



WEEKLY PRINT EDITION

October 19, 2007

MUKASEY A STUDY IN EVASION BUT CONFIRMATION ASSURED

Watching Michael Mukasey's responses to questioning before the Senate Judiciary Committee was an exercise in political agony. In question after question Mukasey skillfully evaded, deferred and/or claimed ignorance of things he could have easily answered. Worse yet, on the first day not a single Senator broke ranks to charge the Bush nominee for Attorney General with evasion, or label it for what it was. Obviously the members of the Senate were only going through the motions of asking the questions the public demanded answers to and then accepting whatever Mukasey was willing to offer up. What was obvious to me was that Mukasey will continue the Bush agenda of subverting constitutional liberties, but with a much higher degree of stealth than Alberto Gonzales.

There was not a single hint in any of Mukasey's responses that he was going to change course or take a truly independent stance as Attorney General. He was very slick in not showing his hand. You could tell this man was an expert in evasion and carefully crafted responses.

Examples: Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-NY) asked Mukasey about the White House claim that correspondence with people outside the White House were covered by executive privilege and should not be turned over to Congress. Schumer specifically made mention of an email from the chairman of the New Mexico Republican Party to the White House about New Mexico's US attorney, David Iglesias. Mukasey crafts his answer to both give a false hope that he is a critic of the doctrine of executive privilege, and yet refuses to commit to challenge the doctrine.

Mukasey begins by giving a lengthy dissertation on how he could see certain circumstances where outside communication might be covered by privilege, but then says "I will admit to you that my first reaction to that section of the letter was, 'Huh?'" giving the impression that he too was a critic. Then he quickly added (here's the evasion) that he'd like to "take a closer look at the facts" before coming to a final conclusion—suggesting false hope.

Responding to a question from Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., on a 2002 memorandum by assistant attorney general Jay Bybee, claiming that the president had the power to circumvent the Geneva Conventions as well as laws banning torture, Mukasey claimed this memo was later disavowed and superseded. How would he know this, other than by repeating what administration briefers had told him?

His next response was the one and only occasion he appeared to be clear and resolute—as he expressed disagreement with the original memo—something easy to do now that the memo had been defused by labeling it as a past error by others. Leahy asks, "Would it be a safe characterization of what you've just said that you repudiate

this memo as not only being contrary to law, but also contrary to the values America stands for?" Leahy asked. "I do," the nominee replied. The Bybee memo he would say is "worse than a sin, it's a mistake."

There were sighs of false relief and satisfaction all around—mostly because Mukasey was letting them off the hook and they would not have to press further. "Thank you," Leahy said, and then continued: "Is there such a thing as a commander in chief override that would allow the immunization of acts of torture that violate the law?" Mukasey answers with a less-than-forthright "Not that I'm aware of." There's an inherent out in this statement. He allows himself to say later that "he became aware of additional legal opinions" that would change his mind. Slick.

The most egregious example of Mukasey's dissembling was his complete denial that the US uses torture. Despite the fact that the nation's leading establishment newspapers have confirmed that the Bush Administration continues to use torture, disguised as "enhanced interrogation," Mukasey pretended that the administration he would serve "does not torture." Of course, he was saying this knowing that he and the administration define torture differently than the public or the international community, and not a single Senator called him on that point.

As Spencer Ackerman of the NY Times reported, "Mukasey said that he is unaware of any inherent commander-in-chief authority to override legal restrictions on torture -- a huge repudiation of Dick Cheney, David Addington and John Yoo's perspective on broad constitutional powers possessed by the president in wartime -- or to immunize practitioners of torture from prosecution." I disagree. There was no repudiation of use in the future—only in this one memo. Once again, Mukasey being a former judge could have said with clarity, "There is NO inherent authority in the commander-in chief to override the law on torture, and I will NOT allow it in the future." but he did not. So, he has wiggle room.

Asked by Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC) about confessions gotten through waterboarding, Mukasey said, "I would be uncomfortable with any evidence used in trial that is coerced." By saying he is merely "uncomfortable" with using evidence at trial when obtained through coercion, is a long way from saying "I would not allow it to be used!"

Mukasey professed ignorance about what waterboarding entails, but said when asked directly if waterboarding was constitutional, "If water boarding is torture, torture is not constitutional," Mukasey said. I find that incredible that he claims not to know what waterboarding is. His White House briefers would have surely discussed this in detail. I think he was lying. Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.) responded in disgust "That's a massive hedge...I mean, it either is or it isn't."

On the issue of closing the notorious Guantanamo prison facility on Cuba, Mukasey wouldn't commit. In response to

Sen. Herb Kohl (D-WI), Mukasey said he's "not prepared to say, close it... there's no easy solution."

As to subjecting American citizens to indefinite detention on mere suspicion of terrorist activities, he was equally non-committal. There was a September 2001 authorization of military force for Afghanistan that permitted the seizing of US citizens on US soil indefinitely without charge. Mukasey used the Hamdi case to uphold the president's ability to detain U.S. citizens on the battlefield, but now evades the issue by saying he "can't say now" whether the "battlefield" applies to the United States.

The NY Times opined that, "The nomination of Mukasey has been welcomed by senators from both parties, partly because they believe he is likely to be more independent of the White House than Gonzales was." That's pure wishful thinking. Anyone who knows this administration knows they never select anyone who is independent of their wishes, but they do keep searching for people like Supreme Court Justice Roberts who will give the impression of independence.

IMMUNITY FOR PHONE COMPANIES WHO SPIED FOR THE GOVERNMENT

Isn't it ironic? The government is prosecuting the one telephone company executive (Joe Nacchio of Qwest) who refused to go along with warrantless phone surveillance, and then lobbying the Senate leaders for an immunity deal for phone companies who did go along with government. Of course, the telephone companies (Sprint, Verizon, and AT&T) are also lobbying for immunity as Newsweek noted:

"The nation's biggest telecommunications companies, working closely with the White House, have mounted a secretive lobbying campaign to get Congress to quickly approve a measure wiping out all private lawsuits against them for assisting the U.S. intelligence community's warrantless surveillance programs. The campaign—which involves some of Washington's most prominent lobbying and law firms—has taken on new urgency in recent weeks because of fears that a U.S. appellate court in San Francisco is poised to rule that the lawsuits should be allowed to proceed. If that happens, the telecom companies say, they may be forced to terminate their cooperation with the U.S. intelligence community—or risk potentially crippling damage awards for allegedly turning over personal information about their customers to the government without a judicial warrant. 'It's not an exaggeration to say the U.S. intelligence community is in a near-panic about this.'"

Scott Horton of Harper's puts the Nacchio case into sharp perspective: "[CEO Joseph] Nacchio discovered that the NSA was engaged in a project to gather warrantless surveillance data on millions of Americans. He took advice of counsel. His lawyers told him, correctly, that this was illegal. They probably also warned him that if Qwest participated in the program, it would be committing a felony. So Nacchio said, no, sorry, I can't work with you on this. But I can help if you want to change the law. And the reaction of the NSA? It was, apparently, to cut Qwest out of a series of contract awards by way of retaliation. (If that charge sticks, it would probably be yet another felony.) And the second reaction? To try to build a criminal case

against Nacchio as a means of retaliation against him. (And if that charge sticks, it would probably be yet a third felony—on the part of the Government officials who did it). We are seeing the Government engaging in a sweeping pattern of criminal dealings, and ultimately, one of the biggest crimes of all, abusing the criminal justice process to strike out at an individual who refused to play their crooked game [*The courts will never allow the government to take the wrap for this*]. Oh, and by the way: who was heading the NSA when all of this transpired? **Michael Hayden**, the man who now runs the CIA, and is busily dismantling the CIA Inspector General's office because it has apparently raised questions about potentially criminal conduct on his watch there, too."

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC), tasked with ensuring telecoms comply with federal law is openly colluding with the White House to obstruct justice in this case. The Chairman of the FCC, Kevin Martin, declined to investigate reports that phone companies illegally turned over customer records without a warrant to the National Security Agency, citing national security concerns—the excuse they always use to conceal illegal acts. Naturally, National Intelligence Director Michael McConnell agreed with Martin's decision not to investigate.

McConnell also used the state secrets privilege to instruct AT&T and other phone companies involved with spying to neither confirm nor deny any details about intelligence programs. That's obstruction at its best. This allowed AT&T general counsel Wayne Watts to write a letter to the House Energy and Commerce Committee refusing to testify.

In the latest insult to the rule of law, Congress is poised to grant a **bill of immunity** to these same telephone companies. As Eric Lichtblau reports, "Leaders of the Senate Intelligence Committee reached a tentative agreement on Wednesday with the Bush administration that would give telephone carriers legal immunity for any role they played in the National Security Agency's domestic eavesdropping program approved by President Bush after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks [*actually, warrantless surveillance preceded 9/11*], a Congressional official said Wednesday. Senators this week began reviewing classified documents related to the participation of the telephone carriers in the security agency program and came away from that early review convinced that the companies had 'acted in good faith' in cooperating with what they believed was a legal and presidentially authorized program and that they should not be punished through civil litigation for their roles, the official said."

This is false on its face. How can the Senate believe the companies were ignorant of the legalities of supplying personal telephone records without a warrant when the Qwest CEO testified that all his lawyers were unanimous in stating the NSA request was illegal?

Sen. Russel Feingold took exception to the Senate's claim that the secret documents supported the phone company's claims of innocence: "The documents made available by the White House for the first time this week only further demonstrate that the program was illegal and that there is no basis for granting retroactive immunity to those who allegedly cooperated." But what Feingold fails to mention

is that the classified documents the White House presented to the Senate show that the government did assure the phone companies that cooperation was legal (even though it wasn't). The backers of immunity are using those assurances to say that telephone executives acted in good faith. That's not really true. Telecom executives knew it wasn't legal, but they had faith in the government's promise of protection. That is what we are seeing play out—the promised immunity.

Glenn Greenwald, former Constitutional lawyer, blogger and author revealed this week that the NSA has been breaking the law on warrantless wiretapping long before the 9/11 attacks, which supposedly provided the impetus to bypass the law on warrantless searches, made by presidential decree.

It gets worse for the Democrats claiming to object to these crimes of government. Ray McGovern says that **House Speaker Nancy Pelosi** has admitted knowing for several years about the Bush administration's eavesdropping on Americans without a court warrant (and saying nothing). She said she was briefed on it when she was ranking Democrat on the House Intelligence Committee. Referring to her briefing in an apologia-sans-apology in a Washington Post op-ed on Jan. 15, 2006, she wrote: 'This is how I came to be informed of President Bush's authorization for the NSA to conduct certain types of surveillance...But when the administration notifies Congress in this manner, it is not seeking approval. There is a clear expectation that the information will be shared by no one, including other members of the intelligence committees. As a result, only a few members of Congress were aware of the president's surveillance program, and they were constrained from discussing it more widely.'"

This is untrue according to former Sen. Mike Gravel of Alaska. He told the News Hour with Jim Lehrer Wednesday night that he won his court case against the government when they tried to prosecute him for revealing information from a classified briefing to the public. The courts affirmed, according to Gravel, the right of an elected representative to reveal to the public anything he feels is necessary for the welfare of the nation.

AL GORE'S NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

The Nobel committee, notorious for its pro-Left bias in Nobel prize winners, must be grasping at straws to relate Gore's propaganda efforts on behalf of human-caused global warming to world peace. British Commentator Robert Faletra said it well: "After I finished chuckling last Friday when I heard about the absurdity of Al Gore winning the Nobel Peace Prize for making a propaganda movie about global warming, I got to thinking. Heck, if this guy can win a million-dollar prize for flying around in private jets, taking limousines everywhere he goes, burning mucho gallons of oil heating his oversize mansion and then tell everyone else they are screwing up the planet, why can't I get in on this deal?

"One of the world's foremost meteorologists has called the theory that helped Al Gore share the Nobel Peace Prize 'ridiculous' and the product of 'people who don't understand how the atmosphere works.' Dr William Gray, a pioneer in the science of seasonal hurricane forecasts, told a packed lecture hall at the University of North Carolina

that humans were not responsible for the warming of the earth. His comments came on the same day that the Nobel committee honored Mr Gore for his work in support of the link between humans and global warming.

"'We're brainwashing our children,' said Dr Gray, 78, a long-time professor at Colorado State University. 'They're going to the Gore movie [An Inconvenient Truth] and being fed all this. It's ridiculous.' But Dr Gray, whose annual forecasts of the number of tropical storms and hurricanes are widely publicized, said a natural cycle of ocean water temperatures - related to the amount of salt in ocean water - was responsible for the global warming that he acknowledges has taken place. However, he said, that same cycle meant a period of cooling would begin soon and last for several years. 'We'll look back on all of this in 10 or 15 years and realise how foolish it was,' Dr Gray said.

"During his speech to a crowd of about 300 that included meteorology students and a host of professional meteorologists, Dr Gray also said those who had linked global warming to the increased number of hurricanes in recent years were in error. He cited statistics showing there were 101 hurricanes from 1900 to 1949, in a period of cooler global temperatures, compared to 83 from 1957 to 2006 when the earth warmed. 'The human impact on the atmosphere is simply too small to have a major effect on global temperatures,' Dr Gray said. 'It bothers me that my fellow scientists are not speaking out against something they know is wrong,' he said. 'But they also know that they'd never get any grants if they spoke out. I don't care about grants.'" Bravo.

BAILING OUT THE HIGH ROLLERS

Mike Whitney decries the ongoing bailout of the high finance speculators that are reeling from the subprime mortgage meltdown. "Officials in the Treasury Dept---working with their colleagues at Citigroup, J.P. Morgan and Bank of America---have concocted a scheme to rescue the banks from their massive losses in mortgage-backed securities. The group is planning to set up a \$100 billion emergency fund which will purchase non-performing assets for short term debt. In truth, the fund is a bailout which provides the financial giants with an excuse for not reporting their enormous losses from bad bets.

The story first appeared in Saturday's Wall Street Journal: "The high stakes plan to rescue banks from losses on mortgage securities amounts to a big bet that a consortium of financial giants—at the prodding of the US government—can persuade investors to pour money into the troubled credit market."

"The banks are presently holding hundreds of billions of dollars in mortgage-backed securities (MBSs) that they cannot sell—because there are no buyers—and don't want to take back on their balance sheets because they'll be forced to increase their capital reserves. So they've decided to launch a public relations campaign to promote some goofy-sounding fund, called the 'Master-Liquidity Enhancement Conduit' or M-LEC, which will allow the banks to place their unwanted bonds in Limbo until some future date when the public appetite for CDOs improves." This is a bailout, pure and simple. But it also represents how desperate the government is to create new financial

gimmicks to salvage the current bubble and stave off collapse.

Meanwhile, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is pumping out more statistics masking the real rate of inflation. They do this by eliminating all prices that rise faster than “normal” from the statistical basket of goods. When they say energy prices rose 0.4% this quarter, they are using a deceptive basis for the calculation. When they say food prices only rose 0.3% this quarter, they are excluding foods that rose much higher than the others—claiming these foods are an anomaly.

MarketWatch parrots the party line: “The CPI figure is used by the Social Security Administration to set next year's cost-of-living adjustment for benefits received by about 50 million Americans [*one of the main reasons for manipulating the CPI—to save billions in entitlement costs*]. COLA will rise 2.3% in January to match the gain in the CPI for workers over the past four quarters. The core CPI rate, which excludes food and energy prices to provide a “better look at inflationary trends,” has risen 2.1% in the past year, close to the Federal Reserve's unofficial comfort zone.”

Let's see if we heard that right? How does excluding food and energy prices provide a “better look at inflationary trends?” It doesn't. It's pure hogwash. Playing games with the criteria masks those trends as intended. Reconstructed M3 money figures (www.nowandfutures.com) are running at nearly 14% —the real rate of monetary inflation. Housing starts are declining fast. We're not out of the woods yet.

TERRORISTS AT GUANTANAMO TREATED BETTER THAN JAILED BORDER PATROL AGENTS

Jerome Corsi says Dana Rohrabacher (R-CA) rightly wants to know why two Border Patrol agents, railroaded into prison on a false conviction of shooting an “unarmed” drug smuggler, are being kept in long-term solitary confinement. “Rep. Dana Rohrabacher, R-Calif., is calling on the Bush administration to conduct a thorough review of harsh treatment convicted Border Patrol Agents Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean reportedly are receiving in solitary confinement. Rohrabacher argues that for 10 months Ramos and Compean have been in conditions more severe than experienced by terrorists held by the U.S. at the Naval Base in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The congressman also disclosed he has written a letter to Manhattan federal trial judge Michael Mukasey, Bush's nominee to replace Alberto Gonzales as attorney general, demanding that upon confirmation Mukasey conduct an unbiased review of the agents' prosecution.” Fat chance. Agents and whistleblowers who buck the system get treated harshly in prison—on orders from above.

PUTIN ON STAGE IN IRAN

Putin's show of solidarity with Iran is NOT what it seems. While Russia claims it “will not allow” the US to attack Iran with military force, it has no intention of following through with any blocking force of its own. Russia, in my analysis, is merely setting the stage to make the US look as bad as possible when it does attack Iran unilaterally. Like Iraq (which was also “backed” by Russia prior to the Iraq

war) Russia intends to let Iran fall in order to enhance the US image as the “bully of the world.”

In other news, Russia is using US insistence in placing an anti-ballistic missile system in Eastern Europe for political leverage. Putin is making the case that the “threat” of these defensive missiles gives Russia an excuse to scrap the Intermediate Nuclear Forces treaty and install new medium range missiles in Western Russia and Belorussia—missile systems specifically prohibited by the INF treaty.

Let me explain why the US anti-ballistic-missiles (ABM) installation in Europe is not for its stated purpose. First, the number of ABMs is very limited—not enough to stop either a Russian attack nor an Iranian attack. Second, the US turned down a Russian offer to place the anti-missiles in Russian controlled regions next to Iran where they would be much more effective in taking out Iranian missiles in their boost phase. This means that the placement of the missiles in Europe was NOT intended to defend against Iran, but to provoke a Russian response—or better said, hand the Russians an excuse to rearm and deploy more missiles, without any corresponding effective defense by the West. It is no surprise, therefore, that Bloomberg reports, “President Vladimir Putin said Russia has ‘grandiose plans’ to continue the country's largest military build-up since the end of the Cold War... Russia, the world's biggest energy supplier, last year earmarked 6 trillion rubles (\$240 billion) for military spending through 2015 as Putin uses revenue from high commodity prices to restore the country's might.” And, the world yawns and fails to become alarmed because the US isn't sounding any alarm bells. After all, Russia is an “ally.”

MORE REASONS TO LEAVE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Sex education and immunization requirements are two more reasons why public schools have become the favored venues of liberals and drug companies to push their own agendas upon students. Bob Unruh of WorldNetDaily.com rightly says that “Public school districts are no longer a safe environment for children.” That's a bit of an understatement and a bit too late. Public Schools never have been safe for children because of the underlying control of content by government. Large numbers of parents are only now beginning to wake up as the control agenda in schools becomes more apparent.

For once large groups of Christians in California are saying, “We've had it with public schools and the promise of reform. We're getting out!” Mr. Unruh cites numerous examples in his article: “A call is being issued to Christians who have been engaged in the culture wars in California's schools to abandon the system, after Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger signed into law a ban on ‘discriminatory bias’ against homosexuals and others with alternative sexual lifestyles. ‘We're calling upon every California parent to pull their child out of California's public school system,’ Randy Thomasson, president of Campaign for Children and Families, told WND.

“... Under the new law, schoolchildren as young as kindergarten will be sexually indoctrinated and introduced to homosexuality, bisexuality, and transsexuality, over the protests of parents, teachers and even school districts,’ he said. The law at issue went through the California legislature as SB 777, and now bans in school texts and

activities any discriminatory bias against those who have chosen alternative sexual lifestyles,' Meredith Turney, legislative liaison for Capitol Resource Institute, said.

"There are no similar protections for students with traditional or conservative lifestyles and beliefs, however. Offenders will face the wrath of the state Department of Education, up to and including lawsuits. 'SB 777 will result in reverse discrimination against students with religious and traditional family values. These students have lost their voice as the direct result of Gov. Schwarzenegger's unbelievable decision. The terms 'mom and dad' or 'husband and wife' could promote discrimination against homosexuals if a same-sex couple is not also featured.

"'Parents want the assurance that when their children go to school they will learn the fundamentals of reading, writing and arithmetic – not social indoctrination regarding alternative sexual lifestyles. Now that SB 777 is law, schools will in fact become indoctrination centers for sexual experimentation,' she said." Karen England, chief of CRI, told WND that the law is not a list of banned words, including 'mom' and 'dad.' But she said the requirement is that the law bans discriminatory bias and the effect will be to ban such terminology."

In other news, the school district in Portland Maine voted to provide **contraceptives** to middle school girls without parental knowledge or consent. Parents were up in arms about the proposal but the school board voted to disregard their concerns and approve the measure anyway. That's typical in a "we know better than parents" system.

Schools have long since become purveyors of **vaccines**, being a requirement for entrance into public schools as early as pre-school. Fortunately, 26 states allow parents to declare a religious exemption, and parents are increasingly using that exemption to opt out. Now, a new barrage of media stories decrying the "misuse" of the religious exemption is hitting the press in hopes of curtailing this practice. The most recent article by Steve LeBlanc of the Associated Press is typical.

He quotes Paul Offit as saying "'Do I think that religious exemptions have become the default? Absolutely,' said Dr. Paul Offit, head of infectious diseases at Children's Hospital in Philadelphia and one of the harshest critics of the anti-vaccine movement. He said the resistance to vaccines is 'an irrational, fear-based decision.'"

But as one of the readers to this column in the Salt Lake Deseret News shot back, "LeBlanc invited a one-sided story when he allowed Paul Offit to comment using words like 'irrational' and 'fear-based.' What LeBlanc doesn't tell you is that Paul Offit is a vaccine patent holder and is part of the advisory committee that approves the vaccine schedule.

"LeBlanc also tells us that 'government-funded studies have found no link between vaccines and autism' and makes out that the movement by some parents to avoid vaccines has no scientific backing. What LeBlanc fails to include is any information about a growing number of independent, well-credentialed scientists like Dr. Boyd Haley, University of Kentucky; Dr. Mady Hornig, Columbia University, Dr. Thomas Burbacher, University of Washington; Dr. Mark Geier, President of The Genetic

Centers of America and David Geier, Vice President of The Institute of Chronic Illnesses, and Dr. Jill James, University of Arkansas whose research links vaccinations to neurological damage.

"LeBlanc carefully omits that a mercury-based preservative, Thimerosal, which has been in use in vaccines since the 1930s was never tested and approved by the FDA before it was allowed in our children's vaccines. Since 1983 the vaccines our children receive have tripled. Since 1983 autism has jumped from 1:10,000 to 1:150. Coincidence?"

Readers also were smart enough to see through the flawed thinking of Dr. Lance Rodewald, director of the CDC's Immunization Services Division when he was quoted as saying, "When you choose not to get a vaccine, you're not just making a choice for yourself, you're making a choice for the person sitting next to you." But as one anonymous readers quipped, "If vaccination protects against disease then how can a non-vaccinated person be a threat to a vaccinated person sitting next to him? If the vaccines do what they are supposed to, then why should an entire school of vaccinated children be worried about one who is not?"

The fact is, vaccines don't give real protection, and the risks of damage to the immune system by those vaccines, especially to young children with developing immune systems, are significant compared to the claimed benefits. Why else is a Vaccine hotline emergency number posted? Trouble is, when you call that number, the medical personnel will try their best to convince you there were other causes that caused your baby's death or injury after taking the vaccine. The entire system is designed to cover up the dangers and side effects.

New vaccines are being created for every disease, even those which are merely inconvenient. But all vaccines contain dangerous and toxic chemicals. Vaccines can contain anything from aluminum, formaldehyde, dangerous microorganisms, thimerosal (mercury), to ethylene glycol. Many additives to vaccines are immune suppressants to keep the immune system from eliminating the vaccine. In the process sometimes the immune system gets altered and tricked into attacking the body's own cells—that's why we have such an epidemic of auto-immune diseases and allergies. As one critic said, "How is the human body supposed to build immunity by being exposed to neurotoxic poisons like mercury, formaldehyde, and DNA from animals? Mercury is the second most toxic material on the planet. The first is radioactive plutonium. To make thimerosal, they start with elemental mercury. Then, they hop it up 1,000 times by converting it to ethyl mercury. Then, they add aluminum to the vaccine that has a synergistic effect with the mercury, causing it to be 10,000 more toxic than elemental mercury." Mercury is used to sterilize vaccines from bacteria and other substances gained during the incubation process in animal proteins. But often the cure can be more toxic than the bacteria.

As Ray Moore of Exodus Mandate told WND, "This really is a call to conservative and Christian pro-family groups to give up this absurd idea of public school reform. It can't be done. The longer they talk about saving public schools, the longer they prolong this agony, when they could be setting up new schools." He's right. While most of WAB readers

don't like public schools, many rationalize their continued participation because they think, "My school is different," or "We can overcome the deficiencies by talking to our kids." Fact is, most of the most damaging things about public schooling are absorbed through social interaction, the thing parents irrationally fear their children may be "losing out on" if they leave. What all need to realize is that more bad comes from unsupervised social interaction than good, and once infected with bad desires and attitudes children become very resistant to parental efforts at correction. Most often the slow change and influence in your children is not recognized by the parents until way too late. It's time to start shielding your children from these subtle but deadly evils.

Private schooling many times isn't much better than public schools as far as infecting your children with bad attitudes. Most private schools are filled with kids who come from public schools, bringing their problem ideas and bad social habits with them. A school that doesn't control attitudes as well as actions won't serve you well in the long term. Home schooling is the most labor intensive of the alternatives, but is also the most rewarding if done right. The most feared "disadvantage" of home schooling (cutting kids off from their "friends" in public school) is actual one of its greatest benefits—if supplanted by meaningful learning and activities. Many parents fear the commitment necessary to teach their own children at home. In reality, running a home school schedule forces the home to "get its act together." Kids have to start working to keep the house clean and orderly. Parental discipline becomes essential in controlling bad attitudes as well as actions. Self-discipline on the kid's part also becomes indispensable to complete assignments when the parent is concentrating on teaching other siblings. These are traits essential to developing sound character. Home schooling, when done right, accelerates character development. [END]