

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.FREEDOM21.COM

The Battle in the States: Freedom Vs Protection

By Tom DeWeese and Mark Lerner

Across the nation, state legislatures are struggling to take back their Constitutional rights as they also seek ways to protect us from outside threats. This has led to some near schizophrenic legislative sessions with laws swinging widely from left to right.

Making it more difficult to get a handle on the situation is the fact that there has been an outgrowth of near “rabid” anti-immigration groups that have sprung up demanding near-Hitler-style tactics to “fix” the problem. While the situation is certainly serious and demands action, these groups openly admit that they are willing to surrender their liberties if that is what it takes to end illegal immigration. They may deeply regret that cavalier dismissal of liberty. Once lost, it is rarely regained.

IN THIS ISSUE:

5. Missouri Scraps MIAC Reports

6. ABSOLUTES:

Destroy the Electoral College and Destroy Freedom; 70 Republican Traitors Who Voted for the Hitler Youth Act

12. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:

The Radical Polarization of Law Enforcement

To address these issues, three very distinct, but widely variant legislative actions have appeared in the states.

First, legislation dealing with protecting the integrity of the Tenth Amendment and state sovereignty has been introduced across the nation, passing in at least 21 states. The states are reacting to the frightening growth of the federal government through anti-terrorist legislation such as the Patriot Act and Real ID, as well as the outrageous spending included in the bailout and stimulus bills.

Second, to address the illegal immigration issue, legislation in many states would provide state law enforcement with the ability to share information through direct electronic access. Many law-enforcement agencies are eagerly supporting such legislation. Yet, this type of legislation clearly contradicts the intent of the states sovereignty effort.

Third, again racing back to the other side to protect personal privacy from federal surveillance, there is legislation introduced to prohibit the collection of biometric samples/data, social security numbers and the use of RFID chips in state driver’s licenses.

One might ask, what do these

pieces of legislation have to do with one another? They each go to the heart of a battle being waged across our country to decide how much Constitutional power the federal government has to collect, retain and share the personal information of each citizen, and how much power it has to force states to provide it?

Tenth Amendment legislation is exactly what the name implies – that states have Constitutionally-guaranteed rights and powers. It puts the federal government on notice that states will not act as its surrogates. The legislation unequivocally tells the federal government that its power comes from the citizens and the states and that federal powers are limited and defined rather than unlimited and arbitrary.

Fusion Centers

As for those patriots who believe the illegal immigration is so dire that liberty should be thrown on the bonfire, perhaps they need to better understand what they are demanding.

Legislation introduced in several state legislatures, and currently in debate, allows state and local law-enforcement agencies to have direct access to one another’s databases. Some of the anti-immigration patriots

might see it is as prudent legislation until one takes a closer look.

Most states now have Fusion Centers. Fusion Centers were originally intended to allow local and state law-enforcement to work alongside federal officers so that activity suspected of being terrorist related could be identified and responded to by all three law enforcement entities in a coordinated manner. Fusion Centers have representatives of all three working side-by-side in one office.

Fusion Centers are funded primarily by the federal government. Some believe them to be an effective tool to fight terrorism with little that one could find objectionable. The problem is, Fusion Centers have overstepped their intended purpose. This is typical when dealing with the issue of technology and invasive databases. Mission creep is just too easy.

In state after state we see Fusion Centers focusing on *all* suspected criminal activity, including misdemeanors. Some would ask you to believe that the mountain of information about citizens being accumulated actually stays within the borders of a state unless a citizen is suspected of terrorist activity. However, the Fusion Center in Oklahoma has been directed to develop procedures for the sharing of information with the FBI and DHS.

This means that direct electronic access is not limited to just state law enforcement agencies and departments. Since local, state and federal authorities are working together, there is no plausible reason to believe federal law enforcement will not gain access to all information a state law enforcement or local law enforcement authority would have.

The Missouri Outrage

All citizens should take note of a document produced in Missouri by that

state's Fusion Center. That document targeted activists, including supporters of Ron Paul, Chuck Baldwin and Bob Barr. It directed Missouri law enforcement to give special attention to those holding such political beliefs and consider them to be a security risk and potential domestic terrorists. According to the same document, members of militias should also be singled out. According to the Missouri report, anyone advocating limited government and objecting to the massive growth of the federal government is to be considered a security risk.

Whether a citizen is a Democrat, Republican or Independent, the idea that citizens supporting their candidate of choice should be categorized as domestic terrorists is outrageous. The document is so inflammatory that the Lt. Governor of Missouri suspended the head state law enforcement officer in the Fusion Center. It is also worth noting that the Oklahoma Fusion Center will develop privacy protocols. One might reasonably ask why the privacy issues were not fully addressed before the Fusion Center became operational?

However, the issue of the collecting, retaining and sharing of citizen's personal information is not unique to Fusion Centers. Law enforcement in each state has information sharing agreements, not only with federal agencies/departments, but also with foreign entities and international organizations.

There is a literal web of Memorandums of Agreements, laws and other mechanisms such as participation in international organizations that has entrapped all Americans. The most personal and sensitive information of Americans is being shared globally.

Oklahoma's SB 483

A prime example of such dangerous legislation that could lead to an

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 15, No. 5 May 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.

international surveillance state is Oklahoma's SB 483, which will authorize the Commissioner of Public Safety (DPS) the authority to enter into "agreements" with other state agencies and allow these other agencies "direct electronic access" to the DPS database of computerized photos.

Moreover, the Federal Department of Homeland Security is targeting such state databanks and clearly has stated it wants full access to them. It then intends to share them with international databanks. That is why every state must carefully consider the dangerous side-effects of such legislation being promoted as simply an answer to illegal immigration and terrorism.

As Oklahoma State Representative Charles Key says, such legislation is "incrementally putting into place systems that could, 1) violate citizens constitutional rights, 2) unintentionally harm innocent citizens, 3) allow for the continual effective dissolution of our rights enumerated in the Constitution."

Biometric data and Social Security numbers

The final piece of the puzzle is the third tier of legislation making rounds in several state legislatures that would prohibit state governments from collecting biometric samples/data and social security numbers of citizens who apply for driver's licenses. In direct opposition to bills such as SB 483, Oklahoma is considering such legislation which calls for the removal of existing biometric information and social security numbers from the state motor vehicle database. Such

legislation is intended to protect our personal privacy.

Under the provisions of the Real ID Act of 2005, states that comply with that law are required to collect the digital facial biometric samples of all citizens who apply for a state driver's license. In layman's terms, this means you can be identified while walking down the street by a CCTV/surveillance camera. Your facial image would be scanned and the image would be converted to biometric data and compared to images stored in state or federal databases, including your motor vehicle database.

States that comply with that law are required to collect the digital facial biometric samples of all citizens who apply for a state driver's license.

Again, in Oklahoma, some lawmakers have figured out the only way to stop the federal government and international organizations from getting their hands on citizens personal information is to stop collecting the information and putting it in state databases.

It is important to note that the legislation does not impede Oklahoma law enforcement from collecting the information either through a search warrant or as a result of a person being charged with a crime. One lawmaker stated it should not be a "novel" idea that the presumption of innocence is protected or that privacy means something. A Pennsylvania lawmaker stated that we have been told many times since 9/11/2001 what privacy does *not* mean but we do not hear what it *does* mean.

Abuse of power by the federal government is and has always

been a concern. Our forefathers addressed the potential for abuse in our Constitution. Since the 1950's we have witnessed many abuses of power including revelations about what the FBI, NSA and DHS have been doing since 9/11/2001, invading personal privacy, monitoring phone calls, home invasion without notice or warrants, etc.

The abuses have become a pattern of complete disregard for our Constitution. Russell Tice, a former NSA analyst who previously worked for Naval Intelligence and the Department of Defense came forward and stated American citizens were having their phone calls intercepted, e-mails read and financial transactions monitored. He came forward because he said he did not want to live in a police state.

The Inspector General of the Justice Department stated the FBI had abused National Security Letters and obtained information improperly. The Inspector further stated the FBI was not forthright in disclosing all the National Security Letters it had issued. In one three year period alone, the FBI was issuing an average of over 100 of the letters a day. National Security Letters, by their very nature, avoid the need for search warrants. Some in the U.S. Senate have accused DHS of "bullying" states to comply with the Real ID Act 2005. DHS has been asked to adhere to what is known as FIPP (Fair Information Practice Principles) and yet has failed to do so. FIPP requires, among other things, that there be transparency when information is being collected.

Our driver's licenses are the link

between everything we buy and sell. You need a driver's license for just about everything these days. The vendor who produces 95% of all driver's licenses has proposed a Real ID Solutions driver's license in which a citizen's "political party affiliation" would be on the face of the driver's license. The same vendor, who happens to be the largest biometric company, made their biometric facial recognition technology available to the Red Chinese government. The Communist Chinese did exactly what one would expect from a totalitarian state. They used the technology to identify dissidents -- people who were opposed to the policies of the government. Does that sound like the Missouri situation?

Most Americans have never heard of Enhanced Driver's Licenses. These licenses contain RFID chips that can allow for the tracking of people and also for "bad" guys to obtain your personal information by stealing your unique identification number contained on the chip and linking that number to your identity. The current Secretary of Homeland Security is on record saying she believes that Enhanced Driver's Licenses should be issued by all states.

Consider DHS's pilot program that relies on a computer software program to help determine if you present a threat to our government. This pilot computer program, called "Project Hostile Intent," makes assessments about the way we walk and dress, as well as other behavioral characteristics. The computer program will make a judgment as to whether or not you present a threat. That means when you are walking down the street

keep in mind that a camera lens could be pointed at you. Make sure you are dressed "right" and do not walk in a funny manner. What are the chances of you, or someone you care about, being picked out by the camera? Considering the hundred's of millions of taxpayer dollars that DHS has released for CCTV/surveillance cameras the chances are getting better everyday that you won't be left out. Cameras are going up so fast that they remind me of the postal mailboxes that used to be placed on about every block. The cameras are everywhere.

These new efforts to create a surveillance society represent a threat to almost everything guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, from freedom of speech, to freedom to be secure in our homes, to the freedom of being innocent until proven guilty.

America is at a crossroads. States have finally awakened to rediscover their Constitutional powers in the Tenth Amendment, yet as they do so, they are also being pressured to surrender the liberty and privacy of every American in the name of security. Americans are concerned, listening, and are ready to take action. State lawmakers are also ready to listen. All citizens have to do is take a few minutes of their time to contact their state and national lawmakers and say enough is enough.

Terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaeda, Hezbollah and other groups such as Hamas have trained hundred's of thousands of terrorists. Our intelligence community only knows the names of a very small percentage of these people. The

fact is that terrorists do not need driver's licenses to carry out acts of terrorism. They can use passports and international driver's licenses while in our country to facilitate their goals. Criminalizing all Americans into a surveillance state is not the answer.

Legislation to protect us from the surveillance state is being considered in state legislatures across the country. Many states are rising up against implementation of Real ID. Others are passing resolutions to take a stand for state sovereignty. But others are going in the opposite direction with legislation to allow massive databanks of our most personal information to be shared internationally.

In Oklahoma there is still time. The same is true in other states. Oklahoma residents should call their elected leaders in the state's House of Representatives and say they oppose SB 483.

Every American should now call their state representatives and tell them to support Tenth Amendment legislation and any bills that would end the orgy of collecting and sharing of information, starting with citizens' biometric information and social security numbers.

These new efforts to create a surveillance society represent a threat to almost everything guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, from freedom of speech to freedom to be secure in our homes, to the freedom of being innocent until proven guilty. The time to stop it is now.

Tom DeWeese, President of American Policy Center (www.americanpolicy.org) and Mark Lerner, Director, Stop Real ID Coalition (www.stoprealidcoalition.com).

Missouri Scraps MIAC Report

By Chuck Baldwin

Well, there is still hope for liberty after all! After multiple thousands of phone calls, e-mails, faxes, and other communications from outraged citizens, the State of Missouri has rescinded its controversial “militia” report. This proves the point I made in this column recently that the most effective way to fight an ever-encroaching federal leviathan is to focus on our individual states.

Let me review the events of the last few weeks so as to help readers familiarize themselves with this historic and I do mean historic - episode.

On February 20, 2009, the State of Missouri, via its Department of Public Safety, issued what was called “MIAC Strategic Report: The Modern Militia Movement.” In this report, people who supported Presidential candidates Ron Paul, Bob Barr, and yours truly were referenced as being connected to potentially dangerous “militia members.” But the inference did not stop there. People of conservative ideology were also identified in the State Police report as being potentially dangerous. People who held political opinions opposing abortion, illegal immigration, the New World Order, the North American Union, the Income Tax, the U.N., etc., were profiled in the MIAC report.

Interestingly enough, no left-leaning political ideologies were identified. No Islamic extremists. No environmental extremists. Only people holding “conservative” or “right-wing” philosophies were identified in the MIAC report.

The MIAC report was categorized as “Unclassified/Law Enforcement Sensitive,” meaning the report was intended for law enforcement personnel only. Fortunately, an unidentified (for obvious reasons) Missouri law enforcement officer, who was extremely disturbed by this report, sent a copy to nationally syndicated radio talk show host Alex Jones. Of course, Jones immediately “blew the whistle” on the story. This was on March 11.

On March 14, the Columbia (Missouri) Daily Tribune ran a story on the subject, and on March 17, I wrote my first column about it. From that point, the story went viral.

Internet sites, radio talk show hosts, and bloggers all over America picked up the story, and thousands of

outraged citizens began bombarding the appropriate officials in Missouri with protests. Even Fox News Channel talk show host Glenn Beck ran a feature on the story on Friday, March 20, and again on Monday, March 23. The Constitution Party issued a “Travel Advisory” for the State of Missouri, warning tourists and residents about the possibility of being profiled by State Police for such things as having bumper stickers with political statements on their vehicles, etc. All of this commotion was not lost on several Missouri State legislators and executive officers, either.

Missouri Lieutenant Governor Peter Kinder called on Governor Jay Nixon (who had previously stood by and defended the MIAC report) to place Department of Public Safety Director John Britt on administrative leave pending an investigation into the report. In addition, several Missouri State legislators said they would introduce an amendment to the Department of Public Safety’s budget barring the agency from using “state or federal funds for political profiling.”

On March 23, DPS Director John Britt sent an apology letter to Ron Paul, Bob Barr, and me stating, “I have ordered that the offending report be edited so as to excise all reference to Ron Paul, Bob Barr or Chuck Baldwin and to any third-party political organizations.”

While Ron, Bob, and I appreciated the apology and retraction from Mr. Britt, the overriding offense of the report still lingered: namely, the report, with a very broad brush, linked people holding conservative political opinions to dangerous and violence-prone “militias,” which Missouri law enforcement personnel were instructed to be on guard against. Therefore, public outcry against the MIAC report continued, Mr. Britt’s apology notwithstanding.

Then, on Wednesday, March 25, the head of the Missouri State Highway Patrol, Col. James F. Keathley, ordered the Missouri Information Analysis Center (MIAC) to “permanently cease distribution” of this abysmal report. Keathley said that neither he nor Britt had read the report before it was distributed.

Keathley also noted that the report was filled with numerous spelling and grammatical (*Cont’d on page 8*)

ABSOLUTES....!

Destroy the Electoral College and Destroy Freedom

By Tom DeWeese

A new campaign has begun to destroy the Electoral College and “let the people elect the president.” A group called “National Popular Vote” has won commitments from four states to award their electoral votes to the winner of the popular vote. These include, Maryland, New Jersey, Illinois, and Hawaii. That means the movement to make the Electoral College irrelevant already has 20% of the votes needed. There is “National Popular Vote” legislation in nearly every state. It could be a done deal by 2016.

The goal is for states with a total of 270 electoral votes to conspire to give their electoral votes to the winner of the popular vote nationwide, rather than to the winner of votes in their state. 270 votes is the exact number a presidential candidate needs to win the election.

As usual, it’s easy to get people to join this cause – yet another sound bite based on emotion rather than knowledge or logic. “Let the people decide.” “It’s the American way.” “It’s democracy at work.” Yep, that’s why America was never set up as a democracy. Here’s another sound bite for you – “Democracy is a lynch mob.” Here’s another one – “Democracy is three wolves and a sheep voting on what to have for lunch.” Majority rule violates the rights of minorities. It’s not a good thing. Get the picture?

Our Founding Fathers went to a lot of trouble to give us a government that was fair, representing all the people in every state – to protect a minority of one against the will of a mob which isn’t too concerned about the rights of someone standing in their way. Hence the Electoral College.

The abolishment of the Electoral College would, in fact, establish an election tyranny giving control of the government to the massive population centers of the nation’s northeastern sector and the area around Los Angeles. If these sections of the nation were to control the election of our nation’s leaders, the voice of the ranchers and farmers of the mid and far west would be lost, along with the values and virtues of the south. It would also mean the end of the Tenth Amendment and state sovereignty.

Throughout history, certain factions have challenged the legality of the Electoral College. Opponents point out that our President is actually elected by 538 virtually unknown people who are members of 51 small delegations in fifty states and the District of Columbia. Moreover, in most states the electors are not even bound to vote for the candidate that won the popular vote. In fact, many Constitutional scholars believe that’s just what the founders intended, 538 independent thinkers, bound to no one. There is reason and logic behind the idea.

The Founding Fathers, particularly those from small states, were very concerned that they would be smothered by the larger states. Under the representative republic (not a democracy) established by the founders, the United States is made up of fifty sovereign states. Under the Constitution, except for limited powers specifically defined for the central government, power for the rule of law is intended to reside in the states.

To deal with the problem, the founders decided on a compromise that would establish two chambers for the Congress; the House of Representatives, whose size would be dictated by the population in each state and the Senate in which every state would get two representatives, regardless of its size or population. You see, in the beginning, the states appointed Senators to be their representatives in Congress. But, like these geniuses of today who want to wreck the Electoral College, previous geniuses came up with the idea that Senators should be elected by the people – “It’s only fair.” The result is an imperial Senate that answers to no one but their own elite club members. That’s what happens when you mess with the genius of the Constitution.

The same problem arose in deciding how to select a President, the one nationally - elected official. Here again there was the fear that election by popular vote would overwhelm the will of smaller states. Again compromise was reached to address the issue in a fair and equitable manner. Each state was assigned a number of presidential electoral votes equal to its representation in the House and the Senate. In each state, the electors would vote for a President and Vice

...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

President. The candidate receiving the largest number of electoral votes would be elected.

Under the plan, the connection to the popular vote was the selection of state electors. The popular vote was to be used to select individuals the people trust to select the President. Each presidential candidate has a slate of electors committed to them. As the people vote for a candidate, they are actually electing his/her slate of electors. Again, the selection of electors goes directly to local control of the process. Under the plan, even the smallest state was assured at least three votes in the process. To provide a further check to protect the smaller states, in the event no candidate won a majority of the electoral vote, the names of the top five would go to the House of Representatives, where each state delegation would cast one vote for one of the candidates. In this process each state is equal.

To understand the Electoral College one must realize that the Founders considered the states as the dominate power in the nation. Election of the office of President was a bit like the selection of the Chairman of the Board, with the states serving as the Board of Directors for the nation. The great mistake Electoral College opponents make is to believe the President was supposed to be elected by the people. It was never the plan.

There are fundamental and often regional differences in how Americans view the role of government and the leaders they elect to run it. Little wonder those who seek to strengthen the power of the central government prefer that elections be decided by the popular vote. It's a great sound bite- but the results will not give "the people" the "fair" result they desire.

Such a move will eliminate the power of individual states in favor of elections decided by the population of large, politically liberal cities. I've actually heard it said by residents of California, San Francisco, in particular; "Why do we even let people in Ohio and Iowa vote?" Such elitism is behind the "National Popular Vote" movement which apparently believes that only the East and West Coasts count. The rest is just fly-over country.

Individuals living in the majority of the nation's territory will quickly learn how little their "popular vote" counts if the Electoral College is abandoned by the "National Popular Vote" scheme. Their states (and therefore their votes) may have no impact on the election of the President. Control by a few over the many can only be defined as tyranny. Today we can stop the National Popular Vote. Tomorrow will be too late.



70 Republican Traitors Who Voted for the Hitler Youth Act

They called it the Generations Invigorating Volunteerism and Education (GIVE) Act. But the result will be forcing American youth into mandatory government slavery. 70 Republicans supported it, here they are:

Austria	Cao	Emerson	Lance	McMorris, R.	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Bachus	Capito	Fortenberry	Latham	Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Biggert	Cassidy	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette	Murphy, Tim	Rooney	Tiberi
Bilbray	Castle	Gallegly	Lee (NY)	Paulsen	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Bilirakis	Cole	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)	Petri	Schock	Upton
Bono Mack	Crenshaw	Guthrie	LoBiondo	Platts	Shimkus	Walden
Brown-Waite	Dent	Heller	Lucas	Putnam	Simpson	Wittman
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (IL)	McCotter	Rehberg	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Calvert	Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)	McHugh	Reichert	Souder	Young (AK)
Camp	Ehlers	Kirk	McKeon	Roe (TN)	Sullivan	Young (FL)



MIAC REPORT.... (*Cont'd from pg 5*) errors and did not cite any sources for its broad statements about “right-wing” militias. He further said that his department would now review how the MIAC distributes intelligence reports to police officers. He said the process “needs improvement.”

Dear readers, please take a bow! Because of tens of thousands of patriotic, freedom-loving Americans - including thousands of courageous Missourians - the long arm of totalitarianism was shortened just a bit.

This sordid story is truly an embarrassment to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the State of Missouri. Governor Nixon, especially, is left with egg on his face for foolishly and stupidly standing behind the report, when he had either never read it, or, if he had, was just as guilty of political profiling as the ones who wrote the report.

Why DHS, you ask? Because the MIAC report is similar to several other reports currently circulating around various State police agencies courtesy of DHS-sponsored “Fusion Centers.” There is another side of this story that is even more sinister, however.

If we can continue to probe the details of the MIAC report, I am absolutely convinced we will find that this report actually originates with Morris Dees and his ultra-liberal Southern Poverty Law Center. And if my hunch (a very educated hunch, I might add) is correct, it means that the DHS and various State police agencies around the country are allowing a left-wing special interest group to use them to harass, intimidate, and profile people with conservative political opinions.

I would further proffer that those of us who are outraged by this event should not stop with the MIAC report being removed. While this is very good news, the fear and intimidation associated with those referenced in this report has already taken place. Are people opposed to abortion, illegal immigration, the Income Tax, the U.N., etc., now afraid to express their opinions publicly (especially in Missouri)? If so, this seems to me to be the basis for legal action, based on the abridgment of the First Amendment freedom of speech by a State (and perhaps federal) law enforcement agency.

There is yet another chilling question that must be answered: by saying Missouri State Police will “review” how MIAC distributes intelligence reports to police officers, does Col. Keathley mean that the

State of Missouri’s law enforcement agencies will continue to promote similar reports, but simply make them “Classified”? In other words, will they (and other State police agencies around the country) simply employ greater secrecy when issuing such reports, but do nothing to change the content of future reports? Hopefully not, but we shall see.

With that said, here are the lessons all of us need to take to heart:

*Every police officer, deputy sheriff, and law enforcement officer in America who believes in constitutional government, individual liberty, and the Bill of Rights needs to be alert for any report that smacks of the MIAC report, and be willing to quickly “blow the whistle” on any such report they see.

*Lovers of freedom should be much encouraged to see what can happen when they are willing to stand up to their State governing officials as they see abridgements to their liberties taking place. I say again, the best way to fight these mushrooming despotic tendencies of government we seem to see everywhere is to focus on our State governments. Do you now see why I say that? Even if DHS was behind the MIAC report, it was the State of Missouri that had to implement it; and it was the State of Missouri that (under pressure) killed it.

*Notice, too, that we did not need the major media to achieve this victory. We cut off this one branch of the tyranny tree without the help of ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, FOX NEWS (with the exception of Glenn Beck), or even the Drudge Report. Victory was achieved with the weapons of talk radio, syndicated Internet columns, Internet blogging, local news media, and word of mouth.

You see, folks, we can achieve victory without the major media. But we must stay focused and actively involved in our respective State governments. “We the people” are still the power of this country. And don’t let anyone deceive you into believing anything else. Therefore, take heart in knowing that your diligence convinced the State of Missouri to rescind its atrocious MIAC report. Now, don’t let it stop there. Let’s faithfully cut off the tentacles of tyranny wherever we find them. Amen?

Chuck Baldwin is Founder-Pastor of Crossroads Baptist Church in Pensacola, Florida. Please visit Chuck’s web site at www.chuckbaldwinlive.com to learn more about his radio talk show, “Chuck Baldwin Live”.



LAW ENFORCEMENT.... (Cont'd from pg 12)

which creates a threat to law enforcement officers. They view the military, National Guard, and law enforcement as a force that will confiscate their firearms and place them in FEMA concentration camps." [Bold emphasis appears in original]

On the last page of the MIAC report, a section listing Political Paraphernalia (flags and symbols) states:

"Militia members most commonly associate with 3rd party political groups. It is not uncommon for militia members to display Constitutional Party, Campaign for Liberty, or Libertarian material. These members are usually supporters of former Presidential Candidate: Ron Paul, Chuck Baldwin, and Bob Barr.

Militia members commonly display picture, cartoons, bumper stickers that contain anti-government rhetoric. Most of this material will depict the FRS, IRS, FBI, ATF, CIA, UN, Law Enforcement, and the 'New World Order' in a derogatory manor (sic). Additionally, Racial, anti-immigration, and anti-abortion, material may be displayed by militia members."

What was the ostensible genesis of all these "threats" to law enforcement? The report explains it this way...

"Academics contend that female and minority empowerment in the 1970s and 1960s caused a blow to white male's sense of empowerment. This, combined with a sense of defeat from the Vietnam War, increased levels of immigration, and unemployment, spawned a paramilitary culture. This caught on in the 1980s with injects such as Tom Clancy novels, Solder of Fortune Magazine, and movies such as Rambo that glorified combat. This culture glorified white males and portrayed them as morally upright heroes who were mentally and physically tough.

"It was during this time frame that many individuals and organizations began to concoct conspiracy theories to explain their misfortunes. These theories varied but almost always involved a globalist dictatorship the New World Order (NWO), which conspired to exploit the working class citizens."

In other words, these "ridiculous NWO theories" were created by psychological deviants who were trying to justify their own self-induced misfortunes.

FEAR YE, ALL TROOPERS

For unsuspecting law enforcement personnel, this MIAC training document polarizes unsuspecting officers to fear peaceful, law-abiding citizens and greatly increases the risk of armed confrontation. For instance, a routine traffic stop would be escalated if the officer observes a Ron Paul or Chuck Baldwin bumper sticker on the rear bumper of the car. The mere possession of printed material such as the U.S. Constitution or Bill of Rights would be viewed as subversive, even though most officers are required to take an oath to "defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States" as a condition of their employment.

Additionally, troopers are indoctrinated that all such topics are pure fantasy and without any factual basis. Even if they had their own concerns, they would be ridiculed into accepting the position that all criticism of the New World Order is dangerous to their well being.

The Columbia Daily Tribune (Columbia, Missouri) reports this concern from local resident Tim Neal, who apparently fits the MIAC's "Modern Militia" profile:

"If a police officer is pulling me over with my family in the car and he sees a bumper sticker on my vehicle that has been specifically identified as one that an extremist would have in their vehicle, the guy is probably going to be pretty apprehensive and not thinking in a rational manner, and this guy's walking up to my vehicle with a gun."

MIAC IS A FUSION CENTER

As mentioned above, the Missouri Information Analysis Center is one of a network of over 50 Fusion Centers around the country.

According to the National Criminal Intelligence Resource Center (NCIRC), a Fusion Center is "a collaborative effort of two or more agencies that provide resources, expertise, and/or information to the center with the goal of maximizing the ability to detect, prevent, apprehend, and respond to criminal and terrorist activity."

As of 2006, the NCIRC listed 50 Fusion Centers in various states.

Most importantly, the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security are the driving forces behind Fusion Centers, having published "Fusion Center Guidelines: Developing and Sharing" (Cont'd on page 10)

LAW ENFORCEMENT.... *(Cont'd from pg 9)*

Information and Intelligence in a New World.” This report headlines “Fusion” as “Turning Information and Intelligence Into Actionable Knowledge.”

Fusion Centers are one of five areas of information sharing under the Information Sharing Environment (ISE) that was established by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

ISE membership includes the Department of Commerce, CIA, Department of Defense, Director of National Intelligence, Department of Energy, FBI, Health and Human Services, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Homeland Security, National Counter-Terrorism Center, Department of Interior, Office of Management and Budget, Department of Justice, Department of State, Department of Transportation and the Department of Treasury.

According to one white paper (on the ISE web site) entitled The Intelligence Fusion Process for State, Local and Tribal Law Enforcement, “The most important output of the intelligence Fusion Center is *actionable* intelligence. This means that the intelligence produced by the center will drive operational responses and strategic awareness of threats.” Accordingly,

“The heart of good intelligence analysis is to have a diverse array of valid and reliable raw information for analysis. The more robust the raw information, the more accurate the analytic output (i.e., intelligence) will be.”

The above mentioned MIAC report, issued by an official Fusion Center, is apparently part of this “diverse array of valid and reliable raw information.”

However, ISE’s understanding of intelligence is foolish. Any intelligence analyst knows that so-called raw information is treated as garbage until verified from multiple sources to validate accuracy, completeness and freedom from bias. Secondly, analytic output depends upon trained and experienced human reasoning and judgment, not on the “robustness” of the raw information itself.

WHERE DO FUSION CENTERS GET INPUTS?

According to their own documents, Fusion Centers are “seeded” with ideas for analysis by the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security. Although this is problematic in itself, attention is better directed to the left-wing nonprofit organization, Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC).

Upon careful word and theme comparison between the MIAC report and SPLC literature, it is apparent that there is a significant link between the two. Either MIAC received training or training material from SPLC or some of its personnel had some previous exposure to it.

The SPLC aggressively offers training to local, state and federal law enforcement agencies. According to the SPLC web site, “We focus on the history, background, leaders and activities of far-right extremists in the U.S.” and states that it “is internationally known for its tolerance education programs, its legal victories against white supremacists and its tracking of hate groups.”

Hate crimes are essentially acts of vilification of a victim because of his or her membership in a certain social group, such as racial, religious, sexual orientation, nationality, gender, etc. While hate crimes are wrong under any circumstance, the SPLC sees no conflict in profiling conservative whites, Christians, Constitutionals, and patriots as being associated with, if not responsible for, hate crimes in America. This is the pot calling the kettle black.

For instance, consider the SPLC statement, “... a basic fact about all three movements: Patriots, white supremacists and anti-abortion militants are all fueled by interpretations of religion.”

Aside from the fact that this sweeping generalization is plainly not true, it is mud-slinging at its best: Patriots are lumped in with white supremacists, anti-abortionists are militants, and all are driven by an obviously irrational and fanatical application of religion.

In another SPLC article about a tragic killing in South Carolina, entitled “The Abbeville Horror”, the writer goes well beyond just the facts of the story and is careful to sprinkle in words and phrases such as:

Patriots, tax protestors, sovereign citizens, antigovernment extremists, New World Order paranoia, Disarming U.S. Citizens, hard-line Christian Right, constitutional rights, antigovernment “Patriot” literature, anti-Semitic conspiracy, “Live Free or Die,” Ruby Ridge and Waco, Second Amendment, extremist organizing, “closet extremists,” paranoid beliefs, “Give me liberty or give me death.” [quotes appear in original text]

These are the same kinds of words and themes that are seen in The Modern Militia Movement article, where distinctions between good and

(Cont'd on page 11)

LAW ENFORCEMENT.... (Cont'd from pg 10)

bad people are blurred and confused: All are guilty by association, if nothing else.

Should a private organization like SPLC be allowed to provide official training to public-entrusted law enforcement agencies? Most would say, "No." Even if the training was free, the agency should reject influence from the public sector, and even more so if it presents biased and one-sided information that is claimed to be factual.

CONCLUSION

It is critical to understand that the legitimate law enforcement agencies of cities, counties and states are not adversaries of the people. They are greatly needed for protection against crime and for keeping order in our communities.

They are, however, being methodically seeded with very wrongheaded and dangerous information, the specific intent of which is to polarize law enforcement against peaceful citizens who simply care about the downfall of their country.

This writer interviewed Chuck Baldwin and asked about how he felt when he first saw his good name associated with those who would threaten bodily harm to law enforcement agencies. "Personally, I was stunned," he said, "but my family has taken this very personally as well. This is more than disturbing."

When asked about the possible affect of the report on the Constitution Party, of which he was the 2008 presidential candidate, he replied, "I think it will galvanize people and help them to understand the nature of the battle we are in. Freedom must be defended."

In fact, the MIAC report has created a fire storm all over America. Tens of thousands of protests are being called, written, e-mailed and faxed to authorities and legislators in Missouri. It would not be surprising to see the report rescinded and an apology given.

Even so, behind-the-scene groups like the SPLC will continue unabated and undeterred in their effort to misinform and disrupt healthy community relations with worthy law enforcement agencies and personnel.

The message to every jurisdiction: *Don't let it happen!*

FINAL THOUGHT

Locate the Fusion Center in your state and keep a close eye on the information they are releasing. Stay close to as many law enforcement personnel as you can, asking them to keep their eyes open for reports similar to the Missouri report. Petition your state legislators to ban law enforcement training by private organizations such as the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Patrick Wood is the Editor of "The August Review", www.augustreview.com. 

Register Now for the 10th Annual Freedom21 National Conference***You're Invited to attend:***

What: 10th Annual Freedom21 National Conference

When: August 13-15, 2009

Where: Sheraton - Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

A Few of the Guest Speakers include:

**OK Sen. Randy
Brogdon**

**PA Rep. Sam
Rohrer**

Mark Morano

Tom DeWeese

Full Registration Includes:

- All conference sessions
- 3 special training workshops
- All breaks and meal functions
- Thursday night reception
- Friday lunch
- Friday night banquet

Early Bird Special until June 15th

ONLY \$245

After June 15th registration is \$295

For full conference schedule and registration information visit

www.freedom21.org

SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY

THE RADICAL POLARIZATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

By Patrick Wood

Patriots, Christians and concerned citizens are increasingly in the cross hairs of the U.S. intelligence community, and battle lines are being quietly drawn that could soon pit our own law enforcement and military forces against us.

A February 20 report entitled "The Modern Militia Movement" was issued by the Missouri Information Analysis Center (MIAC) that paints mainstream patriotic Americans as dangerous threats to law enforcement and to the country. Operating under the Missouri State Highway Patrol, the MIAC is listed as a Fusion Center that was established in cooperation with the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice.

Because authenticity of the report was questioned by some, this writer contacted Missouri state Representative Jim Guest (R-King City) who had personally verified that the report had indeed been issued. Rep. Guest is chairman of the Personal Privacy Committee and is a prominent leader in the national Blowback against the Real ID Act of 2005 that requires states to issue uniform driver's licenses containing personal biometric data. (See Guest warns against Big Brother, Real ID)

Rep. Guest stated that he was "shocked and outraged" at the report, which clearly paints him and many other elected state leaders, as a potential threats to law enforcement.

Instead of focusing on actual criminal incidents of "home-grown" terrorism, the MAIC report instead lists *issues* that it believes are common to the threats it perceives. Thus, Americans involved with the following issues are highly suspect:

-- "*Ammunition Accountability Act*" - requiring each bullet to to be serialized and registered to the purchaser.

-- "*Anticipation of the economic collapse of the US Government*" - Prominent scholars and economists are openly debating the bankruptcy and insolvency of the United States government.

-- "*Possible Constitutional Convention (Con Con)*" - 32 states have called for a Constitutional Convention to force Congress and the Executive Branch into a balanced budget, but many are concerned that if called, Con Con would be taken over by hostile interests who would introduce Amendments that are harmful to national Sovereignty.

-- "*North American Union*" - MIAC states that "*Conspiracy theorists claim that this union would link Canada, the United States, and Mexico. The NAU would unify its monetary system and trade the dollar for the AMERO. Associated with this theory is concern over a NAFTA Superhighway, which would Fast Track trade between the three nations. There is additional concern that the NAU would open up the border causing security risks and free movement for immigrants.*"

-- "*Universal Service Program*" - "*Statements made by President Elect Obama and his chief of staff have led extremists to fear the creation of a Civilian Defense Force. This theory requires all citizens between the age of 18 and 25 to be forced to attend three months of mandatory training.*" (This is exactly what Obama and Rahm Emmanuel have repeatedly stated on national TV, and thus is hardly a theory.)

-- "*Radio Frequency Identification (RFID)*" - This includes human implantation, but the larger concern is universal id cards and personal property identification that can be read electronically without the bearer's knowledge.

Citizens who are concerned about the above issues are then lumped into radical ideologies such as Christian Identity, White Nationalists (e.g., neo-Nazi, Skinheads, etc.) and anti-Semites. Tax Resisters and Anti-Immigration advocates are thrown into the same category.

The MIAC report then *sternly* warns law enforcement personnel:

"You are the Enemy: The militia subscribes to an antigovernment and NWO mind set,

(Cont'd on page 9)