An Environment of Treason

by the staff of ecologic *magazine*

What are the "elitists" of the previous article up to? What are they doing "for" — and "to" — us? A May 13, 1997, Wall Street Journal editorial by Henry I. Miller offers a clue:

"When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, Americans were overwhelmingly convinced that our national interests were at stake in the Middle East. But how would they feel about sending U.S. troops overseas to enforce limits on carbon dioxide emissions?

"That may seem surreal, but it's just the sort of scenario foreshadowed in 'Environmental Diplomacy,' a slick 10,000-word document released by the State Department in April. With forewords by Vice President Al Gore and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, its message is that today, it's not tyrannical governments, not state-sponsored genocide or terrorism, not poverty or disease, but environmental problems that define America's foreign policy challenges.

"The remedy proposed by Mr. Gore and the State Department is to redefine the relevant measures of economic activity. The purposes are clear: to enable governments to obscure the costs of environmental protection by calling them 'benefits' and to force businesses to list wealth-creating activity as societal 'costs'. But the effects will be profound: Companies around the world will see their regulatory expenses skyrocket and their markets shrink. Consumers will pay inflated prices for fewer products and higher taxes to support bloated bureaucracies.

"The Clinton administration already is implementing the State Department's environmental initiatives in a number of ways — in negotiations of treaties and other agreements; in bilateral and regional diplomacy; in foreign aid from the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development: in the CIA's commitment to "environmental intelligence"; and in new "regional environmental hubs" within certain U.S. embassies, which will preach the gospel according to Mr. Gore.

"Thanks to this co-opting of U.S. foreign policy, Mr. Gore's eco-battiness will metastasize not only domestically but around the world — courtesy of the official U.S. diplomatic apparatus and the American taxpayer. We need to end this unhappy marriage of pseudo-environmentalism and diplomacy before it's too late."

While the Wall Street Journal expressed concern, it underestimated the truth and consequences of the environmental movement. The following article is primarily from the March/April, 1997 issue of "ecologic", and warns that environmentalism is far too dangerous to be dismissed as mere "eco-battiness".

The 6th session of the Ad Hoc Group on the Berlin Mandate (AGBM) finished its work on March 7, 1997, in Bonn, Germany. When the final gavel fell, the world was much closer to the "wrenching transformation" Al Gore called for in his 1992 book, *Earth in the Balance.*[1] His recommendation that the internal combustion engine be eliminated by the year 2017 is one step closer to reality. The protocol being negotiated by the AGBM will begin a phaseout of fossil fuel energy in *developed* countries like the United States.

Develop*ing* nations, however, are not bound by the protocol. Nations such as Mexico, Brazil, China, North Korea, Asian countries, and all the small developing countries will remain free to welcome industries from developed nations to continue to

emitting all the greenhouse gases they want. Despite cries of protest from American labor unions, trade associations, and industry groups, the Clinton-appointed negotiators, have already agreed to accept the legally binding protocol.

Whatever the final target and timetable established in the protocol (which is to undergo two more negotiating sessions before adoption in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997), it will require America to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by about *half* – by either 2005 or 2010. To reach such an ambitious target, draconian restrictions must begin almost immediately. "Carbon taxes", such as those proposed by the EPA's National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), will be the primary method used to reduce fossil fuel use. Gasoline is expected to increase between $0.50 and $0.75 per gallon almost immediately, with annual increases required until fossil fuel is no longer an option. Coal, which produces about 85% of all electricity in America, will experience the same kind of taxation.

"Carbon taxes" are just the beginning. Policies and Measures (PAM's in UN-speak) are being devised which will reach into every corner of what were once thought of as private decisions. Which car will you buy? It won't matter, all cars will be required to achieve 20 kilometers/liter — about 62 mpg. It will look like a toy, drive like an eggbeater, and be guaranteed to put a crick in the joints of the most nimble drivers and passengers.

Want to build a new home? It will have to meet standards set in Kyoto, Japan, which stipulate where it may be built, what materials it may contain, what R-value the insulation must have, and (if Greenpeace has its way) what plants may be used for landscaping. China, the G-7 countries and Greenpeace want the protocol linked to the Conventions on Biological Diversity and "Desertification", both of which ignore private property rights in their requirements to protect biodiversity.

The importance of this protocol cannot be overstated. If ratified by the U.S. Senate, it will become the law of the *world*, with the UN in command of its implementation and enforcement. If it is *not* ratified by the U.S. Senate, it will likely come unraveled.

Al Gore and the Clinton Administration are pushing the protocol forward. All relevant government departments have been instructed to begin a propaganda campaign. Seven "Town Meetings" are planned, where Undersecretary of State for Global Affairs Timothy Wirth will take his dog-and-pony show to different cities and drum up support for the protocol. The road show will culminate in a special White House Conference on Climate Change in Washington in November to provide a media platform to launch Al Gore's trip to Kyoto where he will pledge the support of America and urge the delegates to adopt the protocol.

There will be incredible political pressure from the environmental organizations leveled at the Senate. Skeptics will be demeaned. Opponents will be labeled "anti-earth" and worse. International pressure will come from the Europe and other countries. This is one battle the Kyoto Protocol proponents cannot lose. But it is one they *must* lose if America is to retain its sovereignty.

What can we do?

When the Senate ratified the Montreal Protocol, which banned freon, few Americans had ever heard of the Vienna Convention on Ozone Depleting substances, and even fewer knew that the Montreal Protocol was a legal instrument prepared by the UN to ban the widely-used refrigerant. There was almost no dissent when then-Senator Al Gore asked his colleagues to ratify the protocol to save the world from another imagined calamity.

Americans knew nothing of the Montreal Protocol until freon was no longer available. Not so with the Kyoto Protocol. We are watching it being negotiated. We are proclaiming its dangers to all that will listen. We are urging the delegates to the negotiating sessions to slow down, back up, and take another look. But we must do more. The only chance to retain some semblance of private property rights, free markets, and national sovereignty, rests with the people who will get involved and make sure that their Senator opposes the Kyoto Protocol.

National sovereignty vs. global governance

NATO was created to defend Western Europe from the threat

of invasion from communist Russia and the Warsaw Pact nations. That threat no longer exists. NATO could be dissolved, or at least, severely downsized, without exposing Western Europe to any military threat. Is NATO being downsized? No, it is being expanded. Why?

The world's largest reservoir of low-sulfur coal is under Utah's Escalante Canyon has been closed from any possibility of future development. World demand now must be satisfied by the Lippo-controlled reservoir in Indonesia. Why?

American demand for coal and petroleum will be reduced by as much as one-half if the Clinton-supported Climate Change Protocol is adopted. Chinese demand for coal and petroleum will double or triple, since China and 130 other "developing" nations are not restricted by the climate change protocol. Why?

Former Clinton transition team member, Gustave Speth, told a World Conference in Rio de Janeiro in March, 1997, that "Global governance is here, here to stay and – driven by economic and environmental globalization – global governance will inevitably expand."

Why? Because the White House – beginning with the President and Vice President – and reaching throughout the policy-making positions in all major departments, is filled with people who are committed to global "governance".

When Sarah McClenden asked the President if he could use his influence to quiet the rising tide of concern about UN intrusion, he chose not to do so. Instead, he pointed to the hard decisions that lie ahead as national sovereignty collides with global governance ambition.

Those decisions are now upon America. National Sovereignty is colliding with global governance every day. While claiming that global "governance" is *not* global "government", policies to regulate and control human activity are promulgated at the UN and administered by the White House, *without* public debate, and without Congressional oversight or even awareness.

During the Committee hearings on Don Young's (Rep.-Alaka) American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, many committee members had no idea what a "Biosphere Reserve" was, or that forty-seven Biosphere Reserves already exist in America. The bill simply required the administration get congressional approval before future designations were made; the President vowed to *veto* the bill if it were enacted. Why? Because the White House is committed to global governance.

U.S. *negotiators* (not elected representatives and senators) to the Montreal Protocol were most responsible for the elimination of freon in America. It is U.S. *negotiators* to the Kyoto Climate Change Protocol who will determine whether legally binding reductions in American energy use will be required. Our Undersecretary of State for Global Affairs, Timothy Wirth, has already declared America's support for the protocol.

Our Constitution did not anticipate a government that conspired with foreign agents to diminish individual freedom and trample on private property rights. It has no provision for transferring final authority of trade policies to the World Trade Organization. It has no language that authorizes an "international zone" between Mexico and the U.S.A. instead of an international border, or global "governance" instead of constitutional government — a government and Constitution our President has sworn to defend.

Elitists in action

Throughout the nation, a massive, coordinated effort is underway to transform America's cities and towns into "sustainable communities," designed to be "islands of human habitat" surrounded by government-managed buffer zones which surround huge areas of wilderness, off limits to humans. If the ideal plan is realized, as much as *half* the land area in North America will be restored to "pre-Columbian" wilderness and protected *forever* from human activity. According to the plan's primary author, Dr. Reed F. Noss, most of the remaining land must be "managed" for conservation objectives with only islands of human habitat.

When the plan first appeared in a 1992 special edition of *Wild Earth,* almost no one took the bizarre scheme seriously. Of course, only the elite insiders knew that the UN Environment Program was developing an 1140-page document which em-

braced the scheme and said it was necessary to protect biodiversity for future generations. Only the insiders knew that Agenda 21, developed for Earth Summit II at Rio de Janeiro, already contained the master plan to implement the scheme. Only the insiders knew that the UN Commission on Sustainable Development had already been planned, with provisions for implementing Agenda 21 in every nation. Only the insiders knew that the UN Conference on Human Settlements would present a Plan of Action that would detail the structure of "sustainable communities" at Habitat II in Istanbul.

The insiders knew. And they knew full well that Americans would never accept such a bizarre plan if it were presented in all its glory.

That's why the full-blown plan has never been presented. That's why the Convention on Biological Diversity calls for "a system of protected areas" rather than for the *Wildlands Project* called for in the *Global Biodiversity Assessment.* That's why the UN Commission on Sustainable Development created a mechanism to implement the plan incrementally, rather than to face an up-or-down decision by the U.S. Senate or the American people. That's why, in almost *every* community in America, the plan is being presented as sugar and spice and everything nice, rather than the "wrenching transformation" of America that it really is.

Taxes for treason

As prescribed by Agenda 21, the President's Council on Sustainable Development has recommended financial incentives to communities that engage in the "sustainable communities" process. In other words, the government is endeavoring to provide tax money collected from American citizens to help environmental activists to cripple or destroy American businesses and our standard of living. It also recommends financial disincentives (penalties) for those communities that do not participate. Consequently, the following notice appeared in the *Federal Register,* July 1, 1996:

"EPA and its state and local partners are reinventing the way environmental protection is accomplished in the United States. The Agency recognizes that environmental progress will not be achieved solely by regulation, but also requires individual, institutional and corporate responsibility, commitment and stewardship. The Sustainable Development Challenge Grant program is consistent with other *community*-based efforts the EPA has introduced . . . [and] is also a step in implementing Agenda 21, the Global Plan of Action on Sustainable Development, agreed to by the United States at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992."

The federal government offers grants to communities to begin what is called the "visioning process." The grants may go to a unit of government or a "non-government organization" (NGO) like a 503(c)(3) nonprofit corporation or trust which may be funded by government but is not similarly restricted by the Constitution. Typically, a local NGO will initiate the activity by contacting selected local government officials, a few business leaders, and other NGOs and develop an agreement to begin the process. The group will then create a "stakeholder council" consisting of *carefully selected* individuals from across the community, or frequently, across communi*ties*. The next step is to identify the "coordinating NGO". It may be the initiating organization, or a new organization may be formed. But the coordinating NGO becomes the grant recipient and oversees the development of the community's "visioning process".

In Chicago, San Francisco, Chattanooga, Racine, and many other cities, the process is well underway. In more remote locations, such as Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, the process is also at work. The Maine Sierra Club provided the funding for Michael Kinsley of the Rocky Mountain Institute in Colorado, to come to Maine to explain why the Chamber of Commerce's Economic Development Plan needed to be improved. In what was called an "Economic Renewal" seminar, Kinsley laid out an eight-step process to make the community "sustainable."

Maine's Piscataquis County newspaper reported, "The process is carried out by a small team of residents with the help of a larger group of volunteers, and sometimes with a professional facilitator . . . . The first Economic Renewal step is to mobilize a community by actively recruiting participants for the process, people who represent a wide range of interests. After that, participants are asked to envision the community's preferred future using the 'consensus-building' method."

All politics is "local"

In Washington state, the Discovery Institute is continuing its efforts to develop "sustainable communities" within Cascadia, a rapidly developing Bioregion stretching from Oregon to the Yukon. The Institute sponsored a Conference in January in which Bill Ruckelshaus stressed sustainable development and stricter environmental regulations. He was chosen to chair a special committee of more than 100 influential people to "build a consensus" and make recommendations for change. Ruckleshaus is the former EPA Administrator who

banned DDT, despite recommendations to the contrary from his own 300-member scientific advisory commission. He is a member of the President's Council on Sustainable Development, and is also the Chair of The Enterprise for the Environment, a new group created by the Center for Strategic and International Studies. The group's work is coordinated by an assortment of think-tanks including the Aspen Institute, Resources for the Future, and the Keystone Center which is funded, in part, by the U.S. Department of Interior.

In central Florida, the Center for Construction and Environment at the University of Florida recently concluded its 2nd Annual Sustainable Development Seminar which focused, in part, on Alachua and Marion Counties. "Sustainable Alachua County" is the sponsoring NGO; it's supported by the League of Women Voters and the United Nations Association.

Similar activities are taking place all across the country. Most local residents are totally unaware of the activity until a news report appears about a past event. News reports inevitably present the events as another "Economic Renewal", or community improvement effort. Rarely, if ever, is the activity associated with Agenda 21, or with the UN. Even the seminar *participants* are rarely told that the seminars or "visioning sessions" are, in fact, intended to implement the UN's global agenda. Neither the process nor the technique is accidental. Both are well designed to mesh with the on-going restructuring (masquerading as "reforms") of the United Nations. The UN system is seeking to bypass *national* governments and become the provider of "security for the people."

Our Global Neighborhood, the report of the UN-funded Commission on Global Governance, discusses in detail how this major conceptual shift is to be brought about (See: *ecologic,* Jan./Feb. 1996). One important mechanism is the creation of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI). Under Rule 61 of the UN General Assembly, *state* and *local* government officials have been elevated to the status of "civil society" participants in UN negotiations. In other words, the UN is using *local* officials to skirt the national Constitution.

On a broader scale, Al Gore's "wrenching transformation" of society is being implemented across national borders and in other nations. A little-known provision of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), included the "La Paz Agreement." It surfaced in January, 1997 and calls for a 60-mile strip north and south of the U.S.-Mexican border from the Pacific to the Gulf of Mexico which is to be called "Border Region 21." The project creates a new NGO called the Border Environment Cooperation Project (BECP) and is funded by the North American Development Bank. Information about the project is scarce. Arizona news reporter, Mike Allen, and California investigative reporter, Karren Bixman, have reported that in order to achieve sustainable development, the agreement gives the coordinating NGO extraordinary authority over education, land use, and resource management throughout the area.[2]

World Heritage Sites

In India, the sustainable development agenda is more deeply entrenched. A suit was filed by an advocate for the Taj-Trapezium Zone — an area which encompasses four World Heritage Sites. The World Heritage Treaty requires member nations to "protect" the Sites.

The suit alleged that emissions from coal-burning industries were degrading the World

Heritage Sites. The Indian Supreme Court agreed: "There is no longer any contradiction between development and ecology . . . the principle of sustainable development is accepted the world over."

The Indian court's decision required 292 industries in the area to stop using coal within 120 days. Industries had to switch to natural gas, move out of the area, or shut down. Industries that switched to gas were ordered to pay workers full salary during the transition, even if the industries had to stop operations. Industries that chose to move were ordered to pay workers full salary plus one year's wages as a "shifting bonus." Industries that chose to shut down were ordered to pay a full year's salary plus six years salary as additional compensation.

Remember, the World Heritage Treaty requires member nations — including the U.S. — to "protect" the Sites. There are 20 World Heritage Sites in the United States.[3]

Consensus: the new decision-making process

The President's Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD) says in its We Believe Statement: "We need a new collaborative decision process that leads to better decisions; more rapid change; and more sensible use of human, natural, and financial resources in achieving our goals." The title of the PCSD report is*: Sustainable America: A New Consensus.* The "new collaborative decision process" used by the UN, PCSD, and increasingly in *local* visioning councils and stakeholder councils is called "Consensus Building."

The process was described by Richard H. Graff in a 54-page booklet entitled *Introducing Competition to the Global Currency Markets*. Graff's booklet is distributed widely as a tutorial for consensus builders. Graff says consensus:

". . . is *revolutionary* in that it abandons the traditional model of persuasion . . . while at the same time adroitly discouraging the usual stream of petty objections."

Consensus is not agreement. Graff's booklet makes it clear that consensus building is a process that avoids and disposes of conflicting views by seeking to *quiet objections* rather than reach agreement:

"The idea of consensus is not new. Most people have a vague idea of what it is, but very few, when asked to define it, can give a precise meaning and clearly distinguish it from agreement. Let's begin with agreement. Normally when you want to persuade others of the validity of something, you attempt to convince them to agree with you. You present your case with as much supporting argument as you can muster, and when you are finished, you ask (explicitly or implicitly) whether everyone agrees. Consensus, in contrast, does not involve convincing others to adopt your view, and it most certainly does not require anyone to change his or her mind."

Silence implies consensus

Consensus is an extension of the "Negative Poll"; it involves asking questions rather than making statements. Consensus building *always* begins with a predetermined position which may or may not be made known to the group. The purpose of asking questions is to identify those who may wish to speak. The desired "response" is *silence*. Questions are framed to force individuals who might be opposed to identify themselves and give a reason for their opposition.

According to Graff, "A well-crafted question provokes thought and elicits *no response.*" Those who might disagree are confronted with the decision of whether they disagree strongly enough to speak up and defend their position, or whether or not they "can live with it."

"Everyone also realizes that before answering they had better think about it a moment — make sure they understand it so that if they do open their mouth something intelligent and pertinent will come out. There is *silence*. Everyone is thinking about the same question and no one disagrees. No one can speak without thinking, and the silence *implies* consensus."

Questions are constructed so that a response will force the person to disagree with something that is universally seen to be good, or to support something that is generally seen to be bad.

"This is the key feature of the negative poll: you don't ask if everyone agrees (which encourages everyone to start talking), you ask if there's anyone who does *not* agree (which encourages everyone to keep still). It's a poll for negativity. Thus we have the crucial distinction between agreement and consensus.

Here's an example of how the consensus process works:

"When you ask a question such as, 'Does anyone think we should *not* be concerned about the future well-being of our species?' Everyone who hears, understands and thinks about the question remains silent. You have an immediate *implied* consensus. The point is that no one disagrees that we *should* be concerned, no one speaks up, no one says we should *not* be concerned."

When a consensus is declared, as the result of a series of well-crafted questions, it is a strong claim that *doesn't need proving*. The burden of proof is shifted to opponents who must prove that a consensus does *not* exist.

As with proving any negative, proving that a consensus

does not exist is nearly impossible. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) declared that a consensus by 2,000 of the world's scientists determined that global warming was caused by human activity. That consensus stands in the public perception, despite the vocal disagreement of more than a hundred climatologists who signed the Vienna Declaration, and the thousands of scientists who signed the Heidleburg Appeal. When asked why the so-called consensus of the IPCC had not been measured by even a straw vote, Michael Cutajar, Executive Secretary of the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change, said: "Consensus is not unanimity; it is very much up to the president."

In other words, whenever a president, chairperson, or meeting facilitator decides a consensus has been reached – a consensus has been reached.

The consensus process is especially attractive as a decision-making process because there is virtually no chance of failure. The traditional decision-making process ultimately ends with a vote. If the proposal fails to garner a majority of the votes, the proposal fails. In the consensus process, *no vote is ever taken*. The proposal remains "under development" until a consensus is reached. If the facilitator is unable to quiet objections by recrafting questions, then the process can delayed, or postponed until the troublemaker is replaced by a more cooperative individual. Or the facilitator can simply announce that more work has to be done on the current subject, and then move on to another aspect of the predetermined proposal.

Another strategy used by the consensus builders is the use of notable personalities to support a particular position. Graff teaches his students to not claim that any particular personality *agrees* with a position unless you are certain that your statement is true. On the other hand, however, "You can quite properly name anybody you like as *not disagreeing*. No one can disagree without saying so explicitly so you can name any well-known or highly respected person you like as not disagreeing, and no one can dispute you."

The power of one

However, the consensus process contains the ingredients of disaster if led by an incompetent facilitator. *A single person who raises objections can delay, or perhaps scuttle, the process*. Therefore, it is extremely important that the individuals chosen to participate in the consensus process be very carefully selected. Even so, Graff cautions that the facilitator must be prepared to deal with objections. One way is to recraft the question, making objections more difficult. The process is designed to isolate the objector and make him look foolish by continuing the objection. If the objection persists, the individual can be ignored, or excluded from future meetings of the group.

Consensus decisions are *accountable to no one*. Since no votes are taken, no individual is required to publicly state a position. Every participant in a consensus process can deny that they supported the consensus reached. Nevertheless, public policies across the country are being determined by consensus, more often than not, by "stakeholders" in meetings "facilitated" (manipulated) by trained professionals — rather than by elected officials.

The consensus process is rapidly gaining recognition as the most civil, participatory, and "democratic" process for making policy decisions. It avoids the head-to-head debate, which, as evidenced daily in Congress, often becomes uncivil. Increasingly, disagreement and debate are characterized as "gridlock," and "childish." Throughout the federal government, policy decisions are being made using the "feel-good" consensus process, rather than the traditional debate-and-vote process. The consensus process *predetermines* the outcome and removes accountability to the People who will be affected by the policies.

However, the best public policies result from the public collision of ideas, freely debated by all parties, and decided, finally, by a recorded vote of elected representatives of the People. The first objective of any responsible process for making public policy decisions should be to serve the interest of the People — *within* the context of our Constitution. Order, efficiency, and speed are all secondary considerations. In America, outcome and *accountability* to the People are of ultimate importance.

[1] Ted Kazinsky — AKA the "Unabomber" and allegedly responsible for sending a series of bombs through the mail — is an environmentalist and fan of Mr. Gore's book. A heavily highlighted copy of *Earth In the Balance* was found in Kazinsky's cabin when he was arrested by the FBI.

[2] The U.S.-Mexican border is roughly 1,935 miles long. If a 31-mile wide strip of American soil along that border is ceded to the UN, it will amount to surrendering roughly 60,000 square miles of American sovereign soil to a foreign government — without firing a shot. This is equivalent to the total land mass of our five or six smallest States. Every Congressman and Senator who voted for NAFTA is guilty of an unconstitutional surrender of American land and sovereignty in the most incredible act of treason since

Benedict Arnold.

[3] The implications of 20 World Heritage Sites in the U.S. are ominous. If the 20 Sites are geographically diverse, virtually every American business might be close enough to one or more Sites to be subject to massive, ruinous regulation. Although the regulations would probably be enforced by our own government, the real regulator would be the UN.

While Theodore Forstmann (author of the previous article, "Statism: Opiate of the Elites") and I debate the comparative merits of republics and democracies, elitists within our government and the UN are moving quickly to establish an entirely new "process" for "governance" which renders both republics and democracies irrelevant. In this new process of "consensus," We The People need not vote or even speak, and our silence is interpreted as support for government policies. To the extent this new process of consensus violates our Constitutional guarantees of representation in Congress and the individual right to vote, this "process" is criminal and treasonous.

However, if the consensus process looks scary, consensus advocates admit it can be stopped cold by a single individual willing to stand up and speak out in public. By silence, we surrender. With speech, we overcome.

The collectivists have been kicking our individualist butts with mere tricks based on the fundamental presumption that the average American is simply too scared to speak out in public. This presumption is quite reasonable; studies indicate that most people find the thought of public speaking more terrifying than their own death.

Nevertheless, this article confirms, "All politics is local." We're not only losing this country in Washington, we're losing it in our own backyards. The consensus "trick" may make you mad, but it also offers hope in that a surprisingly simple strategy can slow or even reverse the growth of "global governance" and the New World Order. All we need is a willingness to speak out among our neighbors.

OK, what have we learned?

First, the term "consensus" may have some political clout, but is legally meaningless. Don't be fooled by any activist, think tank, government agency, or politician who uses the term since they are probably trying to con you.

Second, although consensus is deceptive and therefore (according to Sun-Tzu) the "highest form of warfare", it's also a very fragile strategy. Elitists rely on trickery to overcome the Constitution precisely because they lack the power to win a real fight. They are little men behind a curtain and, properly exposed, they'll run.

Third, the consensus process can be "scuttled" by nothing more than a single individual who does his homework and is willing to speak out in public. This nation's sovereignty is being betrayed and diminished by a handful of anti-constitutional activists. That same sovereignty can be restored by a handful of pro-constitutional activists. If America can't find a handful of men and women willing — not to engage in violence — but to simply speak out against treason, then America will not only perish, it will deserve to perish.

However, people and nations don't merely perish for lack of knowledge, they perish for lack of conversation. Shut down the TV, get off the couch, and go talk to somebody. "Craft" some questions, and if necessary, build your own "consensus" that this nation needs and depends on Biblical principles and constitutional government.

When asked – "Does anyone think we should not be concerned about the future well-being of our species?" – counter with, "Do mean our physical or spiritual well-being?" You might also ask, "Does anyone think we should not be concerned about violations of the Constitution (or God's law)?" Or, "Do you mean implement your program, even if it violates the Constitution (or God's law)?"

Put them on the defensive. It's not hard. Just be prepared to answer their questions with your own questions.

And don't imagine you're alone. A headline in the June, 1997 issue of The Idaho Observer newspaper (POB 1806, Post Falls, Idaho 83854) reads: "Kentucky Resolution Ousts UN Control, No UNESCO `Biospheres' in Bluegrass State". According to this article, the Kentucky State Senate passed a resolution and sent it to the U.S. Congress as notice of their opposition to UN plans to convert nearly one-quarter of Kentucky into a UN-controlled "Biosphere" and evict thousands of Kentucky citizens from their land. While the direct effect of the Kentucky Senate's Resolution remains to be seen, that Resolution illustrates that Americans are not only beginning to wake up, but also act, even at the level of state legislature. Organized resistance to the UN's plans for "global governance" and New World Order is beginning to look like "an idea whose time has come". Get involved in the movement to save our national sovereignty.

And finally, subscribe to **ecologic** magazine for $35 a year at ECO, POB 191, Hollow Rock, Tenn. 38342. (901) 986-0099. I highly recommend **ecologic** as an excellent, cutting-edge publication. ■