

The MIAC Report and an Article V Convention

The Report Was Justified On At Least One Issue

By Bill Walker

To say the political right is upset over the eight page [MIAC Report](#) discussing the militia movement, would be a gross understatement. The confidential report, entitled “MIAC Strategic Report, 02/20/09, The Modern Militia Movement.” was written by Missouri Information Analysis Center (MIAC) and, according to several sources, was released to the public by an unidentified member of the Missouri state police. [Wikipedia](#) describes MIAC as “‘fusion center’ combining resources from the federal Department of Homeland Security and other agencies, in particular local agencies. It collects intelligence from both the local agencies and the Department of Homeland Security and uses these combined sources to analyze threats and better combat terrorism and other criminal activity. The center opened in 2005 and is located in Jefferson City, Missouri.”

According to a column written by Chuck Baldwin on March 27, 2009 entitled “Missouri Scraps MIAC Report” Mr. Baldwin notes that “no left-leaning political ideologies were identified. No Islamic extremists. No environmental extremists. Only people holding ‘conservative’ or ‘right-wing’ philosophies were identified in the MIAC report.” Perhaps Mr. Baldwin should reexamine the title of the report. The report deals with a particular political span of individuals who generally are described “conservative” or “right-wing.” Other gun carrying extremists groups who are “liberal” or “left-wing” in their political views are probably described in other confidential reports of the MIAC that were not surreptitiously released to the public by an unnamed source.

Indeed the very nature of the report suggests a series of reports, each focused on a particular political element of the political spectrum. No doubt if all MIAC reports intended to identify possible threats to public safety were made public, instead of just this one, Mr. Baldwin’s complaint would be meaningless. And, given that political splinter and faction groups exist on both sides of the political aisle, it’s equally likely these Islamic extremists, environmental extremists, et al., would be as irritated as Mr. Baldwin is, that based on historic incidents, such as shootings, bombings and so forth, the police dared to write a report describing the history of these events and judging those people who have killed and maimed on repeated occasions in order to further their extreme political agendas as possible threats to public safety.

The report suggests that many militia types may be lurking among the followers of the supporters of Texas Congressman Ron Paul, former congressman from Georgia Bob Barr and Chuck Baldwin him. In his column Mr. Baldwin raises a valid point. Just because someone of particular political philosophy supports a particular candidate is no reason to suggest they may be a terrorist or threat, unless there is evidence to prove the people named in the report have committed an act, terrorist or not, which the police might see as a threat to public safety. In sum, if evidence exists linking Mr. Paul, Mr. Barr and Mr. Baldwin to a criminal act, then the report is justified in its conclusions.

On March 20, 2009, Congressman Paul, Mr. Barr and Mr. Baldwin sent a [letter](#) to the honorable Missouri Governor Jeremiah Nixon requesting “the document be removed, and its distribution and any actual or implied adoption of it by the state of Missouri, stop.” The letter stated, “If it is the intent of the state of Missouri to link three legitimate, former candidates for the office of President of the United States (who also happen to be a sitting Member of the U.S. House, a former member of the U.S. House, and a Baptist Minister) to persons who Missouri believes pose a danger to law enforcement, then this document clearly does so...” So, according to Mr. Baldwin’s column, even Mr. Paul, Mr. Barr and Mr. Baldwin admit that if their past actions can be demonstrated to be a “threat” then the report is proper.

According to Chuck Baldwin’s March 27, 2009 column, the state of Missouri has caved. Mr. Baldwin states in his column, “On March 23, DPS Director John Britt sent an apology letter to Ron Paul, Bob Barr, and me stating, I have ordered that the offending report be edited so as to excise all reference to Ron Paul, Bob Barr or Chuck Baldwin and to any third-party political organizations.”

Baldwin then stated that on March 25, “the head of the Missouri State Highway Patrol, Col. James F. Keathley, ordered the Missouri Information Analysis Center (MIAC) to ‘permanently cease distribution’ of the report. Keathley, according to Baldwin, said that neither he nor Britt had read the report before it was distributed and that the report was filled with numerous spelling and grammatical errors and did not cite any sources for its broad statements about “right-wing” militias.

Clearly, if there was no evidence to support the concerns expressed by the MIAC, then Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Paul and Mr. Barr have every right to have been offended and to request the report be withdrawn. The question is, however, does public record support the position of Mr. Barr, Mr. Paul and Mr. Baldwin. Obviously, something in the public record caused someone in MIAC to write the report and come to the conclusions the report reached. Is there anything in the public record that shows that Mr. Barr, Mr. Paul and Mr. Baldwin have committed any act that would justify the MIAC issuing a report warning police that these three men and their followers, might pose a threat to public safety.

The answer is yes.

The report listed several issues which it stated that “right-wing militias” were opposed to. This laundry list of political issues included opposition to the United Nations, gun control, the Federal Reserve, federal income tax, abortion and illegal immigration. The report concluded that groups holding these views of opposition might pose a threat to public safety. As noted by Mr. Baldwin in his column, the report provided no citations or proof showing that political opposition to these issues was somehow a threat. In this, Mr. Baldwin is correct. Simple political opposition to a political issue is not justification to label someone a “threat.” But there was one issue in the report where Mr. Baldwin is incorrect. On this issue there is public record proving Mr. Paul and Mr. Barr have

violated federal criminal law regarding their opposition to it. This same public record shows Mr. Baldwin to be dangerously close to violating the law. Therefore, so far as this issue is concerned, the MIAC report is justified in expressing its concern for public safety.

The issue is the failure of Congress to call an Article V Convention. What Mr. Barr, Mr. Paul and Mr. Baldwin fail to realize, along with many of their followers, many of whom have been vocal in their opposition to the calling of an Article V Convention, is that a convention call is a constitutional mandate, not a political issue. It is one thing to oppose a political issue, it is an entirely different matter to oppose, or more importantly, support those opposed to obeying the Constitution when their oaths of office require they do so. There is no question the states have satisfied the single term of Article V, that is two-thirds of the state legislatures have applied for a convention call. The Constitution demands 34 applications from 34 states; all 50 states have submitted over 700 applications for a convention call. These applications can be read at [the FOAVC web site](#). Further, as everyone knows, the Constitution is “supreme law” of this nation.

As described [in the FAQ section](#) on the FOAVC web site, the Solicitor General of the United States acting in his official capacity as attorney of record for the members of Congress, acknowledged that members of Congress had violated their oath of office in refusing to call an Article V Convention when the Constitution demanded they do so. Violation of oath of office by any federal official, including members of Congress, is a federal offense. In the lawsuits, individual members of Congress were named as defendants. Congressman Ron Paul was one of the named defendants in the lawsuit.

As to former congressman Bob Barr who had left office before the lawsuit was filed, the same federal criminal laws apply to him. Public record clearly shows that for the entire time Mr. Barr was in office, he failed to obey the Constitution and call an Article V Convention as required by the Constitution and his oath of office. Thus, Mr. Barr violated his oath of office to “support” the Constitution and therefore committed the same criminal act as Mr. Paul.

What of Mr. Baldwin? Mr. Baldwin’s opposition to an Article V Convention is well known. He has spoken many times on his opposition to obeying the Constitution and compelling Congress to call a convention as it is required to do. Thus, Mr. Baldwin has expressed public support for Mr. Paul and Mr. Barr criminally disobeying their oaths of office. There is such a thing as a criminal conspiracy law and while Mr. Baldwin may not have crossed the line, his actions to oppose obeying the Constitution certainly have brought him close. Close enough certainly to justify the writing of a report by a police agency charged with monitoring such actions.

Public record shows that all three men have either actually violated federal criminal law in their public opposition to obeying Article V of the Constitution of the United States or have expressed public support for doing so. Thus they have advocated the overthrow of the Constitution by simply vetoing it. The overthrow of the Constitution whether by force or any other means, clearly poses a threat to the safety of this nation. Only by obedience

to the Constitution can we be assured that the rights and privileges guaranteed in the Constitution remains for us to enjoy. It is the task of organizations such as MIAC to be on the lookout for such potential threats that may endanger our rights or the safety of this nation; to identify them and to warn others in law enforcement of these potential threats.

The MIAC report did just that. Given the public record on at least in one issue raised in the report, the failure of Congress to call an Article V Convention and the opposition of Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Paul and Mr. Barr to it, the report was entirely justified in its conclusions. Given this fact, it appears the actions of the Missouri officials to withdraw their report may have been ill-advised. It is true the report gave no citations supporting its conclusions, but even Missouri police can read the Constitution.