



# 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. 10 – July/August 2005

**The Lawless EU**



How the European Union uses its power to prevent and frustrate competition in the global marketplace. **Page 2**

**The Angry, Hate-filled Left**



Why has the Left become so bitter and vitriolic? **Page 2**  
 FOF Media Appearances **Page 5**

**The U.S. Constitution**



The Supremes trash the Constitution. **Page 1**  
 John Roberts is right for the Court **Page 4**

**Mercury and Fish**



Are fish safe to eat or is this just another example of more overblown environmental scare tactics? **Page 3**

**Stupid or Anti-American?**



Why do politicians compare the U.S. to Nazi Concentration Camps and Soviet Gulags? **Page 5**

**Bad Faith Political Posturing**



What's the truth about Valerie Plame and Joe Wilson and Karl Rove? **Page 6**

## Message from the President

This summer, the Supreme Court by a 5-to-4 vote continued its unrelenting thrashing of the Constitution. The Court ruled in *Kelo v. City of New London* that local governments may seize private homes, businesses, or land against the owner's will and then re-sell the property to another private owner. No real "public use" is required; the government need only allege that the new owner will pay or generate more taxes. Thus, if the government thinks that a convenience store, hotel, apartment building or business will result in more taxes, they can force you out and compel you to sell your home. That's the verdict of five unelected liberals in black robes who obviously haven't read the Constitution in years.

The Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution prohibits the government from taking private property unless it is for "public use" and "just compensation" is paid. The Founders believed these two checks on the government's power to take private property were critical to preventing abuse. Historically, the government could require private landowners to sell their property to the government for such things as schools, libraries, and roads. But now the government can force you against your will to sell them your land simply because they want it. They can now



George Landrith, President of Frontiers of Freedom

justify this abuse simply by alleging the new owner will likely pay more taxes than you pay. This is stunning!

This is what happens when liberals rule on your constitutional rights. To them, the document has no inherent meaning – it means whatever

they want it to mean. When they say, "It is a living, breathing document," that is code for, "It is a meaningless document and five of us can change it whenever and however we want."

The five liberals on the Supreme Court have once again taken off their judicial robes, violated their oath of office, trashed the Constitution, and abused their power to unilaterally rewrite the Constitution. Government now can take your property for essentially whatever reason it wants. Next time some well-heeled developer thinks he'd like to build himself a bigger house on your property and you won't sell it to him, he can just ask the city council – whose political campaigns he funds – to force you sell your home to him. So much for liberals caring about the "little guy." That was always a lie, but at least now it is obvious to everyone.

The Court's majority opinion blathered for more than twenty pages ineptly arguing that seeking more taxes is a "public use" as intended

in the Constitution. This, of course, turns the Fifth Amendment on its head and makes the term "public use" completely meaningless. Public use was once a limit on government's ability to seize your property. Now, anything qualifies as public use. Thus, it is no longer a real check on government abuse. The Court essentially amended the Constitution by removing the public use requirement – and five unelected judges did it without our consent.

Sadly, the Court's decision and other recent decisions make it clear that the Court now gives scant attention to the Constitution itself and instead prefers to discuss and rely upon foreign law, treaties to which the United States is not a party, public opinion polls, and earlier court decisions. The actual text of the Constitution receives scant attention. The historical context and the intention of the Founders receives even less.



U.S. Supreme Court Building

(continued on pg. 2)

## The Supremes: Attacking Private Property

(continued from page 1)

In a stinging dissenting opinion, Justice O'Connor correctly stated, "[A]ll private property is now vulnerable to being taken and transferred to another private owner.... [T]he Court ... wash[es] out any distinction between private and public use of property – and effectively [deletes] the words “for public use” from the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment.”

Justice Thomas, also dissenting, wrote, “I do not believe that this Court can eliminate liberties expressly enumerated in the Constitution...” Justice Thomas is absolutely correct. The Supreme Court has no power to eliminate our enumerated constitutional rights. But five justices did precisely that and violated their oath of office.

If this most recent decision doesn't highlight the need for the President of the United States to appoint, and for the U.S. Senate to confirm judges who will strictly uphold and faithfully interpret the Constitution, nothing will.

## The Lawless European Union

The European Union (EU) recently made the news when a number of the member nations rejected the EU Constitution in public referenda. While this was big news, far more important to Americans is the fact that the EU regularly uses its power and money to skew economic markets and give its favored corporate giants huge illegal subsidies to help them defeat American companies in the global marketplace.

To see just one example of how the EU fights against real competition in the global marketplace, it is instructive to look at the competition for commercial jetliners between Airbus and Boeing. Airbus has received \$15 billion in subsidies with the express purpose of giving Airbus a leg up in its competition with Boeing. In 2000, French Prime Minister Lionel Jospin, said, “We will give Airbus the means (*i.e. money*) to win the battle against Boeing.” In 2003, Airbus had a larger market share than Boeing. In other words, the French Prime Minister made good on his promise. Access to large sums of taxpayer-provided cash from the EU has allowed Airbus to quickly roll out a record-breaking succession of new aircraft.

Now that Boeing has developed a new cutting-edge airliner – the 787, known as the Dreamliner – the EU has promised Airbus more subsidies to help them quickly roll out a new plane to compete with the stunning Dreamliner. This promised aid will be in the form of launch aid, grants, infusions of cash, and interest-free loans that must be repaid *only if* the plane becomes commercially profitable. Boeing developed its Dreamliner, the old fashioned way – with its own money and financing for the development and manufacture of the new airliner. Airbus intends to develop its competing airliner with EU financial aid. This clearly violates international law and flies in the face of a number of free trade agreements.

How can Boeing compete when Airbus gets billions in financial support from more than two-dozen European nations that comprise the EU? It is like asking an American Olympic runner to run 100 meters and the allowing the Olympic competitors from France and Germany to have a 30-meter head start. Such an unfair competition will likely produce a lot of French and German Olympic medals. But that wouldn't mean they are the best competitors – only that they cheated and were given the easiest path to victory.

Fortunately, Boeing has competed quite well given the circumstances. Its Dreamliner is an amazing aircraft. It is more comfortable for passengers, can be run more efficiently and profitably for airlines, and was designed from the ground up to be safer, more durable, and more flexible. However, in the long run, if we allow Airbus to continue cheating in the global market, we shouldn't be surprised if we get the short end of the stick. That is the entire purpose of their cheating – to gain an unfair advantage and, as the French Prime Minister admitted, make sure Airbus wins “the battle against Boeing.”

Under international law, subsidies such as the ones the EU gives to Airbus are illegal and violate international trade agreements. The White House has filed a case with the World Trade Organization (WTO), which is charged with deciding such trade disputes.



Flags of E.U. 25 Nations



Notwithstanding the obvious illegality, the EU defends its subsidies to Airbus by falsely arguing that Boeing gets aid from the U.S. government because of its defense contracts. However, those contracts are competitively bid and Boeing receives only a fair market payment for producing products and services that meets the requirements of the contract. There is no subsidy. When you buy a Big Mac at McDonalds for \$2, is that a subsidy? Of course not – it's just the fair market price of the sandwich. But what really reveals the EU's argument as a lie is that in 2003 Airbus and its parent companies had *more* defense-related revenues than Boeing.

The EU also defends its illegal actions by arguing that Boeing receives tax breaks from states where it operates. However, jurisdictions all over the world grant tax incentives to large employers who locate operations in their jurisdiction. Those economic development strategies are offered to any large employer – even foreign companies. Simply stated, these incentives are not exclusively offered to Boeing. In fact, those same breaks are available to Airbus. A number of Airbus's exclusive suppliers receive the exact same incentives. In contrast, the \$15 billion of taxpayer-provided subsidies given to Airbus were *not* available to Boeing or other competitors. It was a handout available *only* to Airbus paid by the 25 member nations of the EU with the express purpose of helping them “win the battle against Boeing.”

The Administration must press this case hard and require the EU to compete fairly in the world marketplace. The EU has a track record of cheating in the world marketplace and using government regulations to benefit its companies and hamper American companies. Airbus is only one of the more obvious abuses. The Administration must continue to make it clear to the EU that free trade and fair competition are two-way streets.

## The Angry, Hate-filled Left

In America, we enjoy the right to say virtually anything we want. Under the First Amendment to the Constitution, government may not abridge the right of free speech. Unfortunately, too many people exercise the right of free speech without exercising any self-restraint. I'm not suggesting government censorship. I'm talking about people exercising judgment and self-control. I'm talking about people choosing not to say every stupid, hateful, distorted and anti-American thing that pops into their head. Senators Ted Kennedy and Dick Durbin, Cindy Sheehan, war protesters, and the extreme groups who oppose the nomination of John Roberts to the Supreme Court abuse their right of free speech and prove themselves unworthy of the nation that guarantees their liberty.

Earlier this year, Senator Ted Kennedy (D-Mass) said America is the "problem" in Iraq, not the "solution" just days before the historic elections in which millions of Iraqis voted in free elections for the first time in more than a generation. Kennedy, blinded by his anger at his party losing another election, lashed out and gave America's enemies comfort and aid. Aljazeera, the terrorist news network, widely covered Kennedy's remarks and largely overlooked the historic elections.



had their propaganda –from the mouth of a sitting U.S. Senator. To this day, terrorists recruit new bombers and killers using the words of Senator Durbin.

Cindy Sheehan started off as a grieving mother who lost a son in Iraq. She demands a second meeting with the president – she met with him in the White House shortly after her son's death. Even though I disagree with her views on Iraq, I respect her right to see things differently. But as time has passed, she has become shrill and absurd. Sheehan has become just another angry, hate-filled anti-American. Since that first meeting with the president, she has called him a "filth spewer," the world's "biggest terrorist," a man who is "waging nuclear war" in Iraq and committing "blatant genocide," an "evil maniac," and a "lying bastard." Sheehan even resorted to Durbin's trick, calling the president Hitler and a Nazi with the term "fuehrer."



For almost six months, antiwar activists have protested outside Walter Reed Hospital in the nation's capital where soldiers wounded in Iraq receive medical treatment. The protesters greet wounded soldiers with signs that read "Maimed for Lies" and "Enlist here to die for Halliburton." Protesters line the hospital entrance with fake caskets and chant, "Bush kills American soldiers." These soldiers are not policy makers and should not be subjected to the taunts of protesters. The protesters should be at the White House or the Capitol, NOT harassing wounded heroes as they enter the hospital.

The protesters' real agenda is better understood when the organizers' political views are known. Medea Benjamin, the co-founder of Code Pink, the group that has organized the hospital protests and a major



A Code Pink Protest

sponsor of Cindy Sheehan's protests in Crawford, Texas, has long been a supporter of the communist Viet Cong regime in Vietnam, the communist Sandinistas in Nicaragua, and Cuban dictator Fidel Castro. If Code Pink isn't anti-American, nobody is.

Who benefits from this constitutionally-protected, but irresponsible speech? The terrorists and their recruiters. They quote *Americans* who argue that America or its leaders are evil and the real terrorists. Additionally, as protesters demand America leave Iraq, the terrorists and bombers take courage that their efforts are turning the tide in America. They know they cannot defeat America militarily, but they hope their terrorist bombings will cause Americans back home to call for withdrawal. Thus, the virulent and irresponsible antiwar crowd actually feed the terrorist monster and increase the likelihood of more bombings.

Even in John Roberts' Supreme Court confirmation battle, we see hatred as the primary tool of the fanatic left. The National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL), an extreme pro-abortion group, ran an attack ad falsely accusing John Roberts of "supporting ... a convicted clinic bomber" and of "excus[ing] violence." Even prominent pro-choice liberals criticized the ad as completely false and unfair. NARAL pulled the ad, but continued to



Judge John G. Roberts

defend it. Others on the left made fun of the clothes that Roberts' two young children wore to the White House when their father's nomination was announced. Still others sought to open the sealed adoption records of Robert's two children. Vitriolic hatred causes even otherwise intelligent people to say and do utterly stupid things.

Americans have the right to speak their minds – even when irrational, stupid and irresponsible. But like all rights, personal restraint and self-control guarantee that these rights enrich our freedoms, rather than debase them.

Those who abuse the freedom of speech justify their actions by asserting their rights. But we need not listen to their diatribes or give them the respect reserved for serious and responsible speech. Pay no mind to screaming children throwing temper tantrums or howling leftists who aid our enemies and defame America and its leaders.



Senator Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) compared the detention facility at the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay (Gitmo) to Soviet-era Gulags and U.S. Servicemen to Nazis. After a week of telling America he said exactly what he meant to say, he offered a phony apology – saying he was sorry we misunderstood him. But the damage was done. Again, America's enemies

## John Roberts: A Stellar Nominee

President Bush's nomination of Judge John G. Roberts to the United States Supreme Court is a stellar choice. Judge Roberts is a tremendously intelligent legal mind. He is a man of character and integrity. Both liberals and conservatives respect him because he is an honest judge who follows the law and doesn't play politics with the Constitution. John Roberts will faithfully interpret the law and the Constitution and will not misuse his life appointment to legislate from the bench. What better endorsement could be given?



In 2003, Judge Roberts was reported favorably out of the Senate Judiciary Committee by a vote of 16-3, and received overwhelming bipartisan support when the entire Senate unanimously confirmed him for the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. Prior to his appointment to the federal bench, John Roberts was one of the most respected attorneys in the nation and had argued an impressive 39 cases before the Supreme Court.

Extremists oppose this nomination because they are inclined to oppose anyone nominated to the High Court by President Bush. However, this tells us a great deal more about them than it does Judge Roberts. Those who oppose John Roberts seek a court that will advance their political agenda through litigation, rather than through our democratically-elected legislators.

Fanatics will call Judge Roberts all sorts of names and predict all sorts of calamities if he is confirmed. However, it is useful to remember that John Roberts is a sitting federal appellate court judge and his record is stellar. He is widely praised as a model judge by both liberals and conservatives. The American Bar Association has given him their highest rating.

John Roberts is simply a dedicated, honest, and fair-minded judge who is committed to faithfully interpreting the law and the Constitution. He has strictly avoided making politics a part of his decisions. Americans don't want their judges to be politicians. They want honest, fair-minded and dedicated judges. In Judge John Roberts, they will get exactly that.

## Mercury: Is it Safe to Eat More Fish?

Perhaps the most repeated refrain driving the mercury alarmism campaign is that "630,000 American babies are born each year" with elevated concentrations of mercury in their blood, with the potential for "permanent brain damage and learning disabilities." These infants are said to be "poisoned" at birth because their mothers consumed fish containing microtraces of mercury. As a result, pregnant women are being terrified away from fish consumption, and thus denied a source of nutrition shown to enhance both fetal brain development and maternal health.

The genesis of this myth was the 2003 Centers for Disease Control release of its results from the 1999-2000 nutrition and health survey. It was reported that 8% of women of childbearing age (16-49 years old) had blood mercury concentrations above the so-called "safe" mercury reference dose established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Since there are over four million births in the U.S. annually, mercury opponents and several government scientists extrapolated that at least 320,000 babies born are "at risk" in the U.S. each year due to "unsafe" mercury levels in their mother's blood.

In January 2004, an EPA employee revised the number of babies born at risk upward to 630,000, based on "new" information that mercury in maternal cord blood (shared with the fetus) is more concentrated than in body blood. But the information was not "new," it was a double-counting, since the EPA had already accounted for the blood-concentration difference in 2001, helping make its "safe" mercury dose the most stringent in the world.

It must be recognized that the EPA's safe mercury dose is based on inappropriate studies of people who consume whale meat and blubber (a unique diet very different from typical U.S. consumption) containing multiple chemicals -- PCBs, cadmium, pesticides, persistent organic pollutants, DDT, etc. -- of which mercury is only one.



There are other reasons why mercury alarmists' emotive claims are neither justified nor credible. For example, a recent survey in Japan reported that 87% of the population,

including 74% of Japanese women of child-bearing age, had mercury concentrations above EPA's "safe" level. Logically, one must either conclude that generations of Japanese are "brain-damaged" (and suffering from severe and permanent learning deficits), or that EPA's "safe" mercury dose is simply arbitrary and extreme.



Similarly, children in grades four and eight from traditionally high-fish-consumption cultures in Japan, Korea, Singapore and Hong Kong consistently outperformed U.S. students on international standardized math and science tests. This despite the fact that Hong Kong children have mean blood mercury levels some 10 times higher than U.S. children. Even the mummified remains of four Aleutian infants dated to 1445 A.D. contained higher mean mercury levels than young children reported in the CDC surveys.

None of these findings are surprising, considering numerous studies report no adverse affects on children from maternal fish consumption -- as high as 12-14 meals per week -- of the kinds of fish widely available in U.S. markets and restaurants. Only benefits have been reported, such as superior eyesight, higher child mental development scores, less hyperactivity, good heart and brain function, and improved intelligence at four years of age.

Finally, an examination of the actual CDC data shows that the 1999-2000 survey documented seven out of 705 children (or 1%) with blood mercury above the EPA's "safe" mercury dose, while the 2001-2002 survey found only four out of 872 children (or 0.5%) exceeding it. More importantly, even the highest mercury level measured in this four-year survey has a safety cushion of more than 500% of the lowest exposure level of concern.

Yet hardly anyone is rushing to report these important updates, let alone downward revisions in the numbers of children "at risk." Instead, one observes repetition of the near-religious dogma that "600,000-plus American children are born each year" at risk of "birth defects, including mental retardation and problems with motor skills."

Basing enormously consequential energy and health policies -- both nationally and internationally -- on myth is both irresponsible and harmful.

## Stupid or Anti-American: You Decide

Senator Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) is outraged by the treatment of terrorists held at the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba (Gitmo). According to Senator Durbin, terrorists at Gitmo who may have critical information are aggressively questioned about future al Qaeda attacks. He says they are forced to listen to loud music, wear handcuffs and leg irons, and sit in rooms where the air conditioning is turned up and down. Durbin labels this torture and compares American soldiers to Nazis who murdered 12 million. He compares Gitmo to communist Gulags where more than 20 million were killed. When given the chance to apologize for his outrageous and dishonest comparisons, Durbin stubbornly defends his slander but says he is sorry that *we misunderstood him*.

Is Durbin utterly stupid or does he simply hate America?

High school students everywhere know enough history to see that Durbin is dead wrong. They study the Holocaust and have seen the disturbing pictures of Nazi concentration camps – humans that look like skeletons because of starvation, mass graves, and other unspeakable horrors. Most folks know less about Gulags, but they were the model for Nazi concentration camps.



Gulags were prison labor camps in the Soviet Union where staggering numbers were starved and tortured and more than 20 million were murdered. The average life expectancy in a Gulag was one winter. Crimes that brought innocent people to the Gulags included: being Jewish, speaking with foreigners, being from a foreign country, being middle-class, being Christian, and refusing the sexual advances of government bureaucrats.



In contrast, each of the 750 detainees at Gitmo was captured while fighting and killing America soldiers in Afghanistan or Iraq or is believed to be an Al Qaeda terrorist. During war, captured enemy combatants are detained until the conflict is over. No trial is held and no term is imposed. The detention lasts as long as the hostilities exist.

Not one detainee at Gitmo has died as a result of mistreatment. When a Gitmo guard punched a detainee who attacked him, the guard was severely punished. Detainees at Gitmo receive first-rate medical care and are well fed – receiving meals that even meet their religious requirements. We spend more money feeding a detainee than we spend feeding an American soldier serving in Iraq. The Red Cross inspects Gitmo regularly. More than 1,000 journalists and 120 Members of Congress have inspected Gitmo.

We even provide the terrorists with copies of the Qur'an and provide a place and time for their prayers – which presumably include appeals for strength to kill more Americans. We have no obligation to accommodate their warped beliefs. But we accommodate them nonetheless. Amazingly, some have even charged abuse because a few U.S. soldiers *may* have touched copies of the Qur'an without wearing gloves.

Durbin now admits that he does not know whether the anonymous e-mail he read on the Senate floor is true, but he still refuses to apologize (other than to say he is sorry that *we misunderstood him*). Durbin continues to defend his defamation of America. Even if true, playing loud music, wearing handcuffs or leg irons, or having more or less air conditioning does not constitute torture. Our own soldiers in Iraq often work in temperatures well over 120 degrees while wearing twenty pounds of body armor. Why does Senator Durbin think terrorists deserve better conditions than our own troops? To label such things as torture and to compare them to the gulags and Nazi concentration camps only serves to make rational people not care about so-called torture. After all if *that* is torture, why *should* we care?

Why doesn't Durbin show his outrage when terrorists behead and blow up Americans? Why do only handcuffs and a lack of air conditioning draw Durbin's ire? Of all the things in the world worthy of outrage, why does Durbin reserve his warped outrage for America and her soldiers who have a record of defending liberty around the world?

Aljazeera, the terrorist news network, leads its news with Senator Durbin's remarks. Terrorists are using Durbin's false statements to justify killing more Americans and Iraqis – after all a sitting U.S. Senator says America is as bad as the Nazis and that Gitmo is comparable the Communist Gulags. Senator Durbin, do the words "*aid and comfort to the enemy*" mean anything to you? How many new terrorists will be recruited because of Senator Durbin's vitriolic hate speech? How many American soldiers and civilians will die because terrorists believe Durbin's remarks prove that more Americans must die?

We the people should demand that Durbin step down. There is precedent for this. A few years ago, then Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott made some stupid, but ultimately harmless, comments at the 100-year birthday party of Sen. Strom Thurmond. He apologized dozens of times. But the mainstream media wouldn't let it die and Lott resigned his leadership post. The media will not hound Senator Durbin from office, but the American public should.

## Frontiers of Freedom Media Report

In May and June, Frontiers' senior staff made more than 212 appearances on news and talk format programs and were seen or heard in all 50 states discussing energy policy, Social Security reform, national security, global warming, missile defense, gasoline prices, judicial nominations, ANWR, mercury and environmental regulations, prescription drug



importation, tax reform, lawsuit abuse reform, and the ACLU's anti-American and anti-constitutional agenda.

## More Bad Faith Political Posturing on the Left

If speculation about Supreme Court nominees isn't the summer's biggest story in the Nation's Capitol, allegations that Karl Rove leaked the name of a covert CIA officer is. The ultra-liberal MoveOn.org argues Rove must be fired and investigated. Representative Louise Slaughter (D-N.Y.) said Rove "should be thoroughly investigated and prosecuted." Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.) called for the immediate cancellation of Rove's security clearances. Representative Henry Waxman (D-Calif.) said that Rove should be subjected to a full congressional inquiry. It all sounds pretty serious. That's how political gamesmanship is played – making something of nothing.

The game is played by claiming there is smoke everywhere and then pointing at your political adversary and saying, "where there's smoke, there's fire." But there's no fire and no actual smoke. Just a lot of political gamesmanship and posturing.

We now know that a reporter was about to write a story that Vice President Dick Cheney had asked former Clinton-appointed ambassador Joseph Wilson to travel to Africa in 2002 to investigate reports that Iraq had tried to buy uranium used in nuclear weapons. However, the story was untrue. It turns out that Wilson was involved in a massive case of political nepotism. Wilson's wife, Valerie Plame, a CIA employee, had arranged the trip. Rove simply revealed this fact. However, Rove did not know or reveal her name or her position. He simply told the reporter that it was "Wilson's wife, who apparently works at the agency [the CIA] on WMD [weapons of mass destruction] issues who authorized the trip."

The Intelligence Identities Protection Act prohibits government officials from knowingly and deliberately disclosing the identity of a covert CIA agent. Additionally, to be a violation of the law, the person doing the disclosing must have obtained the information from a classified source, and known that the CIA operative was a covert agent. Additionally, for the law to apply,



Joseph Wilson

the government must make diligent and active efforts to conceal the agent's identity. None of these requirements exist in the case at hand.

Early in Plame's career she *was* a covert agent and lived abroad. However, since the mid-1990s she was retired from covert assignments and simply worked a desk job at CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia. The



Valerie Plame

government was not actively concealing Plame's identity. In fact, neither Plame nor her husband were concealing her identity. Her husband's website had posted pictures and information about his wife long before any e-mail from Karl Rove referred to her.

Additionally, Plame and her husband are far too visible in the high society circles in Washington, D.C. to seriously argue that she was making any diligent attempt to conceal her identity or to keep a low profile. The simple fact is that Valerie Plame was not a covert CIA agent. Thus, there is no violation of the law.

But for the sake of an argument, let's ignore the facts just as many Capitol Hill Democrats and members of the media have done – despite the clear evidence to the contrary, let's pretend that Plame was a covert agent. Even still, Karl Rove violated no law. Nor did he endanger any agent's life. Rove clearly did not know her to be a covert agent, as he did not even know her name. This would indicate that he did not learn of her from classified sources which is required for there to have been a crime. Rove also had no knowledge that the government was actively concealing her identity – as it was not, nor was she or her husband.

Thus, even if one assumes that everything his adversaries say is true, Rove did not violate the Intelligence Identities Protection Act. Nor did he endanger any CIA agents in the field. Even the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* now agree that no crime was committed.

So why all the acrimony and vitriol directed at Rove? Many Democrats are mad about losing all but one national election since 1994. They are furious that they could not beat George Bush or regain control of the House or Senate. Many blame Rove for their recent election woes. They want political revenge on the man they believe responsible for their misfortune.

Interestingly, Joseph Wilson, was a consultant to the John Kerry campaign and has been revealed as a charlatan and fraud by the Senate Intelligence Committee. The real

reason Wilson went to Africa was political – to discredit the war in Iraq and impact the presidential election. This entire CIA story is an amateur hour game of "gotcha politics" with the mainstream media having played a strong supporting role. If you ignore the truth and make up your own "facts," it makes for interesting political theatre.

## 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](http://www.ff.org) • [info@ff.org](mailto:info@ff.org)

© 2005 Frontiers of Freedom