

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.FREEDOM21.COM

THE BATTLE TO STOP THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

By Tom DeWeese

The phone call came to my home late on Tuesday night telling me that the next morning the Ohio House of Representatives would be holding hearings on a resolution to call for a Constitutional Convention. We knew this was not good news. But the news was even worse. To our shock, we discovered that if Ohio were to pass such a resolution, it would be state number thirty-three. Only thirty-four states are needed to officially kick the convention apparatus into gear. We were only two states away! And we had only

18 hours to prepare for battle.

Now, sponsors of the resolution were not wild-eyed Leftists who sought to purge the Constitution. Rather, they were patriotic Republican conservatives who were vitally concerned about the massive spending spree and bailouts taking place in Washington, D.C. The issue, said the sponsors, was to add a balanced budget amendment to the U.S Constitution.

So why were we so concerned about the idea of a “Con Con?” Why were we ready to fight to stop it, especially if it could lead to controlling the outrageous waste of tax dollars in Washington? The reason is simple. These legislators were operating on very bad advice.

The fact is, once 34 states petition Congress to convene a Constitutional Convention, the matter is completely out of the state’s hands. There is absolutely no ability to control what the delegates do in the convention. Attempting to instruct delegates to only discuss a balance budget is absolutely impossible. Instead, once the convention starts the delegates become super delegates which can take any action they desire concerning the Constitution. In short, at the convention the Constitution can be

literally put on an operating table at each delegate can take a scalpel (pen) to it and change any section or even the entire document if they desire.

Section V of the Constitution, which covers the issue of Constitutional Conventions and Amendments, gives absolutely no guidelines as to how it will be run, how delegates can be selected and who can do the selecting. Once the 34 states make the request, the entire matter is in the hands of Congress to decide.

The current Congress could control the entire delegate selection. States may not even be represented. If the states are *allowed* to choose delegates then what would be the method? Will the governor or the state legislature appoint delegates? Or could it be a bicameral panel or blue ribbon commission?

Or could it be a plebiscite – a vote of the people? If so, then who would be eligible to vote? Would it be all eligible voters? Taxpayers only? Or would we possibly, in the interest of “enfranchisement” allow all citizens and potentially foreign nationals to vote for this “special election?” There are no guidelines and anything is possible.

And what would be the qualifications

IN THIS ISSUE:

3. RESISTANCE TO REASON:
The “Change” is called Wealth Redistribution - from your pocket to theirs
5. ABSOLUTES:
Why the UN is Worthless to Human Existence; TxDot Plays Opossum Over TTC
10. INSIDERS REPORT:
New GOP Chairman Should Remove Party from the International Democrat Union
12. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:
“Consensus” in Freefall: Inhofe Global Warming Speech

to be a delegate? Would it be exclusively lawyers? A mix of professionals? So-called “proportional representation” of all special interest groups – NGOs. Will some be excluded because of “extreme” convictions? What will the criteria be? All of these choices would be made by Congress – that same one now controlled by Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid.

Now some have argued that no matter what such a convention does, it still must be ratified by two thirds of the states, making it very difficult to do bad things against the will of the people. A history lesson is in order.

There has been only one Constitutional Convention in the history of the nation – that was in 1787. At the time, the nation was held together by the Articles of Confederation. The states were having a difficult time with commerce among themselves. So it was decided to hold a Constitutional Convention to simply discuss how interstate commerce might be better organized. As the delegates were selected they were given specific orders by some of the states to discuss nothing else beyond the commerce issue.

However, as soon as the delegates arrived at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, they closed and locked the door, pulled down the shades and met in secret for a month. When they were finished, they had created an entirely new nation. We were very lucky that the convention was attended by men like Ben Franklin and James Madison. They produced the most magnificent document ever devised for the governance of man.

Today, we have Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid. Do you trust them to produce a document of such magnitude? Or would they at least take care of the present one? We live in an era when the Supreme Court looks to foreign laws to assure our own are worthy. We live in an era when many believe that the Constitution is out of date or our times. They are itching to get

their hands on the old parchment. And as history has shown, they can do anything they want to it, including writing a completely new document.

And there is more. Concerning the argument that whatever they do, the states must ratify it – thus serving as a safeguard to tomfoolery, consider this fact. The Articles of Confederation required that any changes be ratified by 100% of the states. That was the document that was the law of the land – until something else was put into place. But, when the new Constitution was put to the states for a vote of ratification, they needed only two thirds to approve it. Why? The fact is, Article V of the new Constitution was literally in power – even before the Constitution which contained it was approved. Now, what do you think Reid and Pelosi and company would do with that precedent? So much for protection in the states.

These are the reasons why my colleagues and I looked at the Ohio resolution with such horror. There has never been a worse time in the nation’s history to consider changing this grand document.

The thirty-two states which had already passed resolutions to call for a Con Con did so in the mid 1970s. Those resolutions remained dormant for thirty years. In fact, three of the states had actually passed resolutions to rescind their petitions. However, proponents said they found no provision in Article V for states to rescind a call for a Con Con after it was made. They say it’s like trying to “unring a bell.” Instead they intend to push for resolutions from a full 34 states and then challenge those rescinded in court. That is not a fight any of us want to fight.

So there we were, the night before the hearings in the Ohio House. Already on the legislative calendar was a scheduled vote on the resolution, waiting until they could get these pesky hearings out of the way. Only they hadn’t counted on the power of our grassroots network. *(Cont’d on Page 4)*

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 15, No. 2 February 2009

Published by
Freedom21 Communications, LLC

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Copy Editor
Virginia DeWeese

Correspondence/Fulfillment
Sascha McGuckin
Carolyn DeWeese

Graphics/Layout
Kristy Hook

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

Phone: (540) 341-8910
Fax: (540) 341-8916

Web Page:
www.freedom21.com

© 2009 Freedom21
Communications, LLC
ISSN 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

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



RESISTANCE TO REASON

REVEALING FACTS OF THOSE WHO HAVE DECLARED WAR ON LOGIC



The “Change” is called Wealth Redistribution – from your pocket to theirs

“One of the tragedies of the civil rights movement was that the civil rights movement became so court focused, I think, there was a tendency to lose track of the political and organizing activities on the ground that are able to bring about the coalitions of power through which you bring about **redistributive change**.” Barack Obama interview on Chicago Public Radio, 2001

“Maybe I am showing my bias here as a legislator as well as a law professor, but you know I am not optimistic about bringing about major **redistributive change** through the courts. You know the institution just isn’t structured that way... Any of the three of us sitting here could come up with a rationale for bringing about economic change through the courts. I think that, as a practical matter, that our institutions are just poorly equipped to do it.” Barack Obama interview on Chicago Public Radio, 2001

“My attitude is that if the economy’s good for folks from the bottom up, it’s gonna be good for everybody. I think when you spread the wealth around, it’s good for everybody.” Discussion with “Joe the Plumber,” campaign trail, 2008

“It’s not that I want to punish your success, I want to make sure that everybody who is behind you, that they’ve got a chance for success, too.” Discussion with “Joe the Plumber,” campaign trail, 2008

“Now, more than ever, we must rededicate ourselves to the notion that we share a common destiny as Americans that I am my brother’s keeper, I am my sister’s keeper. Now, we must all do our part to serve one another; to seek new ideas and new innovation; and to start a new chapter for our great country.” Barack Obama, holiday radio address, 2008

“Painful crisis also provides us with an opportunity to transform our economy to improve the lives of ordinary people.” Barack Obama talking about the recession, 2009

“You never want a serious crisis to go to waste.” Rahm Emmanuel, Obama Chief of Staff designate, 2009.

“Barack Obama wants to use the recession to remake the U.S. economy.” John Stossel, ABC reporter for 20/20

“So they will ‘transform our economy.’ Obama’s nearly trillion-dollar plan will not merely repair bridges, fill potholes and fix up schools; it will also impose a utopian vision based on the belief that an economy is a thing to be planned from above.” John Stossel, ABC reporter for 20/20

“The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings; the inherent virtue of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries.” Winston Churchill

From the Godfather’s own words

“From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs.” Karl Marx

From the Communist Manifesto: Obama’s blueprint?

“.... These measures will, of course, be different in different countries. Nevertheless, in most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable.

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the banks of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country by a more equable distribution of the populace over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children’s factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc ”... . (From the Manifesto of the Communist Party by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels 1848)



CON CON... (*Cont'd from pg 2*)

My associate in Ohio, Chuck Michaelis was able to get 12 people to converge on the hearing room in the Ohio State House to testify against the resolution. No one was there to testify on its behalf. Meanwhile, as the hearing was underway, my American Policy Center issued a nationwide "Sledgehammer Alert" urging activists to call and e-mail Ohio legislators. As the hearing went on, hundreds of calls and e-mails began to pour in. By the time the hearing was over, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Lou Blessing, announced that a terrible mistake had been made and no vote would be taken on the resolution.

Undaunted, a defiant Senate, the next day filed the resolution there. But within a few days it was clear the battle was over. In the first week of January, the Ohio Legislature announced that the issue was dead, at least in Ohio.

However, on the same day the Ohio legislature was issuing that statement, we received word that Senator Emmett Hanger of Virginia intends to introduce the very same resolution into the Virginia legislature soon. The battle begins anew.

Update: On January 11, 2009, I received a threatening e-mail from a man named Bill Walker. He is co-founder of a group called "Friends of the Article V Convention," and one of the proponents of the Con Con. Walker said he had "irrefutable" evidence that at least one of the documents we were using for our anti-Con Con arguments was a fraud. He was refereeing to a famous letter to Eagle Forum President Phyllis Schlafly from former Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren Burger.

The Burger (*Cont'd on Page 9*)

Tom DeWeese Threatened by Con Con Proponents

On Sunday, January 11, 2009, Tom DeWeese, President of the American Policy Center (APC) received a letter from a Bill Walker, purporting to be co-founder of an organization called "Friends of the Article V Convention," a group supporting a called for a Constitutional Convention. DeWeese and his APC activist group have recently stopped a "Con Con" call in Ohio.

Walker's letter contends that information DeWeese used for his arguments against a Con Con were fraudulent. Specifically, Walker sited a letter from former Supreme Court Justice Warren Burger written in 1983 to Eagle Forum President Phyllis Schlafly, which states in part, "I have also repeatedly given my opinion that there is no effective way to limit or muzzle the actions of a Constitutional Convention. The Convention could make its own rules and set its own agenda." DeWeese has cited the letter as expert opinion on the dangers of calling a Con Con for a specific purpose, such as the Ohio Resolution which simply wanted to discuss a balanced budget amendment for the Constitution.

Without offering any evidence to the contrary, Walker said the letter was a fraud and that, if DeWeese didn't refute the letter publicly, "I intend to state you knew the letter was a fake all along."

The entire exchange, including Tom DeWeese's response is below.

Mr. Walker's E-Mail:

In a message dated 1/11/2009 2:45 PM EST, writes:

Dear Mr. DeWeese,

As we both know you oppose the calling of an Article V Convention. I am not here to persuade you to change your mind.

However, I must inform you, in all fairness, that I have irrefutable, documented evidence to refute your main reference you use in your presentations -- the so-called Burger letter. I can prove it's a fake.

I'm giving this opportunity to publicly refute the letter and declare it to be a fake on all blogs which you have used it as supposedly a valid reference. Take it my word for it Mr. DeWeese, I am not bluffing on this.

I will be releasing a video this week on You Tube detailing all facts, documents and so forth to prove the letter is indeed a fake. Unless I have heard from you that you are publicly refuting the letter and thus the assertions in it, I intend to state you knew the letter was a fake all along. And sir, given the documentation I will present, you will not be able to convince anyone otherwise.

The choice is yours. I don't like destroying someone's public creditability without giving them the chance to correct the error themselves.

Thank you for your time.

Bill Walker
FOAVC co-founder
www.foavc.org

(*Cont'd on Page 9*)

ABSOLUTES....!

Why the UN is Worthless to Human Existence

By Tom DeWeese

Africa has more natural resources than the United States. Yet its people wallow in poverty and a horrible existence, not because the land doesn't provide for them, but because of bad governments.

Case in point is Zimbabwe which, by all accounts, should be the richest of all African nations. It was once called the breadbasket of Africa because of its rich soil and prosperous farmers. Today, under the brutal, unending dictatorship of insane ruler Robert Mugabe, Zimbabwe sits in ruins. As *The Washington Times* reported, "People are starving and compete in the countryside with baboons, jackals and goats for roots and wild fruits; health care has imploded and cholera is on the march as water and sewer systems collapse."

Why the collapse of this once wonderful country? Robert Mugabe. He hates whites, wants them out of the country, and so has literally stolen their land – mostly the once-rich farms. Then he gave the farms to his cronies or to just poor people living on the street. Most of these people had never even seen a farm, let alone worked one. The result was certainly predictable -- instant starvation. Mugabe maintains power through a gang of thugs which roam the streets and savagely beat and murder anyone who dares stand in opposition.

In spite of that, Mugabe has a strong, organized opposition that has bravely struck back, forcing elections and even winning them to throw out Mugabe. Twice. But he refuses to go. He just ignores the election results. In desperation, the opposition then tried to force at least a coalition government, allowing both Mugabe and opposition leaders to run the government. That lasted a couple of minutes. Mugabe made clear his position on the coalition government when he said, "*This thing called democracy is a problem. It's a difficult proposition because always the opposition will want much more than what it deserves.*"

The world has rightfully vilified the corrupt and brutal regimes in North Korea and Iran. The UN has condemned the genocide in Darfur and rung its collective hands over the fighting in the Gaza Strip. The UN has even sent agents to the United States to investigate our legal system and look for human rights violations.

But what of the tragedy in Zimbabwe? What of the brutal rule of Mugabe? Is he considered an international outlaw? Has the UN sent out a call for troops? Is there an international movement to have him removed from office? Has the UN Security Council met to demand action? Is there an international outrage aimed at Mugabe, as there was against the white Apartheid government of South Africa? Sanctions? Blockades? Protest songs by Bono? Anything? No.

Mugabe did speak at the UN's Sustainable Development Conference in South Africa a few years ago. The 15-nation South African Development Community continues to deal with Mugabe. The South African government continues to "mediate" with him as he ignores the will of his own people and stays in office. Mugabe simply told the Associated Press, "Zimbabwe is mine." Apparently that's OK with the UN and the international community.

Meanwhile, rather than divert attention to Zimbabwe and its petty problems, the UN knows it's much more interesting to get back to the investigations against human rights violations in the United States. There's so much more wealth to plunder here.

ABSOLUTES....!

TxDot Plays Opossum Over TTC

By Tom DeWeese

On January 6, 2009, *The Dallas Morning News* carried a headline which read “Trans Texas Corridor is dead, TxDot says.” The article went on to report, “The Texas Department of Transportation announced this morning that it has officially killed the Trans Texas Corridor, saying that despite the project’s visionary aspects, it is clearly not the choice of Texans.”

The fact that TxDot is taking this action to disown the Trans Texas Corridor is testimony to the incredible job by grassroots activists who have opposed the TTC and the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP). We have made life miserable for these officials who have tried to force such policy on us in virtual secrecy. They’ve been caught and so they have bailed out.

The “American Land Foundation” and “Stewards of the Range”, two major opponents headed by Dan and Margaret Byfield, have been successful in organizing 9 local commissions in communities directly in the path of the TTC. Those commissions are largely responsible for delaying and blocking TTC routes.

Said Byfield, “While their statement has largely been released for political reasons, they are at least retreating and regrouping – a major victory for the nine local government commissions formed in Texas to fight the TTC...”

Byfield went on to explain that the TxDot pronouncement is a direct result of grassroots opposition to the TTC. “*Since the first local government commission was formed and began using the coordination strategy developed by Fred Kelly Grant, TXDOT has had to make several changes in their strategy to implement the super corridor concept.*”

He went on to detail the way TxDot has changed its strategy over the past year as opposition grew:

- Their environmental studies have been delayed for over a year as they are challenged by the local governments through coordination.
- They scrambled to form “corridor advisory committees” and “corridor segment committees” all under their control to give the appearance they were listening to local citizens, after the first commissions were formed.
- They changed their preferred alternative on the I-69 TTC route after three commissions had been established on the new corridor path. (We expect them to go back to the new corridor concept if they can find a way around the local government commissions.)
- And today, they announce they are no longer pursuing the full TTC concept, making with it key concessions that indicate a step back for TxDot and the Spanish firm holding the first design/build contracts.
- Concluded Byfield, none of these concessions would have occurred if the nine local government commissions had not formed and required the agency to coordinate the project with them. Although we have caused them to alter their approach, don’t believe the headlines that the fight is over.

Opponents to the TTC should be very proud of their accomplishment in forcing TxDot’s very powerful and determined hand. It is a testament to the fact that grassroots activity is a powerful force.

However, we must also stay vigilant to TxDot’s next move. Just because they are conceding defeat on

...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

their first effort, certainly does not mean they are giving up. History has shown us that, when faced with strong opposition, the perpetrators of these bad policies go underground like the bugs they are and then resurface with a new plan – which is just the old plan with a new name.

Key to the real agenda is this quote from the news report: “Each of the dozens of projects that were linked together under the rubric of the TTC – including the Loop 9 project in Dallas and the I-69 project in the south – will remain as stand-alone projects.” That’s an obvious smokescreen to make Texans think the TTC is dead.

TTC opponents are not falling for the TxDot claim of surrender. Terri Hall, Founder/Director of “Texans Uniting for Reform & Freedom” (TURF) and a major activist against the TTC said, “It’s clear from the TxDot Director’s speech, that it’s only a name change and the Trans Texas Corridor is, in reality, going underground. Hall cited a quote from the *Austin American Statesman* newspaper which said “Those ‘smaller projects’ will apparently include the 300-plus miles of what has been called TTC-35 from San Antonio to the Oklahoma border and the I-69 project from the Rio Grande Valley to Texarkana. But they will not be called the Trans-Texas Corridor.”

As *The Houston Chronicle* put it, “The renewed effort now will operate under the name ‘Innovative Connectivity Plan’.”

Said Hall, “No law has been changed, no minute order rescinded, no environmental document re-done (as is required by federal law), and there are still two contracts signed giving two Spanish companies the right of first refusal on segments of the corridor previously known as TTC-35 & TTC-69. So by every real measure, the Trans Texas Corridor goes on full steam ahead. What today’s hype was about is a political ploy to make the public go back to sleep while it gets built under a different name. While we welcome genuine responsiveness from TxDOT and a true repeal of the Trans Texas Corridor, this hardly qualifies.”

Celebrate this first victory and get ready to engage the enemy again. TxDot’s action gives us one major message – we have them scared. We can and will stop the Trans Texas Corridor. 

**GLOBAL
WARMING**
**WAS IT EVER REALLY
A CRISIS?**

**THE 2009
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

MARCH 8 - 10 · NEW YORK · USA

SPONSORED BY THE HEARTLAND INSTITUTE

COSPONSORED BY AMERICAN POLICY CENTER
and almost 50 other groups, foundations and think-tanks.

Learn the truth firsthand in New York, more than 70 “skeptics” from across the scientific spectrum will report why they believe Global Warming is not a crisis.

TO ATTEND

Contact The Heartland Institute
Phone: (312) 377-4000 Website: www.heartland.org

TELL THEM APC SENT YOU!

INHOFE.... (Cont'd from pg 12) even cursory attention to the issue understands that scientists vigorously disagree over whether human activities are responsible for global warming, or whether those activities will precipitate natural disasters,” and I noted that “not only is there a debate, but (at least in certain corridors) the debate is shifting away from those who subscribe to global warming alarmism.”

After that speech, I led the charge against the McCain-Lieberman global warming cap-and-trade bill in 2003 and again in 2005, both times easily defeating the bills. At times, it was a lonely battle with few Republican members willing to join me on the Senate floor to publicly oppose the McCain-Lieberman bills.

In 2007, I released a Senate Minority Report detailing over 400 scientists disputing man-made global warming claims and the inconvenient real world climate developments refuting warming fears.

Now in 2008, we have updated our report and the so-called “consensus” on global warming is even more disputed. Over 650 dissenting scientists from around the globe challenged man-made global warming claims made by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and former Vice President Al Gore. Our new 233-page U.S. Senate Minority Report features the skeptical voices of over 650 prominent international scientists, including many current and former UN IPCC scientists, who have now turned against the UN IPCC. This updated report includes an additional 250 (and growing) scientists and climate researchers since the initial release in December 2007. The over 650 dissenting scientists are more than 12 times the number of UN scientists (52) who authored the media-hyped IPCC 2007 Summary for Policymakers.

The chorus of skeptical scientific voices grew louder in 2008 as a steady stream of peer-reviewed studies, analyses, real world data, and inconvenient developments challenged the UN’s and former Vice President Al Gore’s claims that the “science is settled” and there is a “consensus.” Despite what is being portrayed in the media, on a range of issues, 2008 proved to be challenging for the promoters of man-made climate fears.

In addition, the following developments further secured 2008 as the year the “consensus” collapsed. Russian scientists “rejected the very idea that carbon dioxide may be responsible for global warming.” An American Physical Society editor conceded that a “considerable presence” of scientific skeptics exists. An International team of scientists countered the UN IPCC, declaring, “Nature, Not

Human Activity, Rules the Climate.” India issued a report challenging global warming fears. A team of international scientists demanded the UN IPCC “be called to account and cease its deceptive practices,” and a canvas of more than 51,000 Canadian scientists revealed that 68% disagree that global warming science is “settled.”

Here are some of the highlights of my 2008 Senate Minority Report featuring over 650 international scientists dissenting from man-made climate claims:

“I am a skeptic...Global warming has become a new religion.” - Nobel Prize Winner for Physics, Ivar Giaever.

“Since I am no longer affiliated with any organization nor receiving any funding, I can speak quite frankly....As a scientist I remain skeptical... The main basis of the claim that man’s release of greenhouse gases is the cause of the warming is based almost entirely upon climate models. We all know the frailty of models concerning the air-surface system.” - Atmospheric Scientist Dr. Joanne Simpson, the first woman in the world to receive a PhD in meteorology, and formerly of NASA, who has authored more than 190 studies and has been called “among the most preeminent scientists of the last 100 years.”

Warming fears are the “worst scientific scandal in the history...When people come to know what the truth is, they will feel deceived by science and scientists.” - UN IPCC Japanese Scientist Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an award-winning PhD environmental physical chemist.

“The IPCC has actually become a closed circuit; it doesn’t listen to others. It doesn’t have open minds... I am really amazed that the Nobel Peace Prize has been given on scientifically incorrect conclusions by people who are not geologists.” - Indian geologist Dr. Arun D. Ahluwalia at Punjab University and a board member of the UN-supported International Year of the Planet.

“So far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming.” - Scientist Dr. Jarl R. Ahlbeck, a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in Finland, author of 200 scientific publications and former Greenpeace member.

“Anyone who claims that the debate is over and the conclusions are firm has a fundamentally unscientific approach to one of the most momentous issues of our time.” - Solar physicist Dr. Pal Brekke, senior advisor to the Norwegian Space Centre in Oslo. Brekke has published more than 40 peer-reviewed scientific articles on the sun and solar interaction with the Earth. (Cont'd on Page 9)

INHOFE.... (Cont'd from pg 8) **“The models and forecasts of the UN IPCC “are incorrect because they only are based on mathematical models and presented results at scenarios that do not include, for example, solar activity.”** - Victor Manuel Velasco Herrera, a researcher at the Institute of Geophysics of the National Autonomous University of Mexico.

“It is a blatant lie put forth in the media that makes it seem there is only a fringe of scientists who don't buy into anthropogenic global warming.” - U.S Government Atmospheric Scientist Stanley B. Goldenberg of the Hurricane Research Division of NOAA.

“Even doubling or tripling the amount of carbon dioxide will virtually have little impact, as water vapor and water condensed on particles as clouds dominate the worldwide scene and always will.” – Geoffrey G. Duffy, a professor in the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering of the University of Auckland, NZ. 

CON CON... (Cont'd from pg 4)

letter is a major and damning piece of evidence against a call for a Con Con because it verifies our fears that states could not control the subject matter discussed at the convention. In the letter, Burger stated, “The Convention could make its own rules and set its own agenda.” This is damning evidence to those who continually assure legislators that they can control the subject of a Con Con.

Walker obviously needed to discredit the letter for his own purposes, and chose to threaten me in hopes of scarring me into stopping use of it. In his e-mail to me he said, “Unless I have heard from you that you are publicly refuting the letter and thus the assertions in it, I intend to state you knew the letter was a fake all along.” He also threatened to “destroy...” my public credibility.

My first act was to verify with Phyllis Schlafly that she indeed had the letter and that it was from Burger. She did and it was. She has now posted it on the Eagle Forum web site.

APC's position is clear. We fear a Con Con because the subject matter cannot be controlled and we have no guarantee that we can win state ratification fights if changes to the Constitution are offered. We fear, instead that in today's climate of radical socialism and American ignorance about the Constitution that this is the worst possible time in our nation's history to start to mess with the greatest governing document of all time. We will continue to oppose any and all attempts to do that, no matter how noble the reason. 

Tom DeWeese's Email Response:

In a message dated 1/12/2009 2:52 PM EST, writes:

Mr. Walker:

I received your e-mail yesterday, Sunday, January 11, 2009.

You have made some serious accusations along with specific threats to me. Let me address them.

First, concerning the “Burger Letter” and its authenticity: Just moments ago I spoke directly with Phyllis Schlafly to confirm the authenticity of the letter and its existence. I have a copy in my hand. She has also posted it on her website at www.eagleforum.org/topics/concon/pdf/WarrenBurger-letter.pdf.

I have no reason to doubt her word. You, of course, have not presented your “evidence” to me that the letter is a fraud - you chose instead to use unfounded scare tactics. If you wanted to be honest in this matter, you would offer your proof, not only to me but to Phyllis Schlafly, giving her a chance to respond as well - particularly since she is the one you are calling a liar. But in talking with her today, I learned she has never heard of you either.

Second, in fact, I have only used reference to that letter once, in the first alert APC issued concerning the Ohio Con Con resolution. And I have rarely mentioned it during the numerous radio interviews I have given on this subject over the last month. The existence of that letter is not vital to our argument against calling a Constitutional Convention. I have instead looked to the history of the 1787 Con Con and its precedents, along with documents, notes and writings of those who actually attended the original Con Con. The proof is in the original authorizing documents and the debates calling for the convention, and the notes of leaders like Madison, Yancey and others. The evidence that states cannot control the delegates, once a Con Con is called, is irrefutable. Have you read them?

Third, in your mail to me you said, “Unless I have heard from you that you are publicly refuting the letter and thus the assertions in it, I intend to state you knew the letter was a fake all along.” Sir, until I received your e-mail on Sunday, I had never heard a single word about a dispute regarding the authenticity of the Burger letter. So, your threat stating that I “knew the letter was a fake all along,” is a lie and a slander. Say it, and I assure you I will sue you to the fullest extent of the law. That, I guarantee. And I assure YOU, I'm not bluffing.

Your charges are groundless, your position is unsupportable and your threats are toothless.

Do as you will and we'll see who is “discredited.”

Very Sincerely,

Tom DeWeese

President, American Policy Center 

INSIDER'S REPORT

New GOP Chairman Should Remove Party from the International Democrat Union

The race is on for a new chairman of the Republican Party. The outcome is important because the party has become so lost over the past few decades. No longer is it the party of limited government, low taxes and free enterprise. To the contrary, under the reign of terror by the Bush Administration, the GOP had been the force behind the largest growth of government in the history of the United States: record-setting budgets and deficits, assaults on our national sovereignty, invasion of our personal privacy, destruction of private property rights, illegal amnesty, international ID cards and the collapse of the greatest economy in the world.

Yes, it's certainly time for a change in GOP leadership and direction. The candidates for Republican National Committee (RNC) Chairman include former Ohio Secretary of State Ken Blackwell, former Maryland Lt. Governor Michael Steele, current RNC Chairman Mike Duncan, Michigan party chairman Saul Anuzis, South Carolina party chairman Laton Dawson, and Chip Saltsman, the presidential campaign manager of former Arkansas Governor Mike Huckabee. Each of these candidates is working to convince the GOP rank and file that they are the more conservative candidate and best qualified to lead the Republican Party back to its roots of limited government. It's a tall order.

But here's a true test of where they really stand. One question every true Republic should ask the wanna-be chairman is this: **Which document would you choose as the guiding principle for your vision of government – the Declaration of Independence, as written by America's Founding Fathers, or the Declaration of Human Rights, as produced by the United Nations?**

Do you think that is a strange question to ask a potential chairman of the Republican Party? Would you assume that he would naturally stand with the Founding Fathers? Then you are about to be surprised.

Not many Americans, particularly Conservative Republicans, have heard of the International Democrat Union (IDU), but most would be very surprised to learn

the names of its membership and its true goals.

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

In the IDU's 2005 Declaration, issued after a recent meeting in Washington, DC, it stated, "*Our common goal is free, just and compassionate societies. We appreciate the value of tradition and inherited wisdom. We value freely elected governments, the market-based economy and liberty for our citizens. We will protect our people from those who preach hate and plan to destroy our way of life. Free enterprise, free trade and private property are the corner stones of free ideas and creativity as well as material well-being. We believe in justice, with an independent judiciary. We believe in democracy, in limited government and a strong civic society.*"

Such a statement gives one the impression that the IDU is on a mission to spread the ideals of the American Revolution around the globe. Here, at last might be an international organization that brings the good news of our own Declaration of Independence to the far corners of the oppressed world. No other document on earth more strongly declares the principles of liberty that made the United States the guiding light of freedom in the world. With the Republican Party as an active member, it would certainly be expected that American documents and principles would be the basis of policy for an international organization that declares it promotes "free enterprise, free trade, and private property."

But a careful look at the IDU's founding Declaration of Principles reveals a very different message. The second paragraph of the IDU document states: "Being committed to advancing the social and

political values on which democratic societies are founded, including the basic personal freedoms and human rights, as defined in the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights...** That, of course, is the United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights that the IDU document is promoting as its guiding principle.

There are two conflicting philosophies of governance in the world. One, the American view, as outlined in the Declaration of Independence, states that all people have rights they are **born** with and that government's only job is to protect those rights at all costs. The Declaration says that these rights are forever and unquestioned. It is the foundation of human freedom. It is what makes the United States a Republic, where the rights of minorities (even of one) are firmly defined and protected.

The other philosophy says that **government** grants our rights, professing that all such rights give way to an undefined common good whenever it's warranted – which is often. That means that all so called rights are subject to the whim of whatever gang is currently in power at the time, dictating the definitions of what constitutes the “common good.” Today that is commonly called a democracy, where the power of majority rule can and does obliterate the rights of minorities.

As an example of how this second system works in practice, The Constitution of the old Soviet Union said that Soviet citizens had most of the same rights as Americans. Except that it also said individual rights were secondary to the common good. In the case of the Soviet Union, the common good was defined as creating a worldwide communist utopia where individual wants and needs simply didn't count. We all know how that worked out for the Soviet citizens.

While veiled in language designed to sound much like the Declaration of Independence, the UN's Declaration of Human Rights actually takes this second approach, outlining specific rights it says we should all have. It says nothing of “unalienable” rights, instead referring to “rights under the law.” Who or what is the law, according to the Human Rights Declaration? It says, “the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government. Now, at first look, that sounds like America. Democracy. People voting – the opposite of dictatorship. But such a concept ignores the very root of American freedom – that our rights are guaranteed, no matter what the majority thinks or wants. Moreover,

Article 29, Section 3 of the Declaration says “*These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.*” So much for “unalienable” rights.

Suppose the majority of people vote to abolish your business (Wal-Mart?) or take your home (to protect bird habitat?)? The reason is always to protect the common good, or the children, or the environment, or whatever is the fad of the day. This is called majority rule, but it is still just another form of dictatorship. It's what led to the ravages of the guillotine in revolutionary France. It's rule by fear; fear of the wrong gang changing the rules; fear of standing against the crowd. Majority rule is simply a lynch mob – or more graphically, three wolves and a sheep voting on what to have for lunch.

This is the root of the philosophy entrenched in the UN's Declaration of Human Rights. It is the basis for the political policy behind Sustainable Development and the Supreme Court's Kelo decision on eminent domain. It's the philosophy that dictates a common good must be served, no matter the consequences. Personal liberty must give way to the whims of the crowd.

Now, based on its endorsement of the UN's Declaration of Human Rights rather than the unique American founding document – the Declaration of Independence, this destructive, anti-human philosophy is entrenched and being passed off as freedom by the International Democrat Union. The IDU is an international organization that dares pretend to speak for those of us who advocate limited government and human liberty. The IDU documents are filled with rhetoric about compassion for human rights. Yet, does it show compassion to support policy that says no one's property is safe from confiscation; no one's dreams may be fulfilled if they aren't approved by a jealous mob?

Is this truly what the Republican Party now supports? Well, that's a question for those candidates now campaigning for its chairmanship. All say they seek a new direction to move the party back to its roots. So here is the question every Republican in the grassroots should ask each of these candidates: Will you remove the Republican Party from the International Democrat Union and again use the Declaration of Independence as your guide for the proper role of government? It's a fair question they should be ready to answer.

SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY



'Consensus' in Freefall: Inhofe Global Warming Speech



Senator Presents Ground-breaking Senate Minority Report
of More Than 650 Scientists Dissenting from Climate Fears

Profiles Left of Center Scientists & Environmental Activists Who Are Now Skeptics

U.S. Senator James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Ranking Member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, today delivered a global warming speech entitled: "Global Warming 'Consensus' in Freefall: More Than 650 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims." Inhofe presented his ground breaking new global warming report detailing the More Than 650 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims to Congress on the Senate Floor.

Inhofe also detailed the growing number of left of center scientists and environmental activists who are speaking out to reject man-made climate fears.

Selected Highlights of Inhofe's Speech:

Inhofe: Many politically left-of-center scientists and environmental activists are now realizing that the so-called "consensus" on man-made global warming is not holding up. The left-wing blog *Huffington Post* surprised many by featuring an article on January 3, 2008 by Harold Ambler, demanding an apology from Gore for promoting unfounded global warming fears. *The Huffington Post* article accused Gore of telling, "the biggest whopper ever sold to the public in the history of humankind," because he claimed the science was settled on global warming. *The Huffington Post* article entitled "Mr. Gore: Apology Accepted" adds, "It is Mr. Gore and his brethren who are flat-Earthers," not skeptics. Again, it is not Jim Inhofe saying this about Gore, it is the left-wing blog *Huffington Post* saying these things. *The Huffington Post* article continues, "Let us neither cripple our own economy by mislabeling carbon dioxide a pollutant nor discourage development in the Third World, where suffering continues unabated, day after day."

Another left-of-center atmospheric scientist who has dissented on man-made climate fears is the UK's Richard

Courtney. Courtney, a UN IPCC expert reviewer and a UK-based climate and atmospheric science consultant, is a self-described socialist who also happens to reject man-made climate fears.

Joining Courtney are many other progressive environmentalist scientists:

Former Greenpeace member and Finnish Scientist Dr. Jarl R. Ahlbeck, a lecturer of environmental technology and a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in Finland who has authored 200 scientific publications, is also skeptical of man-made climate doom. Ahlbeck wrote in 2008, "Contrary to common belief, there has been no or little global warming since 1995 and this is shown by two completely independent datasets. But so far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming."

Life-long liberal Democrat Dr. Martin Hertzberg, a retired Navy meteorologist with a PhD in physical chemistry, also declared his dissent of warming fears in 2008. "As a scientist and life-long liberal Democrat, I find the constant regurgitation of the anecdotal, fear mongering clap-trap about human-caused global warming to be a disservice to science," Hertzberg wrote.

More than 650 Scientists Dissent

Recently, I released a new minority report on climate science which documents many of the studies ignored by the mainstream media. That report included over 650 scientists who have challenged man-made global warming claims made by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). I have been detailing these science issues for a number of years. In a July 28, 2003, floor speech in this chamber, I said the issue of global warming "is far from settled, and indeed is seriously disputed."

I explained that "anyone who pays (Cont'd on Page 8)