



Freedom Report

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness...." – The Declaration of Independence

"The course of history shows that as a government grows, liberty decreases." – Thomas Jefferson

"A government that robs Peter to pay Paul, can always count on the support of Paul." – George Bernard Shaw

Frontiers of Freedom's Newsletter

www.ff.org

Issue No. 12 – January/February 2007

Foreign Oil: Is Ethanol a Real Solution?

Yes to Tax Cuts, No to Universal Health Care

Rogue Prosecutors: American Justice Defiled

Missile Defense: Reagan was Right!

FOF Media Appearances



Page 2



Page 3



Page 4



Page 6



Page 5

FOF's Ten Tenets



Page 6

Message from the President

Political Correctness and Political Extremism Run Amuck

Many on the Left work overtime to silence anyone who questions them or disagrees with them. Some even advocate prison, professional banishment and violence against those who don't tow the party line.

Political correctness is not a modern phenomena. Those who want to control the terms of debate and the minds of the masses have used political correctness throughout the Ages -- albeit by different names -- to stop debate and demand that everyone agree with their "consensus view." For example, Galileo Galilei, who lived more than 400 years ago and is



George Landrith, President of Frontiers of Freedom

widely viewed as the father of modern science, fought against political correctness and lost -- at least during his lifetime. His improvements to the telescope permitted him to disprove the almost universally held belief that the Earth was the center of the Universe.

Instead, Galileo concluded that the Earth orbits around the Sun -- something we now take for granted, but was quite controversial in his time. There were powers that did not welcome Galileo's questions or his scientific research. These early slaves to political correctness labeled Galileo's ideas dangerous and his theories irresponsible. They branded him a skeptic of widely accepted truth. Eventually, Galileo was tried on charges of heresy and he was imprisoned and forced to recant his views and forbidden

to defend or teach them.

Today, no serious person would defend the abuse of power used to silence and punish Galileo. Yet, that same political correctness is alive and well today. Prominent politicians, UN backed scientists, and environmental extremists argue that mankind is causing catastrophic global warming and demand that government impose draconian measures to save mankind from a never-ending parade of horrible disasters -- disease, floods, droughts, storms, heat, cold, famine, and pestilence.



Galileo Galilei, lived more than 400 years ago and was an early victim of political correctness.

But they don't stop at merely advocating their doomsday theories. They work overtime to silence anyone who questions them. Some even advocate prison, professional banishment and violence against those who don't tow the party line. Not much has changed since Galileo's time.



Ellen Goodman, despite her mainstream appearance, asserts those who don't accept her views are no different than "Holocaust deniers."

Commentator, Ellen Goodman, recently wrote, "global warming deniers are now on a par with Holocaust deniers..." Currently, the most famous Holocaust denier is Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad who has the curious distinction of simultaneously denying the Holocaust while advocating a second one. According to Goodman, those who question the flimsy science surrounding global warming are no different than Ahmadinejad. So much for civil discourse or serious scientific debate!

Environmental writer David Roberts wrote that for those who question global warming theories, "we should have war crimes trials for these bastards -- some sort of climate Nuremberg." Of course, the Nuremberg trials were held after World War II to bring high-level Nazi war criminals to justice for their systematic torture and execution of millions of Jews and others Nazis labeled as political enemies. To Roberts, ideas contrary to his own and scientific debate are a crime -- a war crime no less!

Columnist George Monbiot, complaining about the airline industry's use of fossil fuels, wrote: "[E]very time someone dies as a result of floods in Bangladesh, an airline executive should be dragged out of his office and drowned." Monbiot apparently believes that there were no floods in Bangladesh prior to the advent of commercial airlines -- a thoroughly silly notion. But his call to violence is revealing.

Even Galileo's tormentors did not threaten death.

The Weather Channel's Heidi Cullen called for the American Meteorological Society to revoke the professional certification of any weatherman who does not agree with her about global warming. This would all sound eerily familiar to Galileo.

In a letter, U.S. Senators Jay Rockefeller and Olympia Snowe demanded that an energy company stop supporting scientific research that casts doubt on the UN's global warming agenda. But their letter is far more sinister than a demand to stop funding speech the senators don't like. It was also a not too subtle threat to punish those who don't tow the politically correct line. If one takes the First Amendment seriously, government officials ought not be telling people what they can think or support.

The point of free speech is to encourage debate so that the best ideas rise to the top. Healthy debate is needed. Science is about testing evidence and theories in an open and free debate. But for far too many, science is just another political weapon to maintain power and shut down opposing views.

If you don't believe me, just ask Galileo.

Foreign Oil: Is Ethanol a Real Solution?

If you've been paying attention to the news, you know that America imports a lot of oil (about two-thirds of the oil we use is imported). You also know that one of the most commonly recited solutions to imported oil is home grown ethanol made from corn. The argument goes something like this -- we have a lot of corn and if we turn it into fuel (ethanol), we won't need to import so much foreign oil. But is this a realistic solution? Will it significantly reduce our dependence on foreign oil? Does it make sense for government (both state and federal) to spend billions of taxpayer dollars to subsidize ethanol? While ethanol and newer biofuel innovations hold great promise, the answer to these questions is currently, "No."

First, at current prices, ethanol costs about a dollar more per gallon than gasoline. To make matters worse, a gallon of gasoline and a gallon of ethanol are not equal. A car will go about 33% farther on a gallon of gas than it will on a gallon of ethanol. So ethanol costs more and carries you fewer miles. Additionally, only a very small percentage of cars on the road today can burn a gasoline mixture that contains more than 10% ethanol. And engines that burn primarily ethanol won't last as long as traditional gasoline or diesel engines because ethanol is corrosive and rough on engines.

Second, University of Minnesota researchers note that if we used every last ear of corn in the U.S. to make ethanol, it would replace at most about 12% of the gasoline that we



U.S. Senators Jay Rockefeller (D-WV) and Olympia Snowe (R-ME) misused their political offices to threaten people and demand they stop supporting research the Senators don't like.



Heidi Cullen argues that weather forecasters who don't agree with her should have their professional certifications revoked.

currently use. However, once you take into account the energy required to grow the corn; produce the required fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides; convert the corn into ethanol; and transport the ethanol which can't be moved in the traditional petroleum pipelines due to its corrosive nature -- ethanol would only reduce our need for gasoline by about 2 percent. And that is still assuming that we divert every last kernel of corn in the U.S. into ethanol production. Other experts say that ethanol would provide even less than the estimated 2 percent because more energy is required to produce a gallon of ethanol than can be obtained from that same gallon of ethanol. Whether it's two percent or zero, either way ethanol does far less at present to reduce our need for foreign oil than proponents would have you believe.



An ethanol plant

Of course, it is not realistic to use *all* of our corn for ethanol because corn has many other uses -- food, sweeteners, cosmetics, livestock and animal feed, etc. If large amounts of corn were shifted to ethanol production by government mandates, the cost of food, poultry and meat, and anything made from corn would cost dramatically more. Americans would pay twice -- once as taxpayers subsidizing ethanol production which is not currently viable without government subsidies, and a second time as consumers paying the higher cost of food, meat, anything that is sweetened, and any product that uses or contains corn.

Third, corn production has environmental impacts of its own. Large quantities of fertilizer, herbicides and pesticides are required to grow corn. These chemicals have a significant impact on water quality and wild life habitat. Additionally, as government

mandates more ethanol, more land will be converted to corn production and taken from conservation usage which could adversely impact wildlife.



The point isn't that ethanol is bad or that it will never work. The point is that government mandates requiring ethanol are bad and will not work. What will work is more research and development of alternative fuels and technologies, including ethanol. With time and research to prove what works and what does not, the marketplace will produce the answers. And whatever that solution may be, it won't saddle taxpayers or consumers with unnecessary costs.

The mad rush on Capitol Hill to increase the national renewable fuels standard is misguided. It won't reduce our dependence on foreign oil. It will cost taxpayers and consumers a lot of money. And it has many environmental and economic impacts that are not fully understood. The bottom line is that government should not mandate fuels or technologies that are not economically viable.

**Yes to Tax Cuts,
No to Universal
Healthcare**

President Bush has submitted his \$2.9 trillion budget to Congress. Among other things, the proposal would make permanent his first term tax cuts. Congress should take action to meet that goal.

On the same day former Senator John Edwards, a Democrat presidential

candidate, made public his plan for universal health care, which would require all businesses to provide health care, oblige all Americans to have it and would impose tax increases to meet the anticipated cost of \$120 billion a year. Unlike Bush's tax proposal, Edwards' idea merits a discussion that should last only long enough to deliver a sound rejection.

America's economy is on the upswing and tax increases would damage the progress that has been made. In December, unemployment was 4.5 percent, which is below 2005's average of 5.1 percent. After tax income per person has risen more than \$2,800 during the Bush Administration. Failing to make the tax cuts permanent would impose a major tax hike on American families who are using their revenue for saving, spending and investing.



Presidential hopeful John Edwards

During testimony before the Senate Committee on the Budget, Heritage Foundation scholar Stuart Butler explained that the key to a sound economy is not to increase taxes and to curb unneeded and unwise entitlement spending. For example, the 2003 Medicare senior citizen drug bill should not have been passed as written. That entitlement went far beyond providing assistance to seniors who needed help to purchase their prescription medications. The legislation gives aid to every retiree who is on Medicare, including millions of seniors who are able to pay for their drugs on their own. Public resources should not be used to help those who can help themselves.

Butler said, "If we were to balance the budget without tackling entitlements, and maintained discretionary spending at the same proportion of GDP today,

federal taxes would have to rise to almost 30 percent of GDP by 2050 – two-thirds higher than today. Add in state and local taxes of approximately 10 percent and our children and grandchildren will face total taxes similar to low-growth, high-unemployment Europe.”

Implementing the Edwards’ universal health care proposal would only add to the gargantuan entitlement burden taxpayers already shoulder. Does anyone believe the \$120 billion annual projection for the program would not balloon significantly like every other government entitlement? The cost of the senior prescription drug program offers insight as to what universal health care would look like. When assessing projected government expenditures we would do well to recall an article from the January 30, 2004 edition of the Boston Globe that reported, “The new Medicare prescription drug benefit will cost about 35 percent more than Congress anticipated... The prescription drug plan ... will cost about \$540 billion over 10 years, instead of the \$396 billion projected by the law Congress approved last year....”

But even aside from the costs, America should not pursue universal health care. Citizens living in nations that have created such a structure find themselves paying for a system that forces them to wait months for treatment. Robert Moffit, and the Heritage Foundation found that in Canada individuals have died waiting for surgery and others had been removed from a list because they had become medically unsuitable for surgery while waiting their turn.

A study released by the Cato Institute, reported, “Countries with national health insurance limit health care spending by limiting supply. They do so primarily by imposing global budgets on hospitals and area health authorities and skimping on high-tech

equipment. The result is rationing by waiting. In Britain, with a population of almost 60 million, government statistics show that more than 1 million are waiting to be admitted to hospitals at any one time. ...In New Zealand, with a population of about 3.6 million, almost 111,000 people are on waiting lists for surgery and other treatments.”



The rationing of health care in these countries is government policy. Cato reported, “Canadian patients waited an average 8.3 weeks in 2003 from the time they were referred to a specialist until the actual consultation, and another 9.5 weeks before treatment, including surgery.”

This is not a scenario the United States should emulate. Nevertheless, some maintain universal health care is desirable and cite as evidence a recent survey that found that Canadians live longer than U.S. citizens, have fewer instances of diabetes and high blood pressure and that U.S. citizens tend to be more obese. But the health problems mentioned in the survey are more related to lifestyle than access to a physician.

Commenting on the study in the Wall Street Journal, Dr. David Gratzer, of the Manhattan Institute, wrote, “We shouldn’t confuse problems in public health with flaws in health care systems. Americans may be heavier than Canadians but this speaks more to genetics, diet, exercise and culture than to the accessibility or inaccessibility of health services.”

Making Bush’s tax cuts permanent, allowing people to keep more of their own paychecks, reducing unnecessary entitlement spending and pursuing health care reforms like expanding association health plans so small businesses can better afford health care coverage would do far more for America’s health care situation than higher taxes and a costly and inefficient universal program run by the government.



Rogue Prosecutors: American Justice Defiled

A pattern of abuse is spreading and escalating throughout America, at the hands of out of control public prosecutors, who are pursuing their “duties” with no intention towards justice, but with personal and political agendas. Since the perpetrators of this malignancy work so closely in league with those who must hold them accountable, little has been done to restrain or control them. To date, only cursory efforts are being suggested to address the problem. Those entrusted to enforce the law must be held to the highest standards of conduct, lest by exceeding the boundaries of that law they become the worst version of the threat they are sworn to avert.

The loudest and most publicized event of this nature involves Durham County North Carolina prosecutor Michael Nifong and the Duke University Lacrosse team. Details of Nifong’s malfeasance have come to light, representing a degree of injustice and malice so outrageous that Nifong has finally been forced to recuse himself from the case and the State Bar is considering disciplinary action against him.

Yet in the course of his malevolent pursuit of the lacrosse players, he engaged in no less a crime than to knowingly suppress vital evidence sufficient to totally vindicate the accused. Had any private citizen been involved in so extreme of an effort to distort a case through the suppression of highly relevant evidence, that citizen would surely be on his way to the “big house” for obstruction of justice.

It is noteworthy that in the same week Michael Nifong was forced to abandon the Duke Lacrosse case, the trial of Lewis I. “Scooter” Libby has begun. Libby, who has already been convicted in the court of public opinion is accused of lying during testimony before a grand jury investigation of the Valerie Plame - Joe Wilson “scandal.”

During two years of testimony, Libby transposed a couple of dates and events and thus, we are told, for the good of society, he must be put away. Yet recently revealed information inarguably proves that Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald knew from the beginning 1) that no underling crime had been committed, and 2) that Libby had not revealed Valerie Plame's inconsequential employment status to the media.

Nevertheless, Fitzgerald zealously pursued this non-criminal "investigation." In the end, all he could muster was a comparatively negligible accusation of perjury against Libby, with no possibility of Libby's actions having compromised Plame's position, or national security. Even if a conviction is won at the trial level, it would seem on appeal, this case has no substance. It is merely politics.

Even Nifong as bad as he is, did not engage in such excesses. Despite having full knowledge that no security breach had been committed by Libby, in the post-indictment press conference, once in front of the cameras, Fitzgerald treated the entire episode as a great and sinister effort to undermine a covert CIA agent. Yet he knew it all to be false. By any standard, Fitzgerald's deceit vastly eclipsed the presumed missteps of Libby.

Ultimately, Fitzgerald perjured himself to a far greater degree than Libby ever could have, though no statute or directive, other than his oath of office, apparently holds him to accountability. Clearly, in Fitzgerald's world such quaint concepts as oaths, fairness and candor are completely situational.



Mike Nifong

As amazing as it might seem, Fitzgerald's unethical conduct pales in comparison to that of Travis County Texas Prosecuting Attorney Ronnie Earl, who last spring was able to bring then House Majority Leader Tom Delay under indictment. Earl actually announced to the public that his motives were political – leaving little doubt that he was a political player, rather than a careful prosecutor.

Having been unable to convince more than one grand jury of any criminal action by Delay, even after angrily threatening the jurors, Earl engaged in an action that can only be termed "grand jury shopping" whereby he simply moved from one panel to another until he was able to find a grand jury that would uphold his accusations against Delay. This is truly unprecedented.



Patrick Fitzgerald

Such a reprehensible abuse of the powers of his office did not represent any departure from Earl's past behavior. As a shameless partisan, his past track record is one of selective inquiry, based on the political alignment of his intended target. In one particularly despicable case, his hunt was suddenly followed by a complete reversal, once the organization in his cross-hairs agreed to financially support a cause of his choosing.



Ronnie Earl

Those who exploit the law as a weapon with which to bludgeon their fellow citizens for personal or political gain ought not to be allowed to escape accountability. The unscrupulous actions of such

out of control prosecutors as Nifong, Fitzgerald, and Earl show difficulty in checking the powers of those who are entrusted with upholding justice. Unscrupulous rogue prosecutors can be a greater threat to our society than the "criminals" they claim to be pursuing.

Missile Defense: Reagan Was Right!

On March 23, 1983, President Ronald Reagan revealed his vision to protect America from missile attack by asking: "What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?"

With this question, the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) was born. Predictably, the liberal chattering class in Washington – already in near hysterics over Reagan's "evil empire" remark made just weeks earlier – greeted Reagan's missile defense initiative with derision, scorn, and fear. However, Reagan knew that the arms control and treaty approach had simply allowed the Soviets to amass a hug arsenal of nuclear missiles pointed directly at the U.S. and

Frontiers of Freedom Media Report

In November and December of 2006, Frontiers' senior staff made more than 192 appearances on news and talk format programs and were seen or heard in all 50 states discussing tax reform, national security, energy prices and energy policy,



global warming, missile defense, protection of constitutional rights, internet regulation, the global war on terror, environmental regulations, lawsuit abuse reform, and the ACLU's anti-American and anti-constitutional agenda.

our allies. Their arsenal was growing as was the risk and the arms control treaties were not solving the problem.



The work started by Reagan was carried on by President George H.W. Bush, but essentially shelved by President Bill Clinton. But in 1998, Congress forced Clinton to give at least modest support to missile defense.

When George W. Bush became president, he renewed America's commitment to national missile defense. Because the ABM Treaty prohibited further progress on missile defense, Bush pulled out of the it – precisely as the treaty's terms permitted. Bush stated: "No treaty that prevents us from addressing today's threats, that prohibits us from pursuing promising technology to defend ourselves, our friends and our allies is in our interests or in the interests of world peace."

Bush explained why in the 21st Century, missile defense was even more important than previously, "This is still a dangerous world--a less certain, less predictable one. More nations have nuclear weapons and still more have nuclear aspirations. Many have chemical and biological weapons." These technologies are being spread to "some of the world's least-responsible states."

Reagan and Bush were right about the need to develop defenses against missile attack. We must defend ourselves against foreseeable and dangerous risk. We cannot merely rely upon the "good intentions" of our enemies – an oxymoron if there ever was one.

Though it received little press, America now has a working missile defense system. On January 29, Reuters reported: "Within a year, the U.S. missile defense system should be able to guard against enemy attacks, while testing new technologies, said Brig. Gen. Patrick O'Reilly, deputy director of the U.S. Missile Defense Agency. The United States activated the ground-based system last summer when North Korea launched one long-range and six short-range missiles."

The latest test results are stunning: "Gen. O'Reilly said the missile defense system, which includes sea-based and ground-based interceptors, and powerful X-Band radar systems, achieved success in 14 of 15 flight tests. The United States has 14 interceptors in Alaska and two in California, primarily to counter North Korea. O'Reilly said the number in Alaska would grow to 21 within eight months."

But the good news doesn't stop there. The Air Force Times reports: "The YAL-1A ... known as the Airborne Laser, will test-fire its low-power laser in flight for the first time as part of a long-term test phase at the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif." The Airborne Laser, part of the Missile Defense Agency's Ballistic Missile Defense System, is designed to identify, track and shoot down enemy ballistic missiles shortly after they launch.

Yet, the mainstream media and several liberal icons have consistently argued that missile defense was nothing more than science fiction. An Accuracy in Media study found that in the "six-month period commencing in December 1991, the New York Times ran 17 anti-SDI articles, op-ed pieces and editorials denouncing SDI as, among other things, a "bizarre, costly concoction ... science fiction ... lunacy ... sheer fantasy...." Additionally, the Times gave front-page coverage to Teddy Kennedy's Senate speech deriding SDI as "Star Wars," likening the idea to a science fiction movie or a video arcade game, and thus providing SDI foes their slogan-of-choice."

So who was right and who was wrong? The New York Times was dead wrong. Ted Kennedy was dead wrong. Ronald Reagan was dead on right!

So, call it "Star Wars" if you like, but give thanks to a man who saw the future so much clearer than the liberal leaders of his time and gave America the courage to think beyond conventional opinion. Today, we must continue in that vein. We must constantly develop new and better defenses because our enemies are always seeking new ways to attack us.

FOF's Ten Tenets

- The most basic moral obligation of the federal government is to defend America, which requires military, economic, and moral preparation and strength.
- Property rights and economic freedom are the fertile soil in which all other rights grow and thrive. The environment is best protected and preserved where free markets thrive, capitalism is robust, and property rights are respected.
- The Constitution's enumerated and limited powers, checks and balances, federalism, separation of powers, and guarantee of basic rights are fundamental to America's freedom.
- "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness" and each of the rights guaranteed in the Constitution are necessary to the foundation of freedom – including the right to bear arms and to not be deprived of property without just compensation.
- The courts have a constitutional duty to faithfully and strictly interpret the law and the Constitution and may not invent or create new law.
- Justice is the equal treatment of all *individuals* regardless of ethnicity or religion. Fabricating *group* rights undermines individual freedom and civil rights.
- Taxes may be legitimately imposed *only* to the extent necessary to pay for the essential and constitutionally permitted activities of government. To tax more than this is a form of tyranny and extortion.
- Government mandates and regulations too often exceed constitutional authority, waste resources, erode freedom, diminish property rights, and produce harmful unintended consequences.
- To remove sound science from public policy is legislative and regulatory malpractice. To employ junk science in public policy is unethical and irresponsible.
- Basic standards of morality and civic virtue are essential to maintaining America's economic strength, military might, and freedom. Parents and families, not government, are responsible to rear and educate their children.

FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM

Headquarters:
P.O. Box 69 • Oakton, Virginia 22124

Capitol Hill:
209 Pennsylvania Ave. SE, Suite 2100
Washington, D.C. 20003

Ph. 703-246-0110 • www.ff.org • info@ff.org

© 2007 Frontiers of Freedom