

# THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 20 - Issue 11

November 2014

## Six Years Later: The Clear Connection Between Barack Obama and The Weathermen

By Tom DeWeese

*If you happened to see the Fox News, Megan Kelly (The Kelly File) interview with Bill Ayres, you witnessed a master of propaganda and misdirection, as Ayres tried to slip past Kelly's direct questions. According to Ayres, he's just a concerned citizen taking part in our democratic debate. How patriotic! The truth is, Ayres, his wife Bernadine Dohrn and the rest of the Weather Underground were and are true domestic terrorists out to destroy American society. Not only do they still roam our streets, but, in fact, live quite well off the society they professed to hate and sought to destroy. And the Weatherman's ultimate victory, 40 years later, may just be Barack Obama.*

Just before the election of Barack Obama in 2008, it was quite shocking to see that a forty-year old, seemingly forgotten radical group called "Weatherman" was getting so much attention. Of course, Obama denied any connection to old Weathermen. Here's a quick history of the "Weatherman" and why it's relevant to a president whose entire campaign relied on a call for an undefined "change." Now, six years later, the change is coming much clearer into view. And it seems we now know which way the wind blows.

You've heard the famous names: Bill Ayres, Mark Rudd, Bernadine Dohrn and Jeff Jones, among others. Today, Ayres describes himself as a professor; Dohrn is his wife and a clinical law professor, Jeff Jones, predictably is an environmentalist and political consultant, and Mark Rudd is now a teacher -- just normal Americans, living their lives. Really?

In 1962, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was born. It was a radical organization of college students. SDS quickly became the opposition to the

Viet Nam War. They organized demonstrations on college campuses across the nation to mobilize students to take "direct action" against "racism, poverty and war." In 1963, SDS got involved in "community organizing," teaming up with the Black Panthers, the Hispanic Young Lords, and other radical organizations.

By 1966, SDS was moving in a revolutionary Marxist direction. Their demonstrations and marches became violent clashes with police, many turning into riots. About the same time, SDS was joined by the Progressive Labor Party (PLP), a self-styled Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party, dedicated to implementing communist ideology.

By 1969, a majority of SDS found the PLP's strict Marxist ideology too restraining, hurting organizing and recruiting efforts. At the same time, SDS leaders were looking for a more long-term agenda to bring about a communist revolution in the United States. Simply fighting the war was too limiting. In June 1969, SDS held a raucous convention in which the PLP was tossed out of SDS and a new faction took control. That faction was called "Weatherman." It issued a long, rambling manifesto detailing the future direction of the movement. The document was entitled "You Don't Need A Weatherman To Know Which Way The Wind Blows." The title was taken from a Bob Dylan song.

The manifesto detailed Weatherman ideology and the means to create a Marxist revolution in "Amerika." Some of its chapter titles include: "The Struggle for Socialist Self-Determination;" "Black Liberation Means Revolution;" "Anti-Imperialist Revolution and The United Front;" "The Revolutionary Youth Movement -- Class Analysis;" and "Repression and Revolution." The

IN THIS  
ISSUE

PAGE 4 - OUTRAGEOUS IRS COMMISSIONER FALSE CLAIM: 'WHENEVER WE CAN, WE FOLLOW THE LAW'  
PAGE 5 - THE STEALTH LAND-GRABS OF REGIONAL PLANNERS BY JOHN ANTHONY  
PAGE 6 - EPA'S PHONY "ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE" CAPER BY PAUL DRIESSEN

document called for a class war against America's free market society. It talked of joining up with Marxist revolutions around the world, in China, in Cuba, and more. It called for the creation of a "Revolutionary Party." Above all, it called for war against what Weatherman called "Amerika." Why is that significant today? Because the authors of the document, the leaders of Weatherman, were Mark Rudd, Bill Ayres, Bernadine Dohrn, Jeff Jones, and others.

Weatherman's first public act was what it called "Days of Rage." It called on students to leave their classrooms and engage in three days of violence and street demonstrations. They smashed windows of businesses and cars, and attacked police lines. Mark Rudd himself was arrested in Chicago while leading the violence. The results of the three days of violence were 287 people arrested, 800 automobiles and 600 windows smashed. The combined bail was over \$2 million.

In spite of the damage, Weatherman was disappointed with the turnout of demonstrators. They had hoped to bring thousands to the streets, rather than the three to five hundred who turned out. Mark Rudd and the other Weathermen concluded that white people weren't ready to engage in revolution, as did their "black brothers" in the Black Panthers. To win, decided the Weathermen, whites had to share some of the cost of revolution by "picking up the gun." To not do so was racist, they believed.

That decision led Weatherman leaders Ayres, Dohrn, Rudd and Jones to make the decision to declare war on "Imperialist Amerika" by going underground to foster direct violence against the state. They then became known as the "Weather Underground."

During their reign of terror, the Weather Underground bombed corporate headquarters, burned ROTC buildings on college campuses, and even planted a

bomb in the US Capitol building. They used anti-personnel bombs filled with nails, staples and other shrapnel designed to hurt and kill people. Several of those bombs were planted in police stations resulting in the murder of Police Sgt. Brian McDonnell in San Francisco; another officer was permanently maimed and two others were injured in that attack. A police informant, Larry Grathwohl, working inside the Weather Underground, reported that Bill Ayres planned the bombing and Bernadine Dohrn planted it. There were more such bombings in other cities. Later, Mark Rudd was the sole survivor of a bomb explosion that went off as he was building it in a Weather Underground safe house in New York. That bomb and more were to be placed in a dance hall at the Fort Dix Army base. They would have killed hundreds of soldiers and their dates.

As they engaged in their revolution, the Underground would, from time to time issue "Communiques," to send messages to followers. In "Communique #1 From the Weather Underground," it reads, in part, "Hello. This is Bernadine Dohrn. I'm going to read A DECLARATION OF A STATE OF WAR" (emphasis hers). In the document she warned, "Within the next fourteen days we will attack a symbol or institution of Amerikan injustice." It was issued on May 21, 1970.

On June 9, 1970, came "Communique #2 From The Weather Underground." It reported, "Tonight at 7 PM, we blew up the N.Y.C. police headquarters.... The pigs in this country are our enemies.... The time is now. Political power grows out of a gun, a Molotov, a riot, a commune...and from the soul of the people."

There's much more to the history of violence and revolution pulled off or attempted by Ayres, Rudd, Dohrn and Jones (and others in their clan). But these examples should give anyone enough of an idea as to their dedication to destroying America.

## DeWeese Report

Vol. 20, No. 11  
November 2014

Published by  
The American Policy  
Center

Editor  
Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/  
Fulfillment  
Lola Jane Craig  
Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout  
CJ Scrofani  
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report  
PO Box 129  
Remington, VA  
22734

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

Copyright 2014  
The American Policy  
Center  
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

But what does that have to do with today? And how does it connect to Barack Obama? The bad boys and girls of the Sixties like to portray themselves as just some college kids that got a little carried away. It's in the past, says the news media. It has nothing to do with today – or Barack Obama, say his supporters.

It is vital that Americans understand that these were dedicated revolutionaries determined to destroy America, by violence if necessary. They used every means possible to recruit America's youth into their revolt. They marched in the street, chanted pro Mao slogans, started riots, disrupted schools, burned college buildings, and eventually bombed symbols of the American establishment they hated, resulting in the deaths and maiming of police officers sworn to protect it.

These were not just over-active college kids. The agenda they followed sought to destroy every aspect of American life. They hated private property and wanted it all redistributed with no ownership – like the communes they chose to live on. They hated free enterprise and wanted all business run by the workers – no bosses, no owners. The only private business they would tolerate were those run by individuals that could hire no one. They knew to achieve these things they had to start by changing the history taught to a young generation in the schools. They hated religion and wanted to run it out of the country. They hated the family unit, saying it subjugated women, who should be liberated. They sought to build divides between the rich and the poor, creating a class struggle in America that really didn't exist before. And they didn't hesitate to use violence to achieve their goals. (Compare all of those goals to the real policies coming out of the Obama White House).

When the violence failed, the Weatherman core and their followers didn't give up or fade away. They remained underground in a new way. They melded into society. Some took teaching positions in college to reach that younger generation. Others took jobs in the media to take control of its message. Many more worked their way up in the hated corporations to gain control of policy. And still more surged into government at all levels, boring into the core of America, to impose their agenda at every chance, from the Federal government to state

legislatures to city councils. Today, for example, we have Congressman Bobby Seal, one of the infamous Chicago Eight; and State Senator Tom Hayden, the founder of the SDS and another of the Chicago Eight.

It's interesting to note that a great number of the members of the "revolution" went into the environmental movement. Unable to get Americans to outright accept Marxist ideology in their revolution, instead they wrapped it all in a nice green blanket of environmental protection. Ever since, under that green banner, Americans have ignorantly tossed their liberties on the bonfire like a good old-fashioned book burning. They blindly accepted the premise that private property and business must be controlled or destroyed, simply for the good of the environment. It's not just a happy coincidence. In this way, the revolution of the sixties is now progressing at a rapid pace.

And what of Ayres, Dorhn, Rudd and Jones?

Ayres took the route into education as a professor. But that certainly hasn't replaced his activism for the cause of communism. A few years ago he traveled to the red Mecca of Venezuela, a nation which quickly fell behind a new red curtain of tyranny under Hugo Chavez. Ayres was influential enough with that American-hating dictator to meet with him and appear on the same platform. There, Ayres proclaimed his support for "the profound educational reforms underway here in Venezuela under the leadership of President Chavez. We share this belief that education is the motor-force of revolution... I look forward to seeing how you continue to overcome the failings of capitalist education as you seek to create something truly new and deeply humane..." Does it sound like Ayres has changed a single stripe from his "college activist" days?

Mark Rudd also went into education. He feels at home there, after all, he is the man who shut down Columbia University with a student strike in the Sixties. And he is still active in the cause. During the Obama election campaign in 2008, he turned up making comments on a radical blog called Rag Blog, where he attempted to calm nervous "progressives" (a new euphemism coined a few years back to provide cover for those who didn't want to be called communists). The Progressives were growing nervous

by the cabinet appointments Obama had been making. These old terrorists are so radical that they actually consider Hillary Clinton to be from the right! Of course keeping a bunch of old Clintonistas, not to mention a Bush holdover like Secretary of Defense Gates, has caused great concern for those who thought Obama was the answer to the revolution. Said Rudd, the Obama appointments are part of a deliberate strategy to “feint to the right” and “move left.” He said, “Any other strategy invites sure defeat.” Rudd, to be sure, wanted Obama to be victorious in his goals. Now why would that be? Rudd is a dedicated communist, yesterday, today and tomorrow, seeking to destroy the American way of life.

Jones is now a political consultant and a dedicated environmentalist. One of his clients is the Natural Resources Defense Council, a radical environmental group made up of some of the most far out and vicious lawyers ever assembled. Some on Capitol Hill have called them a street gang. They are revolutionaries in suits. They intimidate companies with their lawsuits and delight in suing the government to get their way. Their lawsuits help stop the drilling of American oil and American logging, and more. And when they win, they fill their coffers with taxpayer money as reimbursement for their legal costs. It’s the proper place for a former underground terrorist.

Dohrn is Ayres’ wife. They went underground together in the old days of the revolution. Today she continues to spread her brand of revolution by reaching into the community of families as a clinical law professor and director of the Children and Family Justice Center at Northwestern University. She forces children’s rights today to create tomorrow’s revolutionaries.

Still, what is the Obama connection to these dedicated revolutionaries? It’s perhaps ironic that all four former Weatherman terrorists today worked through an organization called “Movement for a Democratic Society.” That organization was the parent to another one called “Progressives for Obama.” They raised funds for Obama, promoted his candidacy, and helped to recruit activists to support him.

In more than forty years, Ayres, Dohrn, Rudd, and Jones were not heard from in the mainstream media. They had not been an issue in any presidential election. They did not openly promote or support a candidate, snubbing even John Kerry and Bill and Hillary Clinton as not being revolutionary enough for their agenda for the destruction of America. Until Barack Obama. These four are dedicated Marxist revolutionaries. Why Obama? You don’t need a Weatherman to know why. ●

## Outrageous IRS Commissioner False Claim: 'Whenever we can, we follow the law'

By [Mark J. Fitzgibbons](#)

Internal Revenue Service Commissioner John Koskinen made a disturbing statement before Congress that the IRS follows the law “whenever we can.”

As Thomas Lifson wrote, “The law, to Koskinen, evidently is a suggestion, not an ironclad requirement.” Actually, the situation is even worse than that.

Lernergate unveiled for the public a deeper, even more sinister problem at the IRS. The evidence of criminal wrongdoing in the Tax Exempt unit of the IRS, with its cover-up involving widespread destruction of evidence, is like one highlight reel of a bigger reality within the Service and government agencies generally.

The IRS, like other government agencies, is in fact is a perennial, institutional lawbreaker. Professor Paul Caron’s TaxProf Blog, for example, annually covers the report of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA) about IRS lawbreaking in asset seizures.

In the review period through June 2012, the IRS violated the law 30 percent of the time in asset seizure matters, up

from 22 percent the prior year. It was 38 percent the year before that.

These are stunning statistics made more disturbing by the lack of being cured. Property, right up there with life and liberty, is a fundamental right expressly identified in the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. This raises the obvious questions: What is the level of lawbreaking at the IRS when the stakes are not so high, and what lawbreaking at the IRS does TIGTA *not* look for?

Both Congress and the courts, however, have contributed to the underlying lawlessness at the IRS in ways that most Americans find offensive -- or would if they were to understand the abdication of power to the IRS.

The tax code is a behemoth loaded with goodies for special interests. It has become a social policy Christmas tree, and its complexities are not understood by IRS employees, never mind ordinary taxpayers. It is plagued and zealously guarded by powerful interests and lobbyists in Washington. The tax code is ripe for abuse.

# The Stealth Land-Grabs of Regional Planners

By John Anthony

The people of Polk County, Tennessee cherish their land. Farmers will tell you the soil conditions on every square inch of their acreage and landowners reverently discuss their properties' history. These people would never knowingly submit to strict zoning regulations or government control of their land. Yet, without their knowledge or their informed consent, that is exactly what is about to happen.

Thrive 2055 is a planning scheme to roll 16 counties in Tennessee, Alabama and Georgia into a single regional bundle effecting over 1 million residents. Drive distances to work, bike paths, light rail, mixed-use construction, and greenbelts will all converge into a unified scheme that is a carbon copy of plans unfolding across America. By forming a region, zoning decisions now made by local communities, will be under the authority of a powerful, regional board.

Most Polk County residents never heard of Thrive 2055. It is no wonder. Only a handful of residents attended planners' meetings. On a recent radio appearance, a spokesperson stated that after 2 years of community outreach, planners received just 1200 completed community surveys. Of the planned region's 1 million residents, 998,800 did not participate.

According to the planners, community members decide their plan's makeup and the surveys are critical for gathering their information. The anemic participation suggests very few are interested.

Nor have planners been forthcoming about who took the surveys. Were they stacked with the families of vendors who stand to profit from Thrive 2055, or possibly groups of opponents and their friends? Why are they continuing with a so-called 'community plan' with so little interest on the part of the community?

The planners have not answered one of these questions.

Community participation and full-disclosure about the good and bad of regional planning is fundamental if residents are to make informed decisions. Thrive 2055 offers no plan details. They claim the community decides the plan. What community? Are the 1200 who

took the survey deciding the plan for the remaining 998,800?

The few who have heard of the Thrive 2055 have scant idea of the outcomes beyond the colorful brochures and trendy planner-speak. Feel good phrases like, "educated people with good jobs living in a great place" do not inform people. Rather, they disarm them from questioning the underlying flaws of the process.

Since many people own their land and can produce a property deed, they feel their rights are safe. Where regionalism is involved, this fatal misunderstanding sets people up to lose their property rights, their home values and their way of life.

The government does not need to own land to govern what owners can do with it. Instead, they need to control the zoning of the land. That is what regional planning does. It turns zoning decisions over to unelected boards who must comply with the requirements of the federal grants that paid for the regional plan's implementation.

Already, in Chattanooga, the economic epicenter for Thrive 2055, planners are entertaining the idea of form-based codes. This is a programmable system for fast tracking zoning ordinances while marginalizing or altogether bypassing legislatures.

Nowhere do planners discuss these important facts with community members.

The community did not ask planners to sell them a regional plan that would swallow their communities' choices. It is incumbent on the planners to reach a representative number of people with full disclosure. It is not incumbent on the people to participate in a poorly defined and unsolicited scheme that endangers their property rights.

Perhaps it is time for Thrive 2055 to admit their failure to inform and engage the public, and simply to move on.

*John Anthony is the Director of Sustainable Freedom Lab and an expert on regional governments and their planners.*  
[www.sustainablefreedomlab.org](http://www.sustainablefreedomlab.org). ●

**IRS** *Continued from Page 4*

Again covered by TaxProf Blog, in 2010 TIGTA reported that the IRS wasted billions in stimulus and procurement spending. This past year, and without due process, the IRS seized tax refunds of the adult children of taxpayers who had been overpaid federal benefits decades ago. The IRS was recently caught opening emails without warrants.

The buck never really stops with our elected officials, who later seem surprised that these abuses are the result of power and discretion given to the IRS by Congress.

One area of IRS abuse caused by Congress and the courts falls under the Fourth Amendment. Cato Institute's 1981 paper *The IRS and Civil Liberties: Power of Search and Seizures* shows just how long this has been a problem.

The IRS has to large extent been exempted from the Fourth Amendment. This is a problem because it fosters politically motivated or other improperly targeted audits.

In *United States v. Powell* from 1964, the Supreme Court solidified that the IRS was somehow exempted from the probable cause standard. The Constitution, it seems, would "hamper" the IRS:

Although a more stringent interpretation is possible, one which would require some showing of cause for suspecting fraud, we reject such an interpretation because it might seriously hamper the Commissioner in carrying out investigations he thinks warranted, forcing him to litigate and prosecute appeals on the very subject which he desires to investigate, and because the legislative history of 7605 (b) indicates that no severe restriction was intended.

The court even relied on one of those contrived floor colloquies among two senators to allow the IRS to violate the Fourth Amendment under the guise of actually protecting taxpayers:

"Mr. WALSH. . . . So that up to the present time an inspector could visit the office of an individual or corporation and inspect the books as many times as he chose?

"Mr. PENROSE. And he often did so.

"Mr. WALSH. . . . And this provision of the Senate committee seeks to limit the inspection to one visit unless the commissioner indicates that there is necessity for further examination?

"Mr. PENROSE. That is the purpose of the amendment.

"Mr. WALSH. . . . I heartily agree with the beneficial results that the amendment will produce to the taxpayer.

"Mr. PENROSE. I knew the Senator would agree to the amendment, and it will go a long way toward relieving petty annoyances on the part of honest taxpayers." 61 Cong. Rec. 5855 (Sept. 28, 1921).

Remarkably, the Supreme Court held that Congress could simply legislate away constitutional protections:

"For us to import a probable cause standard to be enforced by the courts would substantially overshoot the goal which the legislators sought to attain. There is no intimation in the legislative history that Congress intended the courts to oversee the Commissioner's determinations to investigate."

In June this year, the Supreme Court in *United States v. Clarke* was handcuffed by precedent and ruled that the burden is on the taxpayer to prove bad faith audits. Given what we have seen with how the IRS operates when under congressional subpoenas and court scrutiny to produce emails, taxpayers are at the mercy of the IRS.

Justice Kagan's opinion at least leaves an opening: *The taxpayer is entitled to examine an IRS agent when he can point to specific facts and circumstances plausibly raising an inference of bad faith. Naked allegations of improper purpose are not enough.* The taxpayer must offer some credible evidence supporting his charge. But circumstantial evidence can suffice to meet that burden; *after all, direct evidence of another person's bad faith, at this threshold stage, will rarely if ever be available. And although bare assertion or conjecture is not enough, neither is a fleshed out case demanded: The taxpayer need only make a showing of facts that give rise to a plausible inference of improper motive. That standard will ensure inquiry where the facts and circumstances make inquiry appropriate, without turning every summons dispute into a fishing expedition for official wrongdoing.*

The irony lost on the Supreme Court, Congress and most certainly the IRS is that the Fourth Amendment's protections, including probable cause, evolved from abuses of searches and seizures for collecting taxes and suppressing what are now First Amendment rights.

The bottom line is that intentional lawbreaking within the IRS and other government agencies exists mostly because it can. Think of many bureaucrat 'Barack Obamas' taunting "so sue me" for violating the law. They are mostly insulated from consequences of lawbreaking because of a lack of congressional oversight of our monster-sized federal government, legal immunity, and the practical immunity of fear by their challengers -- even internal whistleblowers --

that they will face retribution.

Then there are the enablers. Democrats in Congress and progressives in the nonprofit community see the Lois Lerner situation as “missing the point.” The partisan *Nonprofit Quarterly* actually blames the lack of “adequate funding of the tax-exempt unit which has been starved for financial and staff resources,” and Lernergate shows the need for “stronger

rules and regulations concerning the definitions and operations of 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations.”

The big-government response to lawbreaking government, even when it infringes on constitutionally protected rights, always seems to be more regulation, more power, and more money. That misses the point that too often the IRS does not follow the law even when it can. ●

## EPA

*Continued from page 8*

between poor people and other Americans, all of whom have a stake in clean air. McCarthy’s language is more befitting a rabble-rouser than an agency administrator who is supposed make decisions based on science – not on emotions, politics, or racial and class divisiveness.

EPA’s climate and environmental policies appear destined to become even more insane. Just two months after calling climate change “the world’s most fearsome weapon of mass destruction” – and amid radical Islamist chaos and conflagrations across the Arab world – on September 3, Secretary of State John Kerry actually said “Muslim-majority countries are among the most vulnerable” to climate change. “Scriptures,” he claimed, make it clear that Americans have a “responsibility” to prevent this calamity.

McCarthy’s environmental justice claims also appear to be based on an ugly premise that undergirds many Obama Administration policies: that low-income people are victims and businesspeople are guilty of doing irreparable harm to their health and communities. (At least business people who are not aligned with Obama and don’t support liberal/Democrat agendas and candidates are guilty.)

Such sentiments pit low-income and working-class Americans against businesses. They are a divisive throwback to the 99% versus 1% protests. They ignore the fact that Mr. Kerry, climate politics bankroller Tom Steyer, and President Obama and his fundraiser dinner companions are all part of the 0.1 percent.

These sentiments also ignore the fact that businesspeople create jobs, give workers opportunities to earn a living for themselves and their families, and develop the employment and life skills to successfully climb the socio-economic ladder. Any company that violates environmental, health, safety, tax and other laws is penalized civilly or criminally – whereas all too often the regulators themselves escape any accountability or liability for accidental, incompetent and even deliberate actions that hurt their fellow citizens.

Ms. McCarthy’s statements also reflect the lengths to which EPA will go to continue expanding its reach and grow its bureaucracy. The agency cannot admit that it has nearly won the battle against dirty air, because thousands of

government regulators could lose their jobs. (Never mind the millions of Americans who lose their jobs because of EPA regulators and regulations.) To protect its legions of workers, justify its massive taxpayer-provided budget, and expand it many times over, EPA continues to move the goal posts, by invoking environmental justice, climate change and sustainability – for which there can never be objective goals and achievements, but only political considerations and subjective “feelings.”

Apparently Ms. McCarthy embraces the ideology that ignores the benefits of affordable energy and of a robust economy that creates jobs and opportunities. In her view, government controls are paramount, even when they stifle self-reliance, creativity and entrepreneurship, destroy jobs, harm human health and welfare, and cast low-income Americans as perpetual victims.

As Congress of Racial Equality national chairman Roy Innis emphasizes in his book, *Energy Keepers / Energy Killers: The new civil rights battle*: access to abundant, reliable, affordable energy is essential for individuals, families and communities that want to improve their lives and living standards.

Jason Riley puts it just as forcefully in his new book, *Please Stop Helping Us: How liberals make it harder for blacks to succeed*. Blacks must “develop the habits and attitudes that other groups had to develop” to improve their lives, he writes. The real secret to rolling back black unemployment and poverty is to change a culture that has allowed too many black children to grow up without the benefit of a father in the home, and that scorns black intellectual achievement as “acting white.”

Environmental protection should never be an “us vs. them” mentality. Such attitudes divide us, rather than bringing us together to improve our nation and world for everyone’s benefit. Ms. McCarthy should base environmental policy on sound science – and check her phony justice rhetoric at the door.

*Paul Driessen is senior policy analyst for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow ([www.CFACT.org](http://www.CFACT.org)) and Congress of Racial Equality, and author of *Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death*. ●*

# EPA's phony "environmental justice" caper

## The agency's real agenda: empire, control, and inverted justice for poor and minority families

By Paul Driessen

When it comes to energy, climate change, justice and transparency, the Obama Administration and its Environmental Protection Agency want it every possible way. Their only consistency is their double standards and their determination to slash hydrocarbon use, ensure that electricity prices "necessarily skyrocket," expand federal government command and control, and "fundamentally transform" America.

The president was thus eager to give away Seal Team secrets in bragging about "he" got Osama bin Laden. But in sharp contrast, there has been no transparency on Benghazi, Fast and Furious, the IRS scandal – or the data and analyses that supposedly support Environmental Protection Agency claims that "dangerous manmade climate change" is "not just a future threat; it is happening right now."

That rhetoric made it sound like EPA's Clean Power Plan was designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. However, in July EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy made it clear that her initiative "is not about pollution control." Rather, it is an "investment strategy" designed to spur renewable energy.

Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) opined that the agency does not have "explicit statutory authority" to steer investments toward "green" energy. Perhaps so, McCarthy replied, but her actions are legal under the Clean Air Act and within the agency's ever broadening purview – as are EPA's attempts to expand its mission and oversight authority by emphasizing "sustainable development" and "environmental justice."

The ironies abound. Wind, solar and ethanol power were intended to address "imminent oil and gas depletion" that ended with the hydraulic fracturing revolution, and prevent "global warming" that ended some 18 years ago. Now "investment" in these "alternative" energy technologies primarily involves greenback dollars taken from hard-working taxpayers and delivered to crony corporatists and campaign contributors who want to earn fat profits from climate scares, renewable energy mandates and subsidies.

A 2010 report suggested that EPA should begin to examine how it might "encourage the development of sustainable communities, biodiversity protection, clean energy, environmentally sustainable economic development and climate change." Talk about an open-ended invitation

to control our lives. A few weeks ago, EPA proclaimed "environmental justice" as yet another new *cause celebre*. The agency claims low-income groups are "disproportionately affected" by airborne pollution, and therefore it must tighten air quality standards yet again. The results will likely be a perverse opposite of true justice.

The agency's own Urban Air Toxics report chronicles a 66% reduction in benzene levels, 84% in outdoor airborne lead, 84% in mercury from coal-fueled power plants, and huge reductions in particulates (soot). "But we know our work is not done yet," McCarthy said. "At the core of EPA's mission is the pursuit of environmental justice – striving for clean air, water and healthy land for every American; and we are committed to reducing remaining pollution, especially in low-income neighborhoods."

Most air quality and health experts say America's air is completely safe. That's why EPA pays its Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee and the American Lung Association millions of dollars a year to say otherwise. It's why the EPA, CASAC and ALA refuse to discuss the \$353 billion in annual regulatory compliance costs that EPA alone imposes on U.S. businesses and families (out of a total federal regulatory bill of \$1.9 trillion), according to Competitive Enterprise Institute studies.

Those costs mean too many people lose their jobs. Their hopes, dreams, pride and work ethic are replaced by despair and dependency. If they can find new work, they are forced to work multiple jobs, commute longer distances, and spend greater portions of their incomes on gasoline and electricity. They suffer greater sleep deprivation, stress, depression, drug and alcohol abuse, spousal and child abuse, and poorer nutrition and medical care. More people have strokes and heart attacks; more die prematurely.

EPA's new 54.5-mile-per-gallon standards mean cars are lighter and less safe in accidents. That means more people suffer severe injuries or get killed. Minority and other poor families are especially at risk.

Every one of these impacts is also a matter of environmental justice. But EPA chooses to ignore them.

Moreover, nothing in the law says EPA has a right to declare that it intends to seek "justice" by drawing a line