

# The Deweese Report

Volume 18 - Issue 8

August 2012

## The American Planning Association and its “faulty” handbook

By Tom DeWeese

With great fanfare, the American Planning Association (APA) reported results of a recent survey the group conducted, (“Planning America: Perceptions and Priorities”) showing that the anti-Agenda 21 “crowd is slim.” Said the report, only 6% of those surveyed expressed opposition to Agenda 21, while 9% expressed support for Agenda 21 and 85%, “the vast majority of respondents, don’t know about Agenda 21.”

Typically, APA is using the survey to formulate the image that opponents to Agenda 21/ Sustainable Development are just a lunatic fringe with no standing and of no consequence in the “real” world. They continue to portray Agenda 21 as simply a 20 year old idea, and just a suggestion that planners and local governments might consider.

However, a closer look at the full survey, plus some additional APA reports reveal some interesting, and in some cases, astounding facts.

First the survey:

It was designed to show support for “Planning.” This has become an obsession with the “planning community” because Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development have become the center of protests by property owners and those who feel government has grown too big and powerful. So the APA has launched a series of efforts to fight back. These include conducting a “boot camp” to train their legions of planners across the nation on how to deal with anti-Agenda 21 protestors.

According to the APA, the findings of the Survey reveal that: Only one-third believe their communities are doing enough to address economic situations; Very few Americans believe that market forces alone (the free market) improve the economy or encourage job growth; 84 % feel that their community is getting worse or staying the same; Community planning is seen as needed by a wide majority of all demographics; and of course, that 85% of Americans just don’t know enough to hold an opinion about Agenda 21.

Those are pretty astounding findings. Looks like these “honest” planners have their fingers on the pulse of the nation. And as the APA constantly reminds us in their materials, “there is no hidden agenda,”(as in Agenda 21).

Astounding perhaps, until you look at the actual questions asked in the survey. For example, Finding #4: Community planning is seen as needed by a wide majority of all demographics (79% agree; 9% disagree; and 12% don’t know). Wow!

But here is the actual question that was asked: “*Generally, do you agree or disagree that your community could benefit from a community plan as defined above?*” The definition **provided** in order to answer the question was this: “*Community planning is a process that seeks to engage all members of a community to create more prosperous, convenient, equitable, healthy and attractive places for present and future generations.*”

*Continued to Page 2*

IN THIS  
ISSUE

Page 1 - THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION AND ITS “FAULTY” HANDBOOK  
Page 4 - BUZZARDS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CIRCLING CHATTANOOGA  
Page 5 - EXECUTIVE TYRANNY  
Page 8 - THE POWER OF ONE

Asking the question in that manner is akin to holding up a picture of Marilyn Monroe along with one of Rosy O'Donnell and asking which one would they want to date. Give me the pretty one please – says 79%. In fact, in some actual planning meetings they do just that – hold up a picture of downtown depicting decaying, dreary buildings verses one of a shining, beautiful utopia, and they literally say, “which one do you want?” If the answer is (of course) the pretty one, then, YES, the community supports planning! Talk about a “dumbed down” process.

Moreover, as the American Planning Association adamantly denies any connection to the United Nations' policy of Agenda 21 and its planning programs, how strange it is then, that the APA definition of planning is almost identical to the definition used by the UN to define Sustainable Development. Compare: “*Development that meets the needs of today without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.*” The UN further defines Agenda 21: “*Effective execution of Agenda 21 will require a profound reorientation of all human society, unlike anything the world has ever experienced.*” Such a forced policy would certainly “engage all members of a community” whether they want to be or not. The UN calls it a “*redeployment of human resources.*” Other than semantics, there is no difference in the APA's and the UN's definitions of planning.” The planners' definition uses an interesting term, “equitable.” The UN also uses such a term in describing Agenda 21 – “Social Equity.” And that is translated into another term: “Social Justice.” It means “redistribution of wealth.” Is that what the “local” planners have in mind for their community development?

It's obvious that the APA is playing word games with its surveys and definitions of planning. No wonder such an overwhelming majority answer in the affirmative to such questions.

And, yes, maybe a lot of Americans don't know what Agenda 21 really is. However, if the APA asked real questions that gave a solid clue as to the planning they actually have in mind, I'm quite sure they would get a much different response – whether the person answering had ever heard of Agenda 21 or not. For example, here are some sample questions that could help the APA take the real pulse of the community – if they wanted to be honest:

- How do the citizens feel about planning policy that dictates the size of their yard and forces high density developments where one practically sits on top of their neighbors? Do they still support such “Planning?”
- How do the citizens feel about planning that enforces the creation of public transportation with a limited number of riders – yet could cost taxpayers so much money that it would be literally cheaper to buy each potential rider a brand new Rolls Royce, even when the chauffeur is thrown in for good measure? Do they still support such “Planning?”
- How do they feel about planning that enforces limits on energy use and forces up energy costs? What if that included forcing residents to replace their appliances with more energy efficient ones to meet “Planning Standards?” Do they still support such “Planning?”
- How do the citizens feel about Planning that forces cars to “share the road” with bicycles and foot traffic, even as Planners narrow the streets, deliberately making it harder to drive? Do they still support such “Planning?”

Continued to Page 3

## DeWeese Report

Vol. 18, No. 8  
August 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

Web Page:  
[www.deweese.com](http://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

- How do the citizens feel about Planning that forces tax payers to pay for plug-in stations for electric cars that hardly anyone wants or uses, for the specific purpose of forcing people to buy them? Do they still support such “Planning?”
- How do the citizens feel about Planning that creates non-elected boards, councils and regional governments to enforce their policies, which actually diminish the power of the officials they elected, severely reducing citizen input into policy? Do they still support such “Planning?”

Ask the questions in this manner instead of trying to whitewash them into sounding like innocent, non-intrusive local ideas for community development. Ask the questions so that they reflect the consequences of the plans, and then see if the 85% now are so eager to ignore the effects of Agenda 21.

The reality is that Americans across the nation are now openly protesting such policies as they are being enforced in communities everywhere. They are directly tied to the stated goals of Sustainable Development, the official policy of Agenda 21. And that is why a twenty year old “suggestion” has become the focal point of attacks on “local” planning.

Planners are shocked that people are opposed to such attacks on their private property and their pocketbooks, and they are doing everything possible to label such Americans as “fringe conspiracy theorists.” The survey is part of that effort.

In fact, the APA survey follows a barrage of news articles, obviously contrived by the public relations firm hired by APA, to again, paint its image as just a group of honest planners trying to do their jobs while being unjustly attacked by fringe radicals. Such convenient reports have suddenly appeared on the front page of the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Wisconsin Watch*, *Mother Jones* and the *Southern Poverty Law Center*, to name a few. It’s interesting to note that most of these stories name me as the perpetrator.

As mentioned, the APA has organized a boot camp to train their planners how to combat us nasty

protestors. Through its new training, the APA downplays revealing details of the plan, instead, suggesting ways to make their presentations merely “conversations with the community,” using empathy, and terms that are non-technical.” Obviously APA believes the protestors are just simpleminded and unable to see their wisdom. One shouldn’t be so upset over losing control of their property, their business or their farm. There’s a higher good at stake here, after all.

And so, to accomplish that task of dumbed-down “planning,” (and in fact, hiding its real purpose) the APA is going to great lengths to change the words. For example, the APA has issued to its members a “Glossary for the Public” that suggests what words should no longer be used in public meetings when discussing planning, because they make the opposition see “red.” So the planners should not use words like collaboration and consensus, or public visioning, or even “Smart Growth.”

The Glossary provides specific language and tactics to be used to defuse protests. “*Stay on message*,” it says. “*The following phrases may be useful to help you frame your message in a way that is positive and inclusive, when transitioning to a local example, or to stay on message during public meetings where critics may attempt to distract from the agenda or topic at hand.*” And here is the language they suggest: “***Plans and planning are time-tested ways for communities and neighborhoods to create more options and choices for their residents...***” In other words, we’ve always had planning, so what’s the problem?”

Such “public” meetings that the APA is so worried about being disrupted are not public at all. They are “consensus” meetings, run by professional facilitators, trained in psychology to use stealth to direct the audience into a pre-determined direction for a pre-determined outcome. Anyone asking questions outside the well-controlled box is labeled a protestor. And we are protesting that! It is not how things are to be done in a free society, especially when your own property is at stake.

Yes, there has been planning throughout the history of America. Many communities have come up with efficient ways to deal with water use and waste disposal, and to assure that factories weren’t built next door to private homes, and so forth. And no one is protesting that!

# BUZZARDS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CIRCLING CHATTANOOGA

By Kathleen Marquardt

*“A stakeholder group consisting of elected, business, and philanthropic leaders from the tri-state region of Southeast Tennessee, Northwest Georgia and Northeast Alabama which encompasses three metropolitan statistical areas has announced a major milestone in the effort to lay the groundwork to launch a 40-year regional growth planning process.”* [The Chattanooga](#)

Sustainablists circle like Buzzards, eagerly awaiting the death knell of the Great American Experiment. They no longer worry about sneaking legislation, regulation or planning in through the back door. Certain that they are in control, they are now up-front, in fact blatantly smug about what they are doing.

In the very first quarter of *The Chattanooga* article, it details Stakeholder groups, the regional growth planning process, it talks of organizing and facilitating, long-term region wide planning, public visioning, common ground solutions, localized planning effort, etc. Tell me how this isn't Sustainable Development.

Chattanooga has been living with this a long time, “This is a continuation of the public visioning and community engagement processes that have been transforming Chattanooga and the surrounding region since the early 1980s.” That is when Senator Bob Corker was the mayor of Chattanooga. Sure is nothing I would be bragging about. But then I am not a useful idiot to the global elite who are orchestrating all of this. The statement from the mayor goes on to admit that their “community pioneered this approach.” Now this is really something to be ashamed of rather than touting it in the local rag.

“We don't have to agree on everything, but failing to cooperate when it benefits citizens would be foolish,” said Georgia State Senator Jeff Mullis. “This planning process will enhance coordination among localities without taking away any of their authority or independence.” If you read the full article you will see time after time that they (the instigators of this travesty) keep insisting that they are not taking away the authority or independence of any localities. Yet, the regional boards do exactly that. The function of legitimate elected government within the system is fast becoming little more than a rubber stamp to create and enforce the dictates of the councils and regions.

“In my mind, the regional planning process is about job creation,” said Tom Edd Wilson, president and CEO of the Chattanooga Area Chamber of Commerce. “We're competing against the whole world to retain and recruit employers.

Coming together as a team on economic development will give us a tremendous advantage in making the most of our economic opportunities while preserving the quality of life that makes us so attractive to the companies we already have.” We are not competing against the whole world, we are competing against the few companies that are left in America. And the sadder thing about this is that only the companies that become Public Private Partnerships (PPP) have much of a chance at all at getting business here now. Many PPPs are nothing more than government-sanctioned monopolies in which a few businesses are granted special favors like tax breaks, the power of eminent domain, non-compete clauses and specific guarantees for return on their investments.

Following the public meeting on Nov. 17, the stakeholder group which has been working to launch the regional growth planning process will weigh public feedback and other requirements set forth in the selection process to determine which of the finalist teams will coordinate the effort with the aim of starting the process during the first part of 2012. Look at that sentence -- stakeholder group and regional growth planning -- two buzz phrases of Sustainable Development. And they will weigh “public feedback,” and how much weight do you think they will give to the legitimate questions of costs, autonomy, property rights and true local control?

I would bet money that not one idea that doesn't conform to Sustainable Development will make it to the selection process. What we are watching is a highly choreographed spectacle that is being staged in cities, towns and counties across this great country of ours in front of audiences that do not have a clue to the fact that this performance is a death knell to the Great American Experiment.

Can we hold them off in Chattanooga? Let us hope so; let us hope that, into the machinery of this consensus process the globalists' useful idiots manipulate so well, a wrench is thrown that will put them out of business.

We need to be supplying the wrench, metaphorically. We need to make certain that Americans understand what is wrong with Sustainable Development, not by name but by what it does to rights and freedom. Show them the effects on property rights, water rights; show them how the prices of food and energy are skyrocketing because of the rules and regulations that are designed into these plans. Show how our duly elected officials are becoming nothing more than rubber stamps for the unelected, often non-local officials of the planning and regional boards that have been mandated through these programs. The words Sustainable and

*Continued to page 7*

# Executive Tyranny

By Alan Caruba

The use of Executive Orders (EO) goes back to the first President, George Washington. Every chief executive has issued them since then. Some have been historic, but the latest Executive Orders of President Obama are downright scary.

The Executive Order signed on June 25 is titled “Russian Highly Enriched Uranium” and offers as its justification the fact that “the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federal continues to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, and hereby declare a national emergency to deal with that threat.”

A national emergency? Over Russian nuclear material?

Are we still in the Cold War?

Are we facing another Cuban Missile Crisis?

Are the Russians getting ready to launch a nuclear attack on the U.S.?

Are the Russians provocateurs? Yes, but what else is new?

***The justification for this Executive Order is absurd.***

The world is filled with nuclear weapons held by both our allies and our presumed enemies.

Having proclaimed a national emergency, why hasn't Obama gone on television to inform Americans? Because, like everything else he does, it is done with stealth.

A previous Executive Order issued on March 16th evoked an even stronger response from those paying attention to what the President is doing. On March 22nd, [Jeffrey T. Kuhner](#), a columnist for The Washington Times, wrote:

“President Obama has given himself the powers to declare martial law—especially in the event of a war with Iran. It is a sweeping power grab that should worry every American.”

“On March 16th, the White House released an executive order, ‘National Defense Resources Preparedness.’ The document is stunning in its audacity and a flagrant violation of the Constitution. It states that, in the case of a war or national emergency, the federal government has the authority to take over almost every aspect of American society. “

“Food, livestock, farming equipment, manufacturing, industry, energy, transportation, hospitals, health care facilities, water resources, defense and construction—all of it could fall under the full control of Mr. Obama.”

“He now possesses the potential powers of a dictator. The order is a direct assault on individual liberties, private property rights and the rule of law. It is blatantly unconstitutional.” Bear in mind that Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution states that “All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

“Specifically, the imposition of martial law by the national government over a state and its people, treating them as an occupied nation, is an act of war. Such an attempted suspension of the Constitution and Bill of Rights voids the compact with the state and with the people.” – [Oathkeepers.org](#).

There has not been a peep out of Congress.

In the last decade the U.S. went to war in Afghanistan and Iraq without a “national emergency” being declared. Whether or not the U.S. goes to war with Iran, Obama has granted to himself sweeping powers consistent with a dictator, not a Chief Executive. The Middle East rumor mill suggests that either he and/or Israel might do that in October.

Recall that the financial crisis of 2008 occurred conveniently before the election that put him in the Oval Office.

In point of fact, Executive Orders do not require Congressional approval to take effect, but they carry the same legal weight as laws passed by Congress. The authority for Executive Orders is found in Article II, Section 1, of the Constitution which grants the President “executive power.” The orders, however, are understood to give direction and guidance to the Executive Branch agencies and departments.

The latest Executive Orders are not “a conspiracy theory.” They are the law of the land.

In the case of the National Defense Resources Preparedness Executive Order, it puts the Executive Branch in total control of everything and everyone in the nation. This includes the power to arrest and detain anyone deemed a threat to the nation.

A study, “Profiles of Perpetrators of Terrorism”, commissioned by the Department of Homeland Security identified the following characteristics of potential “terrorists.”

# Americans who believe their “way of life” is under attack;

# Americans who are “fiercely nationalistic (as opposed to universal and international in orientation)”;

## Planning Association

*Continued from Page 3*

Our fight is with “planning” that is specifically designed to curtail energy use, drive up costs, control private property and development and building - literally dictating a change in our lives and even changing the very structure of our system of government.

One of the tools the APA uses to enforce planning is through the International Code Council (ICC), an international set of standards based on a one size fits all set of regulations. The ICC also develops the International Energy Conservation Code, a model for energy efficiency code. And it develops a standard for Accessible And Usable Building Facilities. Each of these codes is aimed at cutting back energy use, controlling private property use, and, in short, enforcing sustainable development. Where was the concept of sustainable development first introduced and perfected as an agenda for development? Oh yes, in Agenda 21. There is no room for discussion, reason or consideration for exceptional local situations. The APA brings these codes and others into the community planning as a pre-packaged deal inflicting the community with (yes) foreign regulations. And yes, dedicated Americans protest that this is not local government or planning, but the enforcement of an international (UN) agenda.

We further find similar pre-packaged regulations coming from federal agencies, including the EPA (which openly admits that some of its grant programs are designed to impose Agenda 21) the Forest Service (which admits that its policies on forest conservation are coming from the UN’s Brundtland Commission on Global Governance), as well as polices from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the Department of Transportation, to name a few.

And so it goes. Government in the U.S., at all levels, is happily moving forward with such plans, using the ground troops supplied by the American Planning Association in every community. It’s happening fast, and is all-pervasive. And as people are being run over by such plans, some are trying to slow down the runaway freight train by standing in the tracks and yelling stop! They of course are the ones labeled as fringe nuts.

However, as the APA does everything it can to so label our movement, a shocking new report provides new evidence that the sustainable polices advocated by APA in the cities – the policy known as Smart Growth – is wrong headed and really pretty dumb. And where does such a report appear? Here’s the real shocker. It was published in the *Journal of the American Planning*

*Association* in an article entitled “*Does Urban Form Really Matter.*” It is an analysis of Smart Growth polices in the United Kingdom which shows that the “compact city” controls don’t work.

Says the report, “The current planning policy strategies for land use and transportation have virtually no impact on the major long-term increases in resource and energy consumption. They will generally tend to increase costs and reduce costs and reduce economic competitiveness.” Continues the report, “Claims of compaction will make cities more sustainable have been debated for some time, but they lack conclusive supporting evidence as to the environmental and, particularly, economic and social effects.”

There you have it. Right out of the pages of the APA’s own *Journal*, the very policies that they are forcing on communities across the nation, are wrong. Forcing mass migration into cities where people are to live in high density buildings, or homes on lots so close together that the dog can’t squeeze between houses, have no effect on the environment. But as I have stated in articles and speeches across the nation, such “planning” creates an artificial shortage of land, causing housing costs to go up. It doesn’t cut down on energy use or protect the environment. It’s a useless intrusion in the lives of honest Americas.

And that is exactly why we are protesting Agenda 21. It is wrong. The premise is wrong. The facts as presented by the APA and other planners, are wrong. It is wrong for our nation. Wrong for property owners. Wrong for future generations.

In the 1970s, author Richard Bach, who wrote the classic book, *Jonathan Livingston Seagull*, also wrote a second book entitled, *Illusions: The Adventures of a Reluctant Messiah*. In the book, a Messiah, as he was forced to come up with answers to the problems of life, consulted the “Messiah’s Handbook.” All he had to do was open the book and it would miraculously turn open to the very page containing the answer he sought. He stumbled through his adventures, following the handbook. But finally, in the end, as he consulted it a final time, the page read simply, “Everything in this book may be wrong.”

There is only one right approach for a community to come together to discuss and solve common problem: open discussion, honest debates and votes, and above all, a full concentration on the protection of private property rights as the ultimate decider. The American Planning Association needs a new handbook! ●

**BUZZARDS***Continued from Page 4*

Development do not have to be used, just their effects and affects. We need to be doing this across America in every city, county and town because, if it isn't already there, Sustainable Development and its buzzards will be there soon.

To help us have tools to inform the public of this evil, we need to know as many of the names of planning groups associated with Sustainable Development as we can find. We know of some:

Renaissance  
 Piedmont Environmental  
 American Planning Association  
 ICLEI  
 PlaceMatters  
 Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness  
 Center for Neighborhood Technology  
 RERC Strategic Advisors  
 Wallace Roberts & Todd  
 Gresham Smith & Partners

Yes, you can go down the list of the three finalist teams in the article and pull out a lot. But we would like to try to make a definitive list. To that end, if you would email me with ones in your area, I would appreciate it. My email address is listed at the end of this article. Thank you.

*Kathleen Marquardt has been in the freedom movement since before it was called that. She was founder and chairman of Putting People First, a non-profit organization combatting the animal rights movement. Her book, AnimalScam: the Beastly Abuse of Human rights, was published by Regnery in 1993. Kathleen has been Vice President of American Policy Center since 2000. She is a contributing writer and researcher for Freedom Advocates.*

*E-Mail: marquardtkathleen379@gmail.com* ●

**Executive Tyranny***Continued from Page 5*

# People who consider themselves “anti-global” (presumably those who are wary of the loss of American sovereignty, opposed to the United Nations, etc.);

# Americans who are “suspicious of centralized federal authority”;

# Americans who are “reverent of individual liberty”;

# People who “believe in conspiracy theories that involve grave threat to national sovereignty and/or personal

liberty.”

This is a President who called for a “Civilian National Security Force” on July 2, 2008, one that would be “just as powerful, just as strong, just as well funded as the U.S. military.”

Obama is putting in force everything a tyranny requires to replace the Republic.

Alan Caruba's commentaries are posted daily at “Warning Signs” and shared on dozens of news and opinion websites. His blog recently passed more than **1.6 million page views**. If you love to read, visit his monthly report on new books at Bookviews. For information on his professional skills, Caruba Editorial Services is the place to go! You can find me on both Facebook and Twitter as well. ●

**The Power of One***Continued from Page 8*

Two individuals, Orville and Wilber Wright invested every dime they had in the gamble that heavier-than-air objects could fly. No one had ever done it before. But they believed! There was heavy competition from other efforts to be the first to discover the answer. Some of that competition was financed by government. But the Wright Brothers prevailed as their modest home invention took to the skies in sustained flight – and the world changed forever.

Today, Barack Obama gets to fly around the world in the greatest flying machine every designed, Air Force One. But his policies to block the drilling and use of oil are forcing up the price of fuel, making it more and more difficult for the average American to afford a ticket on commercial airlines.

Barack Obama has the process backward. It first takes the power of one to see the ideas and create the tools that will benefit millions of others, who are then able to satisfy their needs and achieve their own dreams. But, in today's society, after an individual envisions it, and takes the risk to invest his own effort and resources, he then has to jump through endless government hoops to finally achieve it. Then government rushes in to tax it and regulate it, all for the “common good.” Then to add insult to injury, that same courageous pioneer has to listen to the likes of Barack Obama telling the masses that the individual didn't do it – the masses did.

That's what government does. It invents nothing. It produces nothing. It creates nothing. It just grabs control of the ideas of free minds and taxes, regulates and, ultimately, stifles and crushes the urge to even try. And then all of us lose. ●

# The Power of One

By  
Tom DeWeese

*“If you’ve got a business – you didn’t build that. Somebody else made that happen.”* Barack Obama, Roanoke, VA July 13, 2012

Thomas Edison tried over 1,000 times to come up with the successful process to make an incandescent light bulb work. When someone remarked that he had failed 1,000 times, he said, “I have successfully discovered 1,000 ways to not make a light bulb.” Other men might have given up and failed. Edison was one man with a determination to succeed.

Once he had found the one correct way, he announced it to the world and performed endless demonstrations to prove its worth and safety. Finally he was ready to bring it into practical use. To bring the world electric light, Edison offered to build the complete infrastructure necessary to light homes in a specific section of New York City.

Immediately, the gas light industry felt the threat and attempted to use the power of government to stop Edison. “The streets would be torn up for two years.” “It would inconvenience citizens.” And the classic argument, “the gas pipes are already in place and providing light.” In other words, don’t mess with the order of things with new ideas. Business run through government power and control (public/private partnerships) kills entrepreneurship and human progress.

Today, Barack Obama’s White House is flooded in electric light. His Administration’s attitude to Edison’s invention that “brought us from darkness?” Ban it and force consumers to use less illuminating environmentally correct florescent lights that were developed through government edict and taxpayer-funded grants. Consumers don’t want them – government does.

Prior to the invention of the electric light, Thomas Edison and Alexander Graham Bell went into fierce competition over the creation of the telephone. One held the patents on the sender, the other held patents on the receiver. Each worked around the clock to invent around the other’s patents in order to wholly control the telephone. Working to get the upper hand over other, Edison and Bell deployed crews to build the infrastructure to bring the telephone into every home. Because of their fierce competition, the telephone’s development soared, making it much more valuable and reliable. Each new improvement by one of the inventors led to more attention and more development.

Government’s contribution to this incredible success story? In England, a bureaucrat became alarmed over the fast growth of this new device. The telegraph industry was threatened, and so was society’s order. And so he set out to control the telephone by imposing the same regulations that governed the telegraph – that government must sanction only one such telephone company, rather than this chaotic competition (government-sanctioned monopolies). And so the British government first attacked Edison and took him to court. Edison lost the court fight and decided to give up his interest in the telephone to Bell. That’s why there was a behemoth monopoly called the Bell Telephone Company,” but no Edison Telephone Company to compete with it. Government created the monopoly and in turn slowed its progress, forcing higher prices on consumers and ultimately a nation-wide disdain for “Ma Bell.”

Barack Obama’s White House incorporates a vast communications system, but no one using it appears to have the slightest knowledge of from where it came. “Was it not always so,” asks the mindless bureaucrat?

Edison went on to invent the phonograph, opening the way for today’s vast entertainment industry. In addition he invented the motion picture camera, creating today’s massive movie industry. All created by one man and his ideas, providing services and jobs for millions. Government’s contribution is to regulate and tax every corner of these industries, causing higher prices and stifled creativity.

Henry Ford didn’t invent the automobile. But he did create the process to mass produce them, making them cheaper and easier for the average person to own. Prior to Ford’s creation, only the very wealthy could even imagine owning a horseless carriage. The automobile gave people greater independence in travel, and gave industry the ability to move more goods at a cheaper rate, and the economy soared. Horses took a much deserved rest. It is true that “after” Ford developed his system of mass production and created a huge demand, government did spend tax dollars to improve highways and bridges, making it easier to drive the cars.

Though his White House owns a massive fleet of some of the most incredible cars in the world, allowing him to travel independently and safely, Obama now seeks to impose policies that would eliminate cars and their provision of independence, forcing the rest of us to, instead use public transportation, run by government.

*Continued on page 7*