

# THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 18 - Issue 7

July 2012

## When Loving Your Country Marks You As A Domestic Terrorist

By Tom DeWeese

When I first became involved in political issues and events some 45 years ago as a young man just out of high school, it was because I believed in the ideals of our Founding Fathers. I had a young man's zeal for the American dream of individuals living their lives free of government control and harassment. I was comfortable in the knowledge that I lived in the greatest nation on earth, where I could speak my mind; choose my own future; and nothing but my own limitations would stand in my way.

The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence were my guidelines. I learned of them in a public school classroom, where we were taught why the American system of free enterprise and limited government were the reasons the United States had the highest standard of living in the world. It was the reason our soldiers were proud to serve and defend those ideas. Around the world, we were known as honest, trustworthy friends and allies. We were the envy of the world.

I got involved in politics, supporting these ideas, at a time when radical leftists who hated our style of government, were marching in the streets, carrying placards of Mao and labeling our nation "Amerika." I stood against them. I gave speeches to local service clubs; I wrote articles; I took action on college campuses, fighting to keep them open and safe as these extremists were shutting down classes and even burning buildings. It was a time of great violence and it was the beginning of a long revolution that has now completely changed our nation.

How severe has America changed? Today, as I stand for exactly the same ideals of American liberty as I did in 1967, I have just been labeled a threat to my country by the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC). In fact, they say I am a right wing extremist, a racist and a potentially violent domestic terrorist.

In a recent SPLC report entitled, "30 New Activists

Heading Up The Radical Right," I have been named along with what SPLC calls "Islamophobes," "Political Opportunists," "Religious Right Anti-Gay groups" and "Patriot groups." Says the report, "*Most dramatically, so-called 'Patriot' groups – which, unlike most hate groups, see the federal government as their primary enemy – have grown explosively in just the last three years...*" Of course they're talking about the Tea Party as a hate movement, and I'm pretty sure that's why I'm listed. In particular, they report on my efforts against Agenda 21, saying "*DeWeese's outfit is only one of several obsessed with what has become one of the main conspiracy theories of the antigovernment 'Patriot' movement.*" This new report from SPLC is just the latest in a series of attacks against Conservatives and others who support the founding principles of the United States, dating back over the past few years.

In March, 2010, SPLC issued a report entitled "*Rage on the Right: The Year in Hate and Extremism,*" in which groups opposed to issues like the Obama health care plan and illegal immigration were lumped with white supremacist groups like the National Socialist Movement and Neo-Nazi Skin Heads.

In August, 2010 SPLC launched an attack against my organization, the American Policy Center, and our national conference, The Freedom Action Conference, held at Valley Forge, PA. The event featured such speakers as best selling author Tom Woods, former presidential candidate Michael Badnarik, Sheriff Richard Mack, five respected state legislators, and many more well known spokesmen.

The title of the SPLC attack against me read, "Patriot Rhetoric Becomes Increasingly Violent," and said we were "united by rage" at the federal government. Not one speaker at our conference advocated violence or lawlessness of any kind. I can prove these statements

*Continued to Page 2*

IN THIS  
ISSUE

Page 1 - WHEN LOVING YOUR COUNTRY MARKS YOU AS A DOMESTIC TERRORIST  
Page 3 - QUOTES: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION OR GLOBAL GOVERNANCE?  
Page 5 - DON'T LET DRONES INVADE OUR PRIVACY  
Page 6 - R.I.P HENRY LAMB AND TOMMY CRYER  
Page 8 - FRACKING: AN EXISTENTIAL THREAT TO GREEN DOGMA

because we have the entire conference on video tape. Yet we were labeled as dangerous and potentially violent terrorists by SPLC. In fact, Sherriff Richard Mack was specifically singled out as one of our speakers whom they say advocated violence. He has filed a law suit against SPLC and will use our video as part of his evidence.

Of course, annually SPLC puts out its list of what it calls "hate" groups and individuals it deems dangerous to the nation. That list is almost exclusively respected pro-Constitution spokesmen.

I live in the world of rough and tumble politics. Charges are regularly made in both directions. I give as good as I get. I attack over opposition to policy. They attack me for the same reason. It's called political discourse; debate; and free speech. It's been our right to participate in such public activity for over 200 years. So, why do I care what this one private organization (SPLC), with its own political agenda, says about me?

I care because the Southern Poverty Law Center has direct ties to the Department of Homeland Security, helping to write official DHS policy that may affect my life, my freedom, my ability to travel and my ability to speak out.

Consider the following facts:

Item: In 2009, The DHS issued a report entitled "*Right-wing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment.*"

That official document of an agency of the United States government said "*Right-wing extremism in the United States can be broadly divided into those groups, movements, and adherents that are primarily hate-oriented (based on hatred of particular religious, racial or ethnic groups), and those that are mainly anti-government, rejecting federal authority in favor of state or local authority, or rejecting government authority entirely. It may include groups and individuals that are dedicated to a single issue, such as opposition to abortion or immigration.*"

Item: Two weeks later, the DHS

released a second report entitled: "*Domestic Extremism Lexicon,*" designed to provide specific definitions of just who may be Right wing extremists.

That report labeled the following to be extremists, bordering on terrorism: Those concerned over the economy; loss of jobs; foreclosures; antagonism toward the Obama Administration; Criticism of free trade programs; anti-abortion; oppose same sex marriage; believe in the "end times;" stock pile food; oppose illegal immigration; oppose a New World Order; oppose the UN; oppose global governance; fear of Communist regimes; oppose loss of US manufacturing to overseas nations; oppose loss of US prestige; use of the internet (or alternative media) to express any of these ideas.

Right after both of these reports were issued, there was the shooting at the Holocaust Museum. Next to their news reports on the incident, many newspapers carried side bar articles citing the DHS reports, basically confirming that such violence is perpetrated by right wing nuts and justifying the concerns of the DHS – just like clockwork. Yet there was absolutely no connection found between that shooter and the right wing. But the damage was done.

And there's more.

The Department of Homeland Security has established Fusion Centers in each state. These are designed to combine federal, state and local law enforcement. Their stated purpose is to assure immediate and efficient response to a terrorist attack or a Katrina-like disaster without bureaucratic red tape.

Item: However, in 2009, the Missouri Fusion Center set off a fire storm over a report it issued entitled "*The Modern Militia Movement.*" Reported Fox News, the report "identifies the warning signs of potential terrorists for law enforcement communities." In other words, this report was issued to law enforcement agencies across the state as official documentation warning who the cops should look out for as potential violent terrorists.

The list of potential terrorists included Americans who voted for presidential candidate Ron Paul; Constitution Party presidential candidate

*Continued to Page 4*

## DeWeese Report

Vol. 18, No. 7  
July 2012

Published by  
The DeWeese  
Company, Inc.

Editor  
Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/  
Fulfillment  
Lola Jane Craig  
Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout  
CJ Scrofani  
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report  
PO Box 3598  
Warrenton, VA 20188

Web Page:  
[www.deweese.com](http://www.deweese.com)

Copy write  
2012 The DeWeese  
Company, Inc.  
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 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

## *Environmental Protection or Global Governance? Reality Vs Spin*

*Those who are determined to impose global governance on the rest of us have made great sport out of attacking anyone who dares oppose their plans. They have attacked those who challenge their claims of global warming by calling for “Nuremburg-style” show trials. Al Gore has actually called for violence against climate “skeptics.” The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) has called those who oppose the policies of Barack Obama domestic terrorists. But if you watch and listen long enough, you will hear incredible things come out of their mouths. You will find that they really are lying about their intent. It’s not really about saving the environment – but about controlling the world – just like we opponents said. Amazing, isn’t it? Here, let them tell you in their own words:*

**We said the issue over Climate Change wasn’t really about protecting the environment but about redistribution of wealth. They called us “deniers.” But who is really denying the truth?**

*“First of all, developed countries have basically expropriated the atmosphere of the world community. But one must say clearly that we redistribute de facto the world’s wealth by climate policy. Obviously, the owners of coal and oil will not be enthusiastic about this. One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with environmental policy anymore, with problems such as deforestation or the ozone hole.”*

**Ottmar Edenhofer, German economist and official of the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).**

**But then there is the spin of “Climate Crisis.”**

*If current trends continue, if current patterns of production and consumption of natural resources prevail and cannot be reversed and ‘decoupled,’ then governments will preside over unprecedented levels of damage and degradation.”*

**UN Under-Secretary General and UNEP Executive Director Achim Steiner**

**So, which is it – disaster or redistribution of wealth? Well, both actually. The disaster they are talking about is not “environmental” but political. And only redistribution of wealth can prevent it. Observe the following quotes:**

*“Eradicating poverty is the greatest global challenge facing the world today and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development. In this regard we are committed to free humanity from poverty and hunger as a matter of urgency.”*

**Second paragraph of the draft copy of the official Rio+20 document “The Future We Want.”**

**And how will poverty be eradicated? Redistribution of wealth (your wealth), of course...**

*“We emphasize the need to enhance tax revenues through modernized tax systems, more efficient tax collection, broadening the tax base and effectively combating tax evasion. We stress that these efforts should be undertaken with an overarching view to make tax systems more pro-poor.”*

*“We recognize that for significant international financing to give strong support to the various commitments made in the outcomes of Rio+20, the developed countries agreed to provide new and additional resources exceeding UD 30 billion per year from 2013 – 17 to the developing countries in their efforts toward promotion of sustainable development.”*

*“We also pledge that for a more sustained and longer-term financial support we agree to enhance the mobilization to UN 100 billion per year from 2018 onwards and work towards setting up a financial mechanism, including a possible sustainable development fund.”*

**Pages 72 and 73 of the draft copy of the official Rio+20 document “The Future We Want.”**

**Redistribution of wealth, away from developed nations to the Third World. It would give the UN 0.7% of a nation’s gross national product = to \$1,325 per year for an American family of four. The “spin” is environmental protection. The “reality” is UN control of our economy. ○**

*Continued from Page 2*

Chuck Baldwin (who is included on the new 2012 list); and Libertarian Party presidential candidate Bob Barr. It also cited those of us who opposed the creation of a North American Union with Canada and Mexico.

Item: Immediately following the shooting of Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, the Arizona Fusion Center issued a report saying that the shooter was influenced by a right wing group called American Renaissance. Immediately the mainstream media picked up the report and flooded the airways with the story that the radical and violent right wing was responsible for the shootings.

The information was completely wrong. There is no evidence that there was ever any connection between the shooter and American Renaissance. Moreover, American Renaissance has never advocated violence or extremism.

Item: in the Spring of 2010, the Department of Homeland Security organized a "*Countering Violent Extremism Working Group*." This is an advisory council given the task of creating a plan to reach out to local law enforcement and community activists for training to respond to potential violence and terrorist threat.

Leafing through the report one gets the distinct impression that the plan is basically a "turn in your neighbor," neighborhood- watch approach. It talks extensively of "sharing" information, along with "training, training, training."

Training for what? To identify potential terrorists, of course. And who are those potential terrorist? A look at the members of the working group offers a clue. While the group includes several public officials and law enforcement officials from around the nation, and it also includes Mohamed Magid, president of the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), an un-indicted co-conspirator in a case concerning the funding of Muslim terrorist organizations. Note that the new 2012 SPLC report labels those who oppose radical Islamic activities as "Islamophobes." Coincidence?

The working group member list also includes Richard Cohen, President of the Southern Poverty Law Center. In addition, as one of the "Subject Matter Experts," it lists Laurie Wood, an analyst for the Southern Poverty Law Center and an instructor for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

That training center is run by the Southern Poverty Law Center and is one of the most visible direct links between DHS, the Fusion Centers and SPLC. Law enforcement agencies actually send their personnel to these training classes to gain Federal Law Enforcement Training Center certification.

That means that policy for this DHS working group is

being created by the very organization that has labeled those who advocate Constitutional law to be potential terrorists. In addition, the "training" called for in the report will most likely be conducted, at least in part, by the SPLC's Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

The pattern is clear, one of the nation's leading hate groups, the Southern Poverty Law Center, which opposes even the right of free speech by people it labels potential terrorists, is helping the largest federal enforcement agency in the nation to create its policy.

That policy clearly implies, according to DHS reports, that anyone disagreeing with actions of the American government is a potential terrorist and must be, at least, watched and monitored by federal, state, and local authorities.

The result of such surveillance could possibly lead to loss of freedom, loss of jobs, loss of the ability to travel, and loss of the ability to speak publicly, for anyone who opposes the private agenda of the Southern Poverty Law Center. It is an effort to silence their opponents. Honest political debate is now being interpreted as dangerous extremism.

Why is DHS dealing with such people? Are the policies of SPLC the same policies of the United States? If so, then freedom in America is in grave danger, indeed.

I believe there needs to be an immediate Congressional investigation into the ties between the Department of Homeland Security and the Southern Poverty Law Center and any other radical groups.

Particular attention should be paid to SPLC's tax exempt status and the amount of money it receives from DHS or any other agency. And there should be an immediate stop to American law enforcement being trained by SPLC's Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

The specific purpose of the Department of Homeland Security is to protect the "STATE" against all enemies. According to its own reports, that has come to include anyone who uses their first amendment right to speak out against specific policies. Apparently, that has been interpreted by DHS to mean a threat to the STATE.

May I remind every American that the tanks which ran over the student protesters in Tiananmen Square in Communist China were also protecting the STATE against its enemies.

I fear that if private groups with their own political agendas, like the SPLC are allowed to continue feeding their own brand of hatred into the policies of DHS, then such a comparison with China is not too far off. I don't think that is the America any of us, whether liberal or conservative, wants.



# Spy Drones Flying Over American Homes

*ED Note: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the Obama Administration's chosen destroyer of American liberty – because it can do it in the name of protecting the environment. Under that worn out excuse, the government claims it can do anything. And I do mean anything. Now, under the EPA's classic excuse, the federal government is openly spying on American citizens with stealth drone spy planes.*

*To the rescue, Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) has introduced the "Preserving Freedom From Unwarranted Surveillance Act of 2012" (S3287). A companion bill (HR 5925) has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Austin Scott (R-GA). Below, Senator Paul explains why his bill is urgent to protect our freedoms from this out of control federal agency. TAD*

## Don't Let Drones Invade Our Privacy

By Senator Rand Paul (R-KY)

When assuming office, every government official must take an oath to abide by and uphold our Constitution. Since 2010, I have made that my mission in Congress. Unfortunately, the Obama administration is not upholding nor abiding by the Constitution -- in fact, this administration is going to great lengths to continually violate it.

Its most recent transgression involves the use of domestic drones. These small drones are to be used as a crime fighting tool for law enforcement officials. But is unwarranted and constant surveillance by an aerial eye of Big Government the answer?

In a memorandum issued by President Barack Obama's secretary of the Air Force, the stated purpose of these drones is "balancing ... obtaining intelligence information ... and protecting individual rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution." However, flying over our homes, farms, ranches and businesses and spying on us while we conduct our everyday lives is not an example of protecting our rights. It is an example of violating them.

The domestic use of drones to spy on Americans clearly violates the Fourth Amendment and limits our rights to personal privacy. I do not want a drone hovering over my house, taking photos of whether I separate my recyclables from my garbage.

When I have friends over for a barbecue, the government drone is not on the invitation list. I do not want a drone monitoring where I go, what I do and for how long I do whatever it is that I'm doing. I do not want a nanny state watching over my every move.

We should not be treated like criminals or terrorists while we are simply conducting our everyday lives. We should not have our rights infringed upon by unwarranted police-state tactics.

I have introduced legislation into the Senate that restates the Constitution. This bill protects individual privacy against unwarranted governmental intrusion through the use of these drones. The Preserving Freedom from Unwarranted Surveillance Act of 2012 will protect Americans' personal privacy by forcing the government to honor our Fourth Amendment rights.

I want to make it clear that I am not arguing against the use of technology. But like other tools used to collect information in law enforcement, a warrant needs to be issued to use drones domestically. The police force should have the power to collect

intelligence; however, I believe they must go through a judge and request a warrant to do so. The judicial branch must have some authority over drones, as they do with other law enforcement tools.

My bill will restate the Fourth Amendment and protect American's privacy by forcing police officials to obtain a warrant before using domestic drones.

There are some exceptions within this bill, such as the patrol of our national borders, when immediate action is needed to prevent "imminent danger to life," and when we are under a high risk of a terrorist attack. Otherwise, the government must have probable cause that led them to ask for a warrant before the use of drones is permitted.

If the warrant is not obtained, this act would allow any person to sue the government. This act also specifies that no evidence obtained or collected in violation of this act can be admissible as evidence in a criminal, civil or regulatory action.

Allowing domestic drones to act as spies for the government is a complete violation of our basic right to personal privacy.

Unrestricted drone surveillance conjures up images reminiscent of Orwell's "1984" -- a totalitarian police-state. According to the Fourth Amendment, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated."

I am sure our police force had good intentions with their suggested drone policies, but do they understand the consequences? Do they realize that they are allowing the government to act as the eye in the sky?

By infringing upon our rights and watching over our every move, the government is not going to protect us, but they will push us one more step closer to completely losing our Fourth Amendment rights. My bill will protect individual privacy against governmental intrusion by these drones and establish a balance by requiring judicial action and allowing protection in court.

I am confident that my colleagues in the Senate will agree with this bill. Each and every one of us took the same oath to abide by and uphold our Constitution. The Preserving Freedom from Unwarranted Surveillance Act does just that. ●

# R.I.P Henry Lamb and Tommy Cryer

By Tom DeWeese

The freedom movement lost two courageous leaders this past month. Our movement is poorer for their passing, but our nation's richer from their lives.

**Henry Lamb** is the man who first discovered Agenda 21 and sounded the alarm. He attended the international meetings and challenged participants to question the programs being proposed. He was alarmed and wanted the world to know what was coming. As he somehow managed to raise the money for his plane tickets to the UN meetings, he prepared for the trip by buying stocks of crackers and other cheap foodstuffs to take with him. That's how he existed while most UN attendees managed to stay in the finest hotels and rent every available limo in town. Somehow, Henry managed to organize an unofficial nationwide network of radio programs and was able to broadcast directly from the UN meetings, telling the nation what the UN was up to. UN officials responded by moving him out and away from the meeting area. It didn't stop him. He kept going back and getting the word out to activist across the nation.

People ask me how I started fighting Agenda 21. How did I learn so much? Henry Lamb is the answer. He was my mentor, my teacher, my friend. No one was more courageous or more driven to stand up for our unique Republic than Henry Lamb. Together we created Freedom 21, to organize official opposition to Agenda 21. We organized ten national conferences and produced DVDs featuring the speakers. They stand today as valuable teaching tools. Henry was a tireless advocate, traveling the nation to speak. Usually he drove in his well-worn van so he could sleep in it rather than pay for a hotel room.

In the past couple of years Henry had grown sick. He was unable to go on the radio because long conversations were interrupted by bouts of coughing. He couldn't breathe and wore an oxygen tank. But still, through the pain, he found a way to carry on. He wrote a book on global governance. He then produced a series of videos on Agenda 21. Each stands as invaluable tools for anyone wanting to know where this evil agenda came from and why it must be stopped.

During the past year, Henry was in and out of the

hospital. Each visit seemed longer and more fearful than the last. But, as soon as he was able to return home, he immediately produced another newsletter or video; improved the Freedom 21 web site; answered emails from new activists eager to learn. He never hesitated to respond to any question. I sought his input for my presentation in my debate against the UN before England's Cambridge University in 2006. Later, I gave him a copy of my main Agenda 21 speech I've now given across the nation. With his approval, I knew I need never doubt the accuracy of my message. He told me more than once how envious he was of me and others who were able to speak across the nation as our opposition to Agenda 21 miraculously grew. He wanted to be there, but his illness just wouldn't let him.

Finally, on May 24<sup>th</sup>, Henry passed away. But before he went, thankfully, he was able to see great progress in the work he had started so long ago.

**Tommy Cryer** passed away on June 4<sup>th</sup>. I didn't know him as well as I did Henry Lamb, but was privileged to have worked with him. Tommy was a lawyer and used his legal skills as a weapon for freedom. He took on the massive Goliath called the IRS. As he challenged them on the grounds that the tax law does not authorize collection of personal income, only profits, the IRS struck back, accusing him of being a tax cheat. They went after his law practice, tracking down his clients, warning them to steer clear of Tom Cryer, thus destroying his law practice and breaking him financially.

So weakened, the IRS then decided it was time to finish him off by charging him with tax fraud. But rather than just trying to defend himself as most did, Tommy turned the tables on them by filing a motion for dismissal of the IRS charges. He claimed, among other things, that the law does not make him liable for income taxes, and that the Constitution does not authorize the Federal government to tax fees he personally earned. Rather than submitting to the usual one-sided tax court in which most Americans find themselves trapped, Tommy got a jury trial in open court, and he made his case. He was found NOT Guilty by all twelve jurors. The first to ever win on such grounds.

Continued to page 7

integrity” – the result of improper cementing between the well borehole and the steel “casing” and pipes that go down through aquifers and thousands of feet deeper into gas-laden shale formations. Similar failures occur in water wells drilled through rock formations containing methane (natural gas).

The solution is straightforward: better standards and procedures for cementing vertical pipes in place, and testing them initially and periodically to ensure there are no leaks.

Similarly, fracking fluids fail to match the “toxic” and “cancerous” opprobrium alleged by anti-drilling campaigns. Over 99.5% of the fluids is water and sand. The other 0.5% is chemicals to keep sand particles suspended in the liquid, fight bacterial growth and improve gas production.

Although industrial chemicals were once used, almost all of today’s are vegetable oil and chemicals used in cheese, beer, canned fish, dairy desserts, shampoo, and other food and cosmetic products.

As to “earthquakes,” barely detectable “tremors” have occasionally been measured near fracking operations and wastewater disposal injection wells. However, calling these snap, crackle and pop noises and movements “earthquakes” is akin to screaming “Earthquake!” when a cement truck goes by.

Despite these facts, EPA is nevertheless trying to invent problems and inject itself into already vigilant and responsive state regulatory efforts. The agency has conducted a roundly criticized study in Wyoming and is conducting water tests in Pennsylvania, where state officials view its activities as unnecessary meddling.

Additional over-reach and over-regulation would be hugely detrimental to US and global well-being. Fracking could help create numerous jobs and provide a far more secure, affordable, dependable and lower-pollution future than would ever be possible with wind or solar power.

By expanding oil and gas development, it could make North America the world’s new energy hub. Middle East sheiks, mullahs and OPEC ministers would lose economic, political and strategic power. Threats of Russian pipeline closures would no longer intimidate Eastern European countries. Politicians everywhere would waste less money on “renewable” energy T-Boonedoggles.

Unfortunately, though, fear campaigns are preventing some of America’s poorest counties and families from enjoying the economic benefits of Marcellus Shale

development.

Baltimore’s Sage Policy Group calculated that fracking in western Maryland could reduce energy costs, create thousands of jobs, and generate millions of dollars annually in revenue for the state and Allegany and Garrett Counties. Similar studies in New York and elsewhere have reached similar conclusions.

Hydraulic fracturing technologies are proven. Regulations to protect drinking water are in place and improving steadily, as cementing and other legitimate concerns are recognized and addressed.

North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Texas, Poland and Israel are showing the way forward.

Communities that have not yet opened their doors to responsible drilling, fracking and production need to replace anti-hydrocarbon agendas and fears with facts, optimism and science-based regulations.

Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and Congress of Racial Equality, and author of *Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death*. ●

Continued from page 6

Tommy traveled the nation, teaching others how to stand up for their rights. He founded an organization called “Truth Attack,” and took to the airwaves, helping to set up the Liberty Works Radio Network, and hosted his own one hour show each week.

As he knew he was entering his final days, he worked to organize a new effort that he hoped would help fund our movement and build new leadership. He wrote to me in his final week asking for my assistance in getting it organized. The end came too quickly to get the job done. But, like Henry Lamb, Tommy Cryer worked to his very last day in a desperate attempt to assure freedom will survive in America.

Henry and Tommy never gave up. They believed that freedom must be our destiny. Without such souls there would be no freedom. It is they who drag the rest of us toward the light of Freedom’s torch. They’ve done their part. Now they have found their way to the place where all heroes go – the place where they can join with the others who have fought before them – the camp of Freedom’s Heroes. ●

# Fracking: An Existential Threat to Green Dogma

Misleading claims about shale gas development serve dogma but not the public interest

By Paul Driessen

The Sierra Club and other environmental pressure groups are redoubling their efforts to “stop fracking in its tracks.” No wonder. The technology is an existential threat to fundamental “green” dogmas.

Horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing is a true “game changer.” In less than two years, this proven but still rapidly advancing technology has obliterated longstanding claims that we are running out of petroleum. Instead, the USA now finds itself blessed with centuries of oil and gas.

Thankfully, much of it is on state and private lands, which cannot easily be locked up by federal diktat.

Poland and Estonia are using it, China has invited companies to the Middle Kingdom, Britain, Israel and Jordan are evaluating their shale deposits, and other nations are following suit – coaxing oil and natural gas from shale and other rock formations that previously had refused to yield their hydrocarbon riches.

By making more natural gas available, fracking has reduced the US price for this clean-burning fuel to under \$3 per thousand cubic feet (or million Btu), compared to a peak of \$8 a few years ago.

Natural gas is also supplanting coal for electricity generation. Due to excessive, mostly unnecessary new Environmental Protection Agency regulations, many US coal-fired power plants are shutting down. Replacement plants are far more likely to be gas-powered than nuclear, especially in the near term.

Natural gas makes heating and electricity more affordable for families, hospitals, government buildings and businesses; feed stocks less expensive for makers of plastics, paints, fabrics and other petrochemical products; and the prospect of natural gas-power vehicles more enticing, without mandates or subsidies. That translates into thousands of jobs created or saved.

Companies are keeping chemical plants open that were slated to close, due to soaring prices for oil that they now can readily replace with cheap natural gas. Shell plans to build a \$2-billion ethane “cracking” plant near Pittsburgh – creating 10,000 construction jobs and 10,000 permanent jobs – thanks to abundant gas from Marcellus Shale. Louisiana, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Texas and other states are reporting subsidy-free employment and revenue gains from shale gas development. More are likely to

follow, as companies seek new ways to capitalize on access to abundant, inexpensive, reliable gas.

Natural gas also provides essential backup power for wind turbines. Without such backup, electricity generation from these projects would plummet to zero 70-80% of the time, affecting assembly lines, computers, televisions, air conditioners and other electrical equipment dozens of times every day.

Even harder for environmentalists to accept, cheap natural gas also makes it harder to justify building redundant wind turbines that require large subsidies to generate far more expensive electricity only 5-8 hours a day, on average, while killing large numbers of raptors, migratory birds and bats. It makes more sense to simply build the gas turbines, and forget about the mostly useless wind turbines.

Fracking is also unlocking oil in the vast Bakken Shale formations beneath Montana, North Dakota and Saskatchewan. Oil production there has shot from 3,000 barrels a day in 2006 to nearly 500,000 today – creating thousands of jobs ... and a growing need for the Keystone XL pipeline to Texas.

In response, eco-activists are spreading unfounded fears about this proven technology. Using words like “reckless,” “dangerous” and “poisonous,” they say unregulated fracking companies are operating with little concern for ecological values and causing cancer, earthquakes and groundwater contamination.

The claims have fanned borderline hysteria in some quarters and prompted Maryland, New York and other states to launch drawn-out studies or impose moratoria that will postpone drilling and the benefits it would bring. Facts are sorely needed.

Drilling and fracking have been carefully and effectively regulated by states for decades. As studies by the University of Texas and various state agencies have documented, there has never been a confirmed case of groundwater contamination due to fracking. Even EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson acknowledged that to a congressional panel.

These analysts, drilling companies and even an Environmental Defense expert now say fracking has not played a role in any of the rare cases where methane has gotten into drinking water.

Instead, the cause has generally been a failure of “well

Continued on page 7