answerable to their own set of standards, is being created for the care and feeding of us all. With the right contacts and the proper show of public spirit, there are riches and power to be gained. Even for your local mayor.

Sustainable Development is truly stunning in its magnitude to transform the world into feudal-like governance by making nature the central organizing principle for our economy and society. It is a scheme fueled by unsound science and discredited economics that can only lead modern society down the road to a new Dark Ages. It is a policy of banning goods and regulating and controlling human action. It is systematically implemented through the creation of non-elected visioning boards and planning commissions. There is no place in the Sustainable world for individual thought, private property or free enterprise. It is the exact opposite of the free society envisioned by this nation's founders.

Even before the San Francisco conference, the UN's influence over the nation's mayors had been felt as 132 U.S. mayors moved to implement the Kyoto Treaty in their communities in defiance of the Bush Administration's rejection of it. Moreover, the treaty was the centerpiece of the agenda for the 2005 national meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, held in Chicago just one week after the San Francisco meeting. Think globally and act locally is no longer just a slogan on the back of a Volvo. It's a well entrenched national policy bleeding down into your local community, carried there by Judas goats who have been elected by you.

America's mayors are the elected representatives closest to the people. They are the ones that our founders intended to have the most influence over our daily lives. If the UN succeeds in its efforts to enforce Sustainable Development policy through our mayors, the process will accelerate at an astounding rate and locally-controlled government will cease to exist. But signs, adorned with green stars, will certainly greet us at every city limit line as the inhabitants -- stripped of their property rights; buried under huge tax burdens; struggling under reduced energy flow -- shuffle on as their proud mayor gleams in the global limelight under the banner "think globally and act locally."

FIGHTING BACK

As massive as the world-wide movement toward Common-ism appears to be, it can be stopped. That's because there are several elements, some from the past, some new, which the international socialists haven't counted on. Here are some examples.

First is the fact that humans are not a colony of ants. We have our own ideas about how to live our lives. Moreover, Americans have grown up with the idea of independence. As asleep as we appear to be at times, when our comfort is threatened we awaken and fight back.

The recent efforts to impose illegal alien amnesty is a prime example. This policy must be in place if Common-ism is to be fully implemented. Yet, the American people time and again have fought back efforts to enforce it. The massive rejection of this policy has set the Common-ists on their heels.

Second, try as the Common-ists might to control the flow of information, they never counted on the Internet. Due to its free flow of information opposition forces are growing around the world. Even in darkest China. As the Common-ist agenda takes hold, more people are growing aware of its existence and are spreading the word against it. That's why it's imperative that all efforts to enforce controls over the Internet be stopped, including those by religious groups to ban or censor pornography. Such efforts open the door for a "legitimized" government role. NGO efforts to ban Internet access to "hate" groups have included some of the nation's most respected freedom groups which they hope to muzzle. The Internet represents the best

opportunity for full *Laissez-faire* free enterprise to be known by the current generation.

Akin to the battle over illegal immigration is the fight to expose and stop the Security and Prosperity Partnership and the Trans Texas Corridor. Proponents of these Common-ist agendas are shocked by the amount of opposition that is building. Some are beginning to doubt they can fully implement their plans. Stopping the TTC and the SPP would create such massive damage to the Common-ist plans that the rest of the global agenda would be in doubt.

Creating a global identification system, complete with international data banks, has been sold as a crucial element for global Common-ist integration. How else can we guarantee peace and security other than to know the whereabouts and activities of every single person in the global commons? Yet, another huge dent in the Common-ist agenda is the battle to stop the creation of an American national ID card. The Common-ists believed their effort to create a national ID was well under way with the passage of the Real ID Act in 2005. That act was to transform state driver's licenses into national ID cards tied to several federal data banks. Deadline for its full implementation was May 11, 2008. Yet that deadline came and went without a single state in compliance and a growing revolt in states refusing to ever comply. Again, against all of the well-laid Common-ist plans, still free Americans are fighting back.

"The noose continues to tighten. Three elements are now being promoted for an American union similar to the European Union."

Internationally, pro-freedom efforts against Common-ism are taking shape as well. One notable example is the work of a Peruvian economist names Hernando de Soto, author of a landmark book, *The Mysteries of Capital*. De Soto advocates private property ownership as the means to eliminate poverty. In spite of the Common-ists efforts to stop Third world development as being "unsustainable" de Soto is becoming much sought after by Third World heads of state who seek his solutions to save their people.

Those who oppose the international Common-ist agenda must fight on four distinct fronts. These include **public education**, where the fight must focus on returning academics to the public school classroom and end the NGO-driven federal curriculum and its psychology-driven behavior modification tactics designed to lead our children into accepting the Common-ism agenda.

The second fight must be an all-out battle to stop any attempts to invade the **individual right to privacy**. Americans must not be lulled into a false sense of security by claims that national ID cards will protect them from terrorists or illegal immigration. Placing every single American's personal information into massive national databanks, accessible by government, private corporations and NGOs who will be able to track our every purchase, every trip and every decision, will only lead to tyranny.

The third fight must be the all-out defense of **private property rights**. Americans must not only have the right to own their own property, but the power to control it as well. That ownership includes land, intellectual property and the fruits of our own labor.

Finally, we must fight for the protection of our **nation's sovereignty and independence.** The United States is unique to every other nation on earth in that we are a Republic – not a social democracy. Such a difference cannot be "harmonized" with nations which don't recognize natural rights. The only result can be to diminish or destroy our rights. The most important battle to protect our nation's sovereignty is the one to remove the United States from the United Nations. End U.S. involvement in the UN and the Common-ists will lose their center of power.

Stop Common-ism on these four fronts and it too will find its way to the ash-heap of history where it belongs.

Common-*ism*...

Its Real Name is Global Governance

A new spirit is hailed in the world - the spirit of Common-ism. All the major powers of the New Europe and the New Americas have entered into a political-spiritual alliance to bring about this new specter. Yesterday's "isms" are Communism and Capitalism. The "ism" of tomorrow is Common-ism.

- From the jacket cover of "The Coming Century of Common-ism", by Philip C. Bom

The Two Meanings of Democracy

"...The common use of the word 'democracy,' together with the contradictory interpretations of the meaning of the word, is a semantic symbol of a civil war in the heart of Western civilization, in which a fanatical equalitarian creed has been pitted against a libertarian one."

- Reinhold Niebuhr, 1977

"We have to develop the process of democratization in all areas - political, economic and in the sphere of reconstructing our federation. We have to move ahead democratically in all areas and this movement toward greater justice and greater liberty, that is the same thing as the movement to socialism and to the implementation of the socialist idea."

- Mikhail Gorbachev, 1991

"In politics and ideology we are seeking to revive the living spirit of Leninism... based on the principle of more socialism and more democracy... consolidating our internationalist community of nations."

- Mikhail Gorbachev

Communism = Common-*ism*

"We are saying this honestly, without trying to fool our own people or the world. Any hopes that we will begin to build a different, non-socialist society and go over to the other camp are unrealistic and futile. Those in the West who expect us to give up socialism will be disappointed. It is high time they understood this, even more importantly, proceed from that understanding in practical relations with the Soviet Union."

- Mikhail Gorbachev, 1987

"More than once he (Lenin) spoke about the priority of interests common to all humanity over class interests. It is only now that we have come to comprehend the entire depth and significance of these ideas. It is they that are feeding our philosophy of international relations, and the new way of thinking."

- Mikhail Gorbachev, 1987

The United Nations The Center of Common-*ism*

"As long as the child breathes the poison of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favour jingoism... We shall presently recognize in nationalism the major obstacle to development of world-mindedness. We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty. UNESCO must be the pioneer."

- William Benton, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State, UNESCO meeting, 1946

"Creating an effective global level of governance and management is clearly the biggest challenge we face in the next century..."

- Maurice Strong, 1987

"Given the common stand that the Soviet Union and the United States have taken at the United Nations, it seems to me that we should be as forthcoming as we possibly can in terms of economics and I plan to do that... This remarkable cooperation... gets me inclined to recommend as close cooperation in the economic field as possible."

- President George Bush, September 9, 1990, USSR/US Summit, Helsinki

Using the Schools to Spread Common-*ism*

"Assisting the child in becoming an intergrated individual who can deal with personal experience while seeing himself as a part of 'the greater whole.' In other words, promote growth of the group idea, so that group good, group understanding, group interrelations and group good - will replace all limited, self-centered objectives, leading to group consciousness."

- Robert Muller, former Secretary-General, UN's Economic and Social Council, 1995

Using the Environment to Spread Common-*ism*

"I have come to believe that we must take bold and unequivocal action: we must make the rescue of the environment the central organizing principle for civilization... Adopting a central organizing principle - one agreed to voluntarily - means embarking on an all-out effort to use every policy and program, every law and institution, every treaty and alliance, every tactic and strategy, every plan and course of action - to use, in short - every means to halt the destruction of the environment and to preserve and nurture our ecological system."

- Vice President Al Gore, Earth in the Balance

Final Word

"When Communism finally hangs Capitalism, a Capitalist will sell us the rope."

- Paraphrasing Lenin