

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 18 - Issue 2

February 2012

Major new weapon in the fight against the United Nations. Immediate Action Needed To Drive Home A Victory!

By Tom DeWeese

Those who are working to enforce Agenda 21 operate from a three-pronged attack; **Social Justice**, which dictates that “community” needs take precedent over “individual” wants; **Public/Private Partnerships**, a dangerous melding of private corporations with government resulting in government-sanctioned monopolies; and **Environmental control**, which translates into the proposition that all actions by man lead to environmental Armageddon and therefore must be tightly regulated by a central force of power.

One major target in the crosshairs of this attack is private property ownership and control by individuals. Across the nation reports are pouring in of government land grabs that lock away private land in the name of protecting a sucker fish, or a spotted owl, or a historic site. The results are destroyed industries such as timber, ranching or mining. Valuable and desperately needed natural resources are put out of reach for use.

Much closer to the average homeowner, property rights are being violated as restrictions are put on a homeowner’s ability to add on to the house or make improvements. In some extreme cases, access roads to houses are disallowed; even normal repairs are interpreted as new building and are banned. There are new building restrictions that dictate the kinds of materials that may be used for building and repairs. Now private homes are being invaded by electric companies, replacing, without permission, electric meters to comply with new regulations. Homeowners are losing their ability to even control their own thermostat.

In some communities, to meet arbitrary energy restrictions, local government is forcing homeowners to

install new energy efficient appliances and windows, and even new roofs, on occasion. There are reports of inspectors actually entering homes and systematically removing incandescent light bulbs and replacing them with the new green models, without the knowledge and against the will of the property owner. Repairmen are instructed to lower temperatures on water heaters as they repair them, and so forth.

In short, private property rights, meaning the control of property by the owner is fast disappearing. While Agenda 21/Sustainable Development-inspired legislation gives lip-service to private property ownership, the language usually says something like, “*balance the rights of individuals and property owners with the needs of the community.*” That line is, in fact, a direct quote from the “Growth Policy” for Great Falls, Montana. Such wording is nearly universal in comprehensive development plans across the nation.

That mindset is growing in local government regulations as Agenda 21 practices are enforced. The promoters understand that their policies are literally ripping apart private ownership of property, but they lack the intestinal fortitude to be honest about their actions. So they acknowledge “property rights,” and hope we don’t question how private control of ones own property is “balanced” with the “needs” of the “community. How is that done? Who stands for the rights of the individual property owner or private business as government makes the rules to decide the “needs” of the community?

To defend such a policy, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s) and planning professionals

IN THIS
ISSUE

Page 3 - SHORTS: OHIO PEACE OFFICER DRAFTS NDAA LETTER FOR POLICE AND SHEFFIS,
Page 4 - 2011 WAS AN INCREDIBLE YEAR AS AGENDA 21 BECOMES A MAJOR ISSUE
Page 7 - JUNK FOOD IN SCHOOLS NOT THE CULPRIT
RAISE TAXES OR SHOOT HOOPS?
Page 8 - TYRANNY: REGIONAL PLANNING BRINGS REGIONAL GOVERNANCE

such as the American Planning Association (APA) which contract with local governments to create such rules, come armed with an arsenal of experts ready to defend the anti-property rights policies whenever challenged. So, if a property owner appears before the County Commissioners to complain that a certain regulation has damaged his property rights, or perhaps has damaged his ability to conduct business, for example, the NGOs immediately jump into action to defend the policy. They bring in a battery of “experts” with official titles to write official sounding reports that serve to overwhelm the elected officials and cut off any honest debate. A local citizen simply has no chance to fight back against this heavily-funded, powerfully-connected onslaught.

Obviously, if Agenda 21 and its mindset of government control is to be reigned in, clearly, something needs to be done to provide a strong voice for protection and defense of the property owners. Such a plan of action has now been developed by County Commissioner Cornel Rasor of Bonner County, Idaho. He calls it a Property Rights Council.

Rasor, Chairman of his County Commission, has been an opponent of Agenda 21 and a proponent of property rights for many years. After being elected to the County Commission several years ago he recognized the threat centralized control of development posed to private property and set out to develop a strategy to protect constituents’ property rights and their right to control their own property. As a result, the concept he created is a “Property Rights Council” (PRC) as an official arm of the county government. It now exists in Bonner County, complete with a full time director on the County payroll.

Key to the success of a Property Rights Council is the proper definition of property rights. Scott Bauer, county attorney for Bonner County, Idaho and one of the driving forces to get it

established, explained their approach in defining property rights this way: *“Practically speaking for each PRC case -file we translate the expression ‘property right’ with the expression ‘control right.’ We take a property right to be a right to control some asset, resource, or physical thing. A PRC case is analyzed in terms of whether the proposal advances public control or private control (code for public/socialized property or private property). Property controlled by a ‘public entity’ is property controlled by an entity that utilizes a measure of socially sanctioned coercion to control the private assets in its possession and to take those assets from private individuals or groups without their full/complete consent. Applying this to land-use controls, new proposed zoning (anti-development or anti-use controls) socialize preexisting privately controlled real property and place it coercively into public control. Using this framework the PRC looks for the mix of public/private control over an asset or assets and promotes more private control and less public.”*

Further, Bauer explains that the root property rights philosophy used in the PRC is based on John Locke’s theories of natural property rights. This is the same root used by America’s founding fathers, especially Thomas Jefferson, when they created the US constitution. So using such definition as the basis of PRC policy is right in line with imposing Constitutional law through PRC decisions.

Here’s how the Property Rights Council works, as both a protector for property owners and as an official advocate for private property rights:

- A PRC is a citizen’s council of between 7 – 9 citizen volunteers, vetted and approved by the County Commission and assigned the task of researching and offering free market recommendations to resolve property rights conflicts.

DeWeese Report

Vol. 18, No. 2
February 2012

Published by
The DeWeese
Company, Inc.

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/
Fulfillment
Lola Jane Craig
Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout
CJ Scrofani
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report
PO Box 3598
Warrenton, VA 20188

Phone: (540) 422 - 2082

Web Page:
www.deweese.com

Copy write
2012 The DeWeese
Company, Inc.
Issn 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

Permission to photocopy, Reprint and quote articles from the DeWeese Report is hereby granted, provided full acknowledgment is included. All reprinted articles must say: “Written by Tom DeWeese, Editor of DeWeese Report (unless another author is listed). All reprints must carry the DeWeese Report address and phone number. Samples of the reprint must be provided to the DeWeese Report

Ohio Peace Officer Drafts NDAA Letter For Police And Sheriffs

Below is a letter composed by an Oath Keeper peace officer in Ohio. This letter was written to raise awareness of the ominous problems in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 (NDAA). Jim Singleton is a State chapter officer for Ohio Oath Keepers and is Ohio's Peace Officer Liaison. www.oathkeepers.org

Greetings and Salutations,

It's unfortunate that I have to write this letter, however in light of current events it is inevitable. Just days ago the United States Congress passed the NDAA (National Defense Authorization Act) this in itself was necessary. However in this bill was an insidious piece of verbiage that for all intents and purposes destroys the foundation of everything we believe in and took an oath to uphold. To me the possibility of those citizens and others under my protection being spirited off in the middle of the night by agents of the military, then being summarily incarcerated without access to judge or jury are insufferable and intolerable acts.

It will be argued that this only applies to foreign persons or others suspected of terrorism, but there are far too many avenues available to apply this to any group to which any administration may take umbrage with. When growing up and especially during our training in the academy we are instructed that the constitutional rights of all must be upheld at all times, as well as the respect for all people we come in contact with or represent. This section of the NDAA attempts to remove those rights which are enumerated and given to us by our creator, and places them in the hands of the office of the President of the United States to be disregarded at his whim.

And in those few words lies a conundrum, do we as police officers, sheriffs, deputies and others who have taken the oath to uphold and defend the constitution, now turn our back on that very oath? Do we now turn against the very same people that entrusted us with a most sacred duty to serve and protect them? If in fact we follow a rule of law such as this bill enacts, it would mean that the oath that we all took meant nothing. We are obliged to follow all lawful orders given to us, but we cannot do this blindly. History has seen the result of these acts and has judged them accordingly. I can only ask all of you to take a moment to reflect upon all that we are taught and hold dear, the people we serve deserve and demand our highest respect for it is through them and they alone that we were given this oath. Do we simply turn a blind eye for the sake of political expediency and lose our respect? Is a few pieces of silver so dear that we would sell our honor for it? How will we explain to our friends and loved ones why members of our community were spirited away or how will they see us when they realize (that when their time comes) we won't be there for them?

I believe that if and when those orders come, I cannot in good faith and in strict observance to my oath, allow myself to be a part of them. I would hope that members of our military in accordance to the articles of the UCMJ, would also refuse them as well. When that time comes I will do exactly as I have sworn to do, I will serve and protect those under my care, so help me God.

Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying,
Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?
Then said I, Here am I; send me. Isaiah 6:8

Respectfully Submitted
James B. Singleton

Secretary Ohio Oath Keepers
LE Liaison - Ohio

2011 Was an incredible year as Agenda 21 becomes a major issue

By Tom DeWeese

After hiding under the radar for more than 19 years, Agenda 21 became the cause of 2011 as thousands of concerned Americans began to study United Nations documents side – by – side with their local comprehensive development plans. To the horror of most, they found identical language – and the battle was on.

Fighting back

The battle to stop Agenda 21 in local communities and in state legislatures has taken several varied but effective paths. In my travels to speak to more than 38 groups in 12 states in 2011, I have been privileged to meet and work with some of the most amazing activists I've even encountered. I've also been able to meet with state legislators in four states, along with a large number of county commissioners and city councilmen - all eager to learn about Agenda 21 and how to stop it. Here are some of the results of their work in countering the massive power of those enforcing Agenda 21 across the nation:

- **Communities Leaving ICLEI**

It started last January, 2011 in Carroll County, Maryland, as the newly elected Board of Commissioners, led by Richard Rothschild, voted to cancel the county's membership in the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI). At the same time the Commission also terminated the contract of the county's sustainable development director, and they sent the county planning commission back to the drawing board for the state-mandated comprehensive development plan – with instructions to not resubmit it until it protected private property rights and complied with the U.S. Constitution. Little did these new commissioners know, they were at the head of a tidal wave that was about to sweep the nation.

Following Carroll County, next came Amador County, California, as the county commissioners voted to end their membership in ICLEI; then came Montgomery County, PA; followed by Edmond, Oklahoma, Las Cruces, New Mexico. The successful battle against ICLEI in Spartanburg, South Carolina was sparked by County Commissioner Roger Nutt; Virginia became a hotbed of activity against Agenda 21 and ICLEI, especially through the efforts of activists like Donna Holt, Cathy Turner and Charles Battig, to name a few. As a result of their efforts, Albemarle County, Virginia (home of Thomas Jefferson), James City County, Virginia (where America basically started at James Town), Abington, Virginia and Lexington, Virginia, have all voted to throw ICLEI out; we can now add to this list Plantation, Florida; Carver, Massachusetts; Pinellas, Florida; Garland, Texas; Sarasota, Florida; Clallam County, Washington; Monmouth County, New Jersey, Chatham County, North Carolina and Somerset County, New Jersey.

Unofficial reports indicate that at least 54 communities have withdrawn from ICLEI in 2011 (though I don't have all of them listed here because we don't have official verification). In addition, while ICLEI set a goal of 1000 American cities as members by 2015, indications are that only 17 new cities joined ICLEI this past year. That would be a net reduction of 37!

- **Property Rights Council**

As I arrived in Idaho last September to speak, I was told that a county commissioner wanted to have dinner with me. I said, fine. I've gotta eat! What I received from that dinner was nothing short of stunning. As I arrived at the restaurant I was ushered into a back room where about eight people awaited me, including Bonner County, Idaho attorney Scott Bauer and Bonner County Commissioner Cornel Rasor. They began to lay out a full-blown presentation for a plan to protect property rights in their county. They called it a Property Rights Council. This was to be an official arm of the county government, complete with a full time employee and a selected council of citizens who would oversee all county legislation and regulations to assure they didn't violate private property rights. In addition, the plan was to connect the council's activities with a state wide network of free market think tanks that would help make such judgments on the proposed legislation. Amazing idea! I mentioned it in my monthly report to APC supporters and it became a sensation. Tennessee activist Karen Bracken picked up the idea, spent hours discussing every detail with attorney Bauer and quickly organized a conference call of national activist leadership, and the idea is now spreading across the nation. Property Rights Councils will be an invaluable tool to counter ICLEI's near total control of county government.

- **State Legislative Activity Against Agenda 21**

It has truly been amazing to see anti-Agenda 21 efforts in state legislatures across the nation. My report here is only a fraction of the activities actually taking place, as I literally can't keep up with the many meetings, hearings and resulting legislation that is being introduced. But here are a few of the highlights:

In the state of Washington, State Representative Matt Shea is succeeding in creating an "Anti-Agenda 21 Caucus," designed to educate fellow legislators to the dangers of Agenda 21 and to block passage or any such legislation. Eight House Members have joined so far.

A bill (Assembly Bill 303) has been introduced by Representative Mary Williams into the state legislature of Wisconsin to repeal state mandated smart growth legislation. *Continued to Page 5*

Agenda 21 continued from page 4

Smart growth legislation has been passed in almost every state and is the Sustainablists' main weapon to enforce Agenda 21 policy in every county. Repeal of such legislation gives the local government the right to choose whether it wants to participate in Sustainable planning or not. The bill has already passed the Wisconsin House and is awaiting action in the state Senate.

Similar legislation has already been passed and signed by the Governor in the state of Florida. That means that Florida counties are now free from state mandates to write and impose comprehensive development plans.

The state of New Hampshire has two landmark bills before it. First is HB 1634, introduced by Rep. Amy Cartwright which prohibits "the state counties or towns from implementing programs of, expending money for, receiving funds from, or contracting with the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI)." The second bill prohibits federal, state and local government agents from entering private property without the property owner's written permission.

- **Republican National Committee Passes Anti-Agenda 21 Resolution**

On Friday, January 13, 2012, Helen Van Etten, Republican National Committeewoman from Kansas, sponsored a resolution entitled "Resolution Exposing United Nations Agenda 21." It was adopted during the RNC's general session that day. This resolution may now be used by all opponents of Agenda 21 to help convince lawmakers that this is a threat serious enough that one of the two major political parties now understands and opposes it. All Republican officeholders now have a valuable tool to stand united and oppose Agenda 21 – if they choose to use it. It is also a major weapon for local activists, who, till now have fought alone, constantly labeled fringe conspiracy theorists.

- **Mainstream Conservative Movement and Candidates Join The Fight**

In addition, The Heritage Foundation has now acknowledged the threat of Agenda 21, in an article entitled "Agenda 21 and the Threat in Our Backyard." This is a sign that the mainstream Conservative movement is coming on board in the Agenda 21 fight.

A few months ago, I was contacted by the Newt Gingrich campaign after he had been pummeled with questions about his position on Agenda 21. When his answers weren't satisfactory to the crowd, people shouted "Call Tom DeWeese," and he did. A few weeks later Gingrich appeared on the Sean Hannity radio show talking about Agenda 21, and then he even brought it up in one of the debates.

In his last week on Fox News, Glenn Beck used some of his remaining precious air time on an international news

network to expose Agenda 21. I was very pleased to have been contacted by his producers to provide information for the program. And Beck provided a link to the American Policy Center's website so viewers could learn more.

The tin foil is falling off our hats rapidly as the fight against Agenda 21 is quickly escalating into the main stream of the political debate.

- **Breaking up Consensus Meetings**

One of the chief tools used by the pro-Agenda 21 forces is the use of trained facilitators and consensus meetings. These are psychology-driven sessions designed to reach a predetermined outcome, as the participants are led to believe it is their own idea. It's very effective in countering our arguments that Agenda 21 is implemented behind closed doors, against the will of the people. Of course, behind those closed doors is where the predetermined outcome and the tactics to enforce it is, well, determined.

That's all starting to change as anti-Agenda 21 forces are learning counter techniques. First, author Beverly Eakman has produced a book entitled "How To Counter Group Manipulation Tactics." Beverly has studied this tactics for years and has learned how to stop its progress. Created by the Rand Corporation and known as the Delphi Technique, the process depends on the fact that there is no debate, no open discussion and no dissent allowed. Beverly's book shows how that can be turned around on the facilitator, and in effect, ruin his day and his meeting's outcome. Beverly teaches activists how to lay low and quietly upset the process. Others have taken a more blunt, in-your-face approach. It works too!

Case in point, at a recent meeting in San Francisco, about 50 anti-Agenda 21 citizens turned out for yet another controlled consensus meeting, only they refused to play by the rules (key to messing up the pre-planned process). They spoke out, they video-taped the process, they refused to put their names on sign up sheets (an intimidation tactic used by the Sustainablists), they continually corrected the facilitator's incorrect statements, they did not participate in the "phony voting process," (again a tactic used in the Delphi technique to make you think you had a part in the outcome. As soon as you take one step in becoming part of the process, even to vote no, you are in the process). The protestors refused to give their names to the media and they brought in cameras and signs. Above all, they passed out flyers to every participant explaining the process being used on them and telling them their rights in a free assembly. No one was arrested in this process. Take away the power of consensus and you have gone a long way toward stopping Agenda 21. It simply cannot be implemented in a free, open society of free debate and transparency in government, as our local, state and federal governments were designed to be.

So, there you have it, a brief rundown of the growing battle to stop Agenda 21. 2011 was an amazing year in this fight to resort the Republic. But 2012 is already shaping up to be the year we finally crush Agenda 21. ●

Property Rights Councils Continued from page 2

- The mission of the PRC is to review county government activities and inter-governmental activities to determine whether the activities may cause adverse impact to private property rights. The PRC then is charged with supplying to county officials an opinion on that impact. The review includes study of county, state and federal regulations to assure County Commissioners are aware of their impact on property rights and help them prepare proper action that, at all times, assures protection of private property rights in the legal framework of local government. In short, the PRC does the research and provides free market solutions to elected officials that don't normally have the time or education to do so.
- The PRC will also be charged with training county employees to look for property rights violations as they go about their daily tasks in running county government. This could impact the permit process; the way inspectors treat property owners; elimination of invasive or unnecessary regulations; and over-zealous ticket writers.
- Perhaps of most importance, the PRC provides the framework for countering the Sustainablist's legal assault. Specifically, the PRC will interface with a network of free market think tanks which can and will provide legal opinions, reports, and even lawyers to substantiate the property rights legal position. They provide expertise, credibility and a legal force to counter the massive force of the Sustainablists that now overwhelm county officials when a property rights question is at issue. There is a nation-wide network of free market think tanks through the State Policy Network (SPN). There are other such think tanks available in every state. So, when a constituent comes before the Commission with a complaint, now he will not be alone. He will benefit from the PRC's efforts to protect his rights.
- The PRC will deal with issues ranging from wetlands regulations that usurp private property rights; watershed overlays; and zoning. The process can be used to determine the damage caused by such federal regulations as Endangered Species, Conservation Easements, EPA regulations on water and energy use, etc. Decisions made by one PRC could have far reaching effect on those made by other PRCs across the nation. A national database can be established of

pending and resolved issues, providing guidance to other PRCs. It will be a precedent-setting decision-making body that could mark the beginning of the restoration of property rights for all Americans.

- To assure the PRC contains the proper members (those who advocate and support private property rights) it will be vitally important that the County Commission submit applicants to intense scrutiny as to their ideas and philosophy. PRC members can request the dismissal of another PRC member for cause. The public can request a PRC member be removed for cause. There will be term limits for each member to assure constant movement in the council. The members of the Council will be volunteers.

Commissioner Razor and Bonner County attorney Scott Bauer are succeeding, under great pressure and criticism, to establish a Property Rights Council to protect citizens and their property from the massive force of the planners who are implementing Sustainable Development across the nation. Their goal now is to help others establish such councils in every community, in every state.

Razor and Bauer are making themselves available to anyone seeking to create a council. They have created tools and an action plan to help local activists start the process to create their own local PRC. They will teach those interested how to lay the ground work; how to select and approach the proper commissioner to get the ball rolling in their community; and finally to get the whole concept on the docket for consideration. To help with that process, Karen Bracken, a property rights activist from Tennessee is serving as the main contact to help activists get started with their own Property Rights Council. Karen will provide preliminary information, and as the process moves forward, she will connect activists directly with Commissioner Razor and Scott Bauer for more detailed planning. Karen can be reached at her email address: karenbracken5@gmail.com.

Contact Karen and get started in the battle to secure private property rights as the first step to countering the massive fire power of the vast network of planning advocates, self-appointed stakeholders, and NGOs that have invaded communities across the nation to enforce top-down control over every aspect of your life and property. Property Rights Councils can and will be the ultimate weapon to defeat Agenda 21 and restore freedom. ●

Regional planning continued from page 8

Agenda 21, which says:

(e) Adopt integrated approaches to sustainable development at the regional level, including transboundary areas, subject to the requirements of particular circumstances and needs;

The federal government has been using grants to shape regional governance for years. The Chattanooga Area Regional Council of Governments has already received more than \$4 million in federal grants in just the last couple of years, and is only one of several regions supported by the federal government.

Citizens in the Chattanooga area, and across the nation, should realize that once these regional administrative units are in place, there will be no way to return to the republican form of government that allows citizens to expect their city councilman or county commissioner to consider their wishes. The consent of the governed will no longer be a factor in public policy. Virtually all human activity will be subject to the approval of a professional bureaucracy that first creates a plan it thinks is a utopian community, and then requires every person to live where the plan dictates; to travel in a vehicle approved by the plan, to a job allowed by the plan — whether you like it or not.

Freedom cannot exist in an administrative form of governance.

Henry Lamb is the founder of Freedom 21
www.freedom21.org

Junk Food in Schools not the Culprit

If sprinkles-hating MeMe Roth was the national education czar, then schools across the country would be purged of everything from birthday cupcakes (replaced by birthday salads) to Halloween candy to Valentine's Day candy-grams. But hey, aren't all those sugary treats making kids fat? Shouldn't schools take a hard line against all the vending machines that create a regular “toxic food environment”? Maybe not.

The American Sociological Association reports on a new study of middle school students finding that “weight gain has nothing to do with the candy, soda, chips, and other junk food they can purchase at school.” The research, which appears in *Sociology of Education* this month, examined almost 20,000 kids in the fifth and eighth grades. Even when snack food availability increased, the percentage of overweight or obese students *decreased* from fifth grade to eighth grade.

“We were really surprised by that result and, in fact, we held back from publishing our study for roughly two years because we kept looking for a connection that just wasn't there,” said the lead author of the study. Meanwhile, regulators rid schools of so-called junk food resulting in resulting in black markets for candy — “Willy-Wonka-meets-Casablanca,” in the words of one observer—and students disgusted with the new “healthy” menus.

Interestingly, a separate “surprising” study in the *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior* released last year also found

no correlation between high school students' risk of being overweight and the presence of stores with snack food choices near their schools.

Maybe it's time for the “food police” to educate themselves. All the attempts to limit choices apparently won't do the students any good.

Copyright © 2012 Center for Consumer Freedom. All Rights Reserved.
 P.O. Box 34557 | Washington, DC 20043 | Tel: 202-463-7112 |
info@consumerfreedom.com

Raise Taxes or Shoot Hoops ?

In a new study published in *Health Affairs*, researchers estimate that a nationwide penny-per-ounce tax on sugar-sweetened beverages would reduce consumption by a whopping 9 calories per day.

Nine calories, that's it? After all of the huffing and puffing over needing to tax sugar-sweetened beverages to prevent obesity and type 2 diabetes, it will only make a 9-calorie-per-day difference? That's less than 1 percent of the total number of calories we consume on a daily basis. The researchers acknowledge that despite 40 states currently imposing sales taxes on all types of soda, no concrete link has been found between state-level soda sales taxes and prevalence of obesity. (Of course, they determine this to be due to existing sales taxes being “too low.”)

None of this is to say we buy the premise that sugary drinks are a unique contributing factor to weight gain. They aren't. Calories are calories, and too many calories from any source cause weight gain. Sugar-sweetened beverages only make up about 6 percent of the average person's daily calories, according to the National Cancer Institute.

Instead of a draconian national beverage tax—which is a handy excuse for a money grab—there are some pretty easy ways for people to burn off a few calories on their own in short order. According to WebMD, a 150 pound person can burn 11 calories by trying on clothes for five minutes, walking around the office for five minutes, or playing with children for five minutes. It only takes three minutes to burn 12 calories shopping for groceries, and only four minutes to burn 10 calories washing the dishes. Two minutes of shooting hoops burns 10 calories, and two minutes playing ping pong burns nine calories.

And after mowing the lawn for three minutes, a 150 pound person could burn more calories than would be saved from a sugary-drink tax. It looks like lawmakers pushing for soda taxes could benefit more from pushing their lawnmowers instead. Even a 250 pound person could burn 10 calories just by spending four minutes reading consumerfreedom.com.

Copyright © 2012 Center for Consumer Freedom. All Rights Reserved.
 P.O. Box 34557 | Washington, DC 20043 | Tel: 202-463-7112 |
info@consumerfreedom.com

Regional planning brings regional governance

By Henry Lamb

So what's wrong with regional governance? Nothing- unless you value the republican form of government and individual freedom — and detest autocracy in all its forms. Regional governance evolved as a way to get around the obstacles presented by multiple local governments, all of which may have a stake in the region, but often disagree on what the region needs.

Regional governments, and their initiatives, are driven by government, not by the people. Government, by its very nature, seeks to increase its power and overcome any obstacle in its path. Local governments, like individual neighbors, often disagree on how best to resolve a common problem. Consequently, governments, especially the executive branch, tend to look for ways to get around the obstacle of disagreement. One successful method is Regional Governance, which diminishes the power of local governments by conferring increasing levels of authority on the executive branch, which implements its authority through appointed bureaucrats.

In very short order, it is the unelected bureaucrats who wield the power; elected officials become little more than a rubber stamp whose approval provides "official" respectability to the bureaucracy.

A classic example of just how this works is available in a report titled: "Regional Governance Districts" produced by the Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (TACIR). The purpose of the report includes, "...to assist the state in responding to globalization...." The report makes this clarification: "Governance is distinct from government — while government is the traditional organization of public authority used to provide necessary services, governance is the provision of those services. While the word has been used to refer to service provision by traditional government, it has come to be used to refer more specifically to service provision through a non-traditional approach, such as by a contractor or through a public-private partnership."

Virtually every state now has some form of this new regional approach to governance, which is simply further evidence of how extensively the "administrative" form of global governance has influenced domestic policy.

The Chattanooga Area Regional Council of Governments, which consists of at least at least six alphabet agencies of appointed bureaucrats, has applied for a \$2.5 million grant from the federal government's Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant program. Before the application is considered, each participating government must sign a Memorandum of Agreement to "develop a shared vision," and to "develop livable communities," and other specific steps, all of which are defined by and must be approved, by the federal government. The Mayor of the city of Chattanooga has signed this MOA, thereby committing the entire city to conform to the requirements of the federal government in the expenditure of the federal money.

The citizens of Chattanooga have no idea that this grant application has been submitted, or what funding of the grant will mean to their individual freedom. They have had no opportunity to express their consent or opposition to this program, and it is unclear whether their elected representatives were even given the opportunity to vote on the application. Sixteen counties and all the municipalities they contain will be constrained by this grant application, and more importantly, by the 40-year regional plan it produces.

This process creates an administrative form of government which does not require the consent of the governed. Each step in the expansion of this process further extinguishes the republican form of government.

The federal government promotes this transformation of local government into regional administrative units which complies with the recommendations set forth in Chapter 8.5 of

Continued on page 7