

Regional Governance

**"I believe there are more instances of the abridgement
of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent
encroachments of those in power than by
violent and sudden usurpations."**

— *James Madison, address to the Virginia Convention, June 16, 1788.*

Published by: THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN - Littleton, Colorado

Beware Metro And Regional Government!

*Library of Congress Catalog No. 73-85483
First Printing, August 1973
Second Printing, November 1973
Manufactured in the United States of America*

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Phoebe Courtney is the managing editor of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, a national Conservative newspaper she founded in January 1955. This book is Mrs. Courtney's eleventh book. Her previous books have sold more than 250,000 copies.

This is also the fifth book in her series of books exposing the prestigious Council on Foreign Relation. According to Phoebe Courtney: "As long as the Council on Foreign Relations controls both the foreign and domestic policies of this nation, regardless of which political party is in power—as I always prove - I will continue my series of books exposing the policies of the semi-secret CFR to public view."

Putting out a national bimonthly newspaper and writing books are two of Phoebe Courtney's activities. She is also the author of a series of pamphlets entitled TAX FAX which deal with national politics and critical issues of the day. As this book goes to press, the current TAX FAX is No. 131. Almost 10,000,000 of her TAX FAX pamphlets have been purchased and distributed throughout the United States since 1956. The main purpose of these thoroughly documented pamphlets is to help mobilize grass-roots opposition to Liberal-Socialist legislation in Congress.

[NOTE: Mrs. Courtney is no longer publishing and has relinquished copyrights on her material so long as it remains intact.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#contents

- [Chapter I](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter I) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter I
NIXON DECREES U.S. COMPOSED OF TEN FEDERAL REGIONS
Flagrant Violation of the U.S. Constitution
- [Chapter II](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter II) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter II
METRO-REGIONAL GOVERNMENT: WHAT IS IT?
Taxation Without Representation
- [Chapter III](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter III) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter III
PEOPLE CONTROL VIA EXECUTIVE ORDERS
Nixon Endorses Kennedy's Dangerous Executive Orders
Role of Federal Regional Councils in Implementing Executive Orders
- [Chapter IV](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter IV) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter IV
NIXON RESTRUCTURES EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO ADMINISTER METRO
Office of Management and Budget - Overseer of Federal Regional Council
- [Chapter V](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter V) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter V
THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS (CFR) IN METRO
C.F.R. Man in Charge of Carrying out Nixon's Executive Orders
- [Chapter VI](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter VI) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html#Chapter VI
THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (CED) AND METRO
C.F.R. Members on C.E.D.'S Research and Policy Committee
C.E.D. Proposals to "Modernize" Local Government
Abolishing Most Elective Offices at the Local Level
Abolishing Most Elective Offices at the State Level
C.E.D. Pushes Metro
"Professionals" to Replace Elected Officials
- Chapter VII http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro2.html#ChapterVII
"1313" - REGIONAL GOVERNMENT'S TROJAN HORSE
Mail-Order State Constitutions and Laws from "1313"
- Chapter VIII http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro2.html#ChapterVIII
HOW METRO OPERATES AT THE LOCAL AND STATE LEVEL
List of City-County Consolidations Since 1957
Regional Councils - "1313's" Apparatus at the Local Level
- Chapter IX http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro3.html#ChapterIX
"REVENUE SHARING" BRINGS INCREASED FEDERAL CONTROL
Present Federal-Grant Programs Will Not be Abolished
Better Communities Act - Newest Version of Revenue Sharing
- Chapter X http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro3.html#ChapterX
TIE-IN BETWEEN "REVENUE SHARING" AND METRO-REGIONAL GOVERNMENT
- [Chapter XI](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXI) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXI
METRO AND URBAN RENEWAL
Urban Renewal - Vehicle for Seizing Private Property
Federal Metro Forces City-Suburbs Merger
- [Chapter XII](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXII) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXII

WHY METRO PROMOTES LAND-USE LAWS

"1313" Backs Land-Use Legislation

"Land-Use" - Vehicle for Regional Government

- [Chapter XIII](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXIII) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXIII
FEDERAL FUNDING FOR METRO-REGIONAL GOVERNMENT VIA LAW
ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION (LEAA)
Ten Federal Regional Councils Ready Plans to Rule the 50 States
 - [Chapter XIV](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXIV) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXIV
HOW TO IDENTIFY A METRO OPERATION
 - [Chapter XV](http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXV) http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro4.html#ChapterXV
WHAT YOU CAN DO
-

CHAPTER I

NIXON DECREES U. S. NOW COMPOSED OF TEN FEDERAL REGIONS

Author's note: In this book, when one or more of the individual States is mentioned by those advocating policies which will diminish the power of the sovereign States, the word appears as "state" or "states." When those supporting the sovereignty of the States make mention of States- it appears as "State" or "States."

In his State of the Union address on January 22, 1971, President Richard Nixon stated:

"The further away government is from people, the stronger government becomes and the weaker people become....

"I reject the idea that government in Washington, D.C. is inevitably more wise, more honest and more efficient than government at the local or state level...

"The idea that a bureaucratic elite in Washington knows what is best for people everywhere and that you cannot trust local government is really a contention that you cannot trust people to govern themselves. This notion is completely foreign to the American experience. Local government is the government closest to the people and it is most responsive to the individual person; it is people's government in a far more intimate way than the government in Washington can ever be...

"Let us give the people of America a chance, a bigger voice in deciding for themselves those questions that so greatly affect their lives."

The philosophy of government expressed in this address does indeed represent that of the vast majority the American people. However, Mr. Nixon's actions regarding this philosophy are the diametric opposite. Commenting on the President's State of the Union message, Congressman John Rarick observed:

"'Power to the people' is a slogan used not only by radical socialists in their plans to communize America but also by President Nixon in his New American Revolution.

"Whereas the rhetoric of the President is desirable and encouraging, the words unfortunately are made suspect by actions. By consistently asking for more and more tax funds for more and more federal programs which add to the federal payroll an increasing

number of bureaucrats who increasingly control more and more facets of the daily lives of citizens; by grouping States into regions with unelected federal overseers, thereby removing power farther from the people... the Chief Executive is, in effect, fostering power over the people rather than 'power to the people.'"

"Power to the people" is a traditionally American concept, which is what the Constitution of the United States is all about. When the necessary number of the original thirteen colonies ratified the U.S. Constitution, they established a government in which political power was decentralized. By the constitutional contract, they surrendered, to the federal government, only specified powers. Powers not delegated to the federal government were reserved to the States and to the people. This is specifically spelled out in the 10th Amendment to the Constitution.

NIXON'S EXECUTIVE ORDER SUB-DIVIDING THE STATES

On February 10, 1972, as the nation's press and TV were inundating the American people with coverage of Nixon's upcoming journey to Communist China, the President signed Executive Order No. 11647, which then appeared in the *FEDERAL REGISTER* of February 12. There was virtually no comment in the nation's press on this action.

By this Executive Order, the President by a stroke of the pen divided the United States into ten federal regions to be run by "Federal Regional Councils."

In Executive Order No. 11647, the President decreed:

"There is hereby established a Federal Regional Council for each of the ten standard federal regions. Each Council shall be composed of the directors of the regional offices of the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Secretarial Representative of the Department of Transportation, and the directors of the regional offices of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

"The President shall designate one member of each such council as chairman of that council and such chairman shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Representatives of the Office of Management and Budget may participate in any deliberations of each council."

The "ten standard federal regions" referred to by Nixon were delineated by him in a press release issued by the White House on May 21, 1969. Purporting to "streamline the structure and processes of federal agencies in the field," the President then gave the alignment for the federal regions as follows: (The city in parentheses is the federal capital of each region.)

- REGION I (Boston) - Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.
- REGION II (New York City) - New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
- REGION III (Philadelphia) - Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia.
- REGION IV (Atlanta) - Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.
- REGION V (Chicago) - Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

- REGION VI (Dallas-Fort Worth) Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.
- REGION VII (Kansas City) - Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska.
- REGION VIII (Denver) - Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.
- REGION IX (San Francisco) -Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada.
- REGION X (Seattle) - Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

As can be noted in the foregoing list, in all cases the lines drawn for these federal regions cross State lines, thus to all intents and purposes obliterating the sovereignty of the States.

FLAGRANT VIOLATION OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

Article IV, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution declares:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government..."

A republican form of government is defined in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary as one in which "the sovereign power resides in a certain body of the people - the electorate - and is exercised by representatives elected by, and responsible to, them."

Under the Federal Regional Councils proclaimed by President Nixon, government in the ten federal regions would be administered by federal appointed bureaucrats accountable only to Washington, D.C.

Thus Nixon's actions are a clear violation of the U.S. Constitution, according to Article IV, Section 4.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1, of the U.S. Constitution stipulates:

"New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State, nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress."

Thus, Nixon's unilateral establishment of the ten federal regions violates this Clause in the U.S. Constitution inasmuch as, prior to the issuance of this edict, the President did not obtain the consent of all the State Legislatures concerned, nor of Congress.

What is behind this ominous consolidation of Federal power over the States and the citizens thereof?

What is its ultimate purpose? And how far has it progressed?

How will it affect you, your pocketbook and your future liberty?

To answer these, and other questions on this grave threat to Constitutional government in the United States, is the purpose of this book.

CHAPTER II

METRO-REGIONAL GOVERNMENT: WHAT IS IT?

THE *DAN SMOOT REPORT* of February, 1, 1965, stated:

"Advocates of governmental planning have visions of a new kind of America: they would transform our union of sovereign States into a regionally-planned, monolithically-unified nation divided into a score of metropolitan areas which sprawl across State boundary lines."

Only four years were to elapse before President Nixon on May 21, 1969, proclaimed that the United States was now ten divided into ten regions (as listed in Chapter I).

In that **same** REPORT, Smoot also predicted:

"Each area will be ruled, at the 'local level', by only one governmental authority: a metropolitan government. Existing governments—city, county and State—will eventually be abolished."

In *COUNT DOWN* Newsletter of March 1973, Virginia R. Wilson, Editor and Publisher, had this to say:

"To understand Regional Government, it is necessary to know, what Metropolitan Government (Metro) involves, because Metro and Regional Government are the same: government of an area or region by a central body of appointed officials who have unlimited and unconstitutional power. Promoters of regional government claim it is a new form of government, but it is the oldest form in history—dictatorship."

Gary Allen in an article appearing in the January 1973 issue of *AMERICAN OPINION* magazine, defined Metro thusly:

"Metro is the governing of an area or region by a central body of 'experts'—planners who are usually appointed and vested with great powers, and who are not directly accountable to the people.

"The purpose is to place all power in the hands of the federal government and to turn State, county, and city governments into administrative cogs [Councils of Government] in one big bureaucratic machine."

Metro, therefore, is the accumulation of power in as few hands as possible—federally appointed, unelected bureaucrats beyond the recall of the electorate.

Metro policies and programs, goals and methods, appear in a variety of forms designed to deal with varying State and local laws. But the basic strategy involves merging and consolidation of local city or town governments into a larger area government—which is in consonance with the 10 federal regions established by Nixon's Executive Order, and controlled by Washington, D.C.

HOW METRO WORKS

Metro moves the heretofore independent divisions of local government into the collective whole. This is accomplished by the merging of city and county, county and district, and then State with other States, into a federal region.

When this has finally been achieved, there will only be two levels of government—federal and regional.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

Jo Hindman, a long-time research-journalist on regional planning issues is credited with coining the word "Metro-crats" to denote the federally appointed bureaucrats who will administer regional government.

In testimony submitted on June 4, 1971, to the Urban Affairs Subcommittee, U.S. Congress Joint

Economic Committee on regional planning issues, Mrs. Hindman stated:

"From the Metro viewpoint, regionalization helps Metrocrats gain control of wealth and the political power to get it. Regions provide a vast tax-base on which to assess, and from which to collect 'equalized' taxes. Metro's equalized taxation and per capita spending formulas take from the regions' sparsely populated fringe areas, but spend heavily on the densely populated regional city cores."

Nixon's ten federal regions are designed to be the vehicles to receive, and match with regional tax dollars collected from all parts of the region, the federal funds allocated.

In this connection Mrs. Hindman pointed out:

"Regional ruling bodies are non-representative because regional officers do not represent the citizenry. Regional officers are appointed... To date, there are no regional constituencies, no regional elections, no regional voters.

"Taxation on a regional basis, therefore, is taxation without representation. Regional rule bypasses voters and taxpayers."

The previously referred to *DAN SMOOT REPORT* of February 1, 1965, predicted:

"Initially, each metropolitan authority will levy taxes directly on local citizens; but when the whole nation has been organized into metropolitan areas, taxation can be made uniform—and local opposition to taxes eliminated—by abolishing local taxes. All taxes can then be levied by the central government in Washington."

THE FUTURE UNDER METRO

What will happen to our cities and States under Metro-regional government? This is answered by Gary Allen in his *AMERICAN OPINION* magazine article as follows:

"Metro is a mechanism for changing a limited Constitutional republic into an unlimited autocracy without altering the apparent form of our government. The State of Kansas will still exist. The city of Seattle will still exist. The county of Los Angeles will still exist. But their independence will not. Our entire form of government will have changed."

CHAPTER III

PEOPLE CONTROL VIA EXECUTIVE ORDERS

In President Nixon's statement of March 27, 1969, which originally established eight federal regions (raised to ten on May 21, Nixon mentioned "the regional council concept" and declared:

"Such councils can make it possible for the federal government to speak consistently and with a single voice in its dealings with states and localities, with private organizations, and with the public."

The "single voice" is the voice of the President whose power has been pyramided and concentrated by a series of Executive Orders made possible by a relinquishment of its perogatives by the Congress.

Early in our history, presidents began issuing Executive Orders governing the procedures of the Executive Department they headed. These Orders concerned such things as rules for federal employees, and for the internal administration of the various departments.

But, in 1933 a precedent was set so that Executive Orders could cover more substantive matters.

[*Sweet Liberty* Note: Executive orders only govern the procedures of the Executive Department (agency) and the bureaucrats heading the agencies. Executive Orders are NOT law and—as stated by Bill Leary of the National Security Council—"there is no legal or criminal penalty for failure to obey an Executive Order". Laws passed by the U.S. Congress giving 'force of law' to Executive Orders are color of law (non-law), since only the U.S. Congress has Constitutional authority to make federal laws. Article 1, Section 8 clearly defines the areas in which federal law applies to the several states.]

In an article in the January 1973 issue of *AMERICAN OPINION* magazine, Alan Stang points out how on May 9, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt demanded that Congress pass the Emergency Banking Act. The Act proposed to reorganize the nation's collapsing banking system, and to legitimize, retroactively, Roosevelt's "bank holiday" proclamation of three days before.

With members of both Houses of Congress barely aware of the future significance of the bill, because of White House pressure it was passed before midnight and Roosevelt signed it.

Among its dangerous provisions was an amendment to Section 5(b) of the Trading With The Enemy Act of 1917. That section originally shifted from Congress to the President the power of regular trade and financial transaction between Americans and foreigners in war time. But the new Section 5(b), as amended in 1933, gave the President these extensive powers *in peace time*.

In this connection, Stang had this to say:

"All the President had to do to get them (these extensive powers) was to declare a 'state of national emergency', which is nowhere defined, and he could then begin to rule by decree—by Executive Order."

And then Stang continued:

"The principle of unlimited executive power, installed in 1933, has since been used in some two hundred laws granting the President unusual authority during national emergencies. Whenever a President believes that the Congress will refuse to pass some legislation he proposes, he can simply decree it is law by invoking some emergency power, and printing an Executive Order to that effect in the FEDERAL REGISTER."

KENNEDY'S DICTATORSHIP-ORIENTED EXECUTIVE ORDERS

President John F. Kennedy was the author of sweeping Executive Orders. For example, on February 16, 1962, Kennedy issued ten Executive Orders:

- No. 10995 - Authorized the appropriate federal agency to seize and operate all communications media in an "emergency".
- No. 10997 - Provided for the federal seizure of all electric power, oil and gas, fuels, and minerals.
- No. 10998 - Authorized the seizure of all food resources and farms, including all farm equipment.
- No. 10999 - Authorized the seizure of the means of transportation, and federal control of highways and seaports.

- No. 11000 - Provided for the mobilization of all civilians into a federal work force.
- No. 11001 - Provided for the federal takeover of all health, education, and welfare activities.
- No. 11002 - Authorized the Postmaster General to conduct a national registration of all persons.
- No. 11003 - Authorized the federal government to seize all airports and aircraft.
- No. 11004 - Authorized a Housing and Home Finance Agency to re-locate communities, build new housing with public funds, designate areas to be abandoned as unsafe, and establish new locations for populations.
- No. 11005 - Allowed the government to seize and operate all railroads, inland waterways, and public storage facilities.

Commenting on these Executive Orders issued by Kenedy, Alan Stang, in the aforementioned magazine article, said:

"Remember that Congress had not specifically authorized any of this. All it had done was write a blank check, allowing American Presidents to do whatever they like — to scrap the Constitution and Congress itself — whenever they decide to declare an 'emergency'. And President Kennedy had used that blank check to publish these Executive Orders in the *FEDERAL REGISTER* to 'legitimize' what he or his successors might decide to do.

"The reader may well agree that John F. Kennedy's Executive Orders, if ever implemented, would impose a totalitarian dictatorship on the American people."

[CDR Note: Given that Executive Orders are NOT LAW, the above scenario could only come about by the acquiescence of the people. State legislators are the 'voice' of the people. Our greatest danger lays in the unfortunate, pathetic fact that neither the people nor the state legislators KNOW their Creator-endowed rights, which are protected under the Constitution. The ninth and tenth Articles of Amendment (Bill of Rights) establishes the premise under which state legislators could/should -- and WILL if the "people" inform them and hold their feet to the fire -- reject the illusion which has been created by colorable laws. It MUST be remembered that Governor's Executive Orders are no more law than are presidential Executive Orders]

NIXON ENDORSES KENNEDY'S DANGEROUS EXECUTIVE ORDERS

So what does Conservative-speechmaking President Nixon do? On October 28, 1969, he signed an all-inclusive Presidential directive, Executive Order No. 11490. This Executive Order consolidated all of Kennedy's dictatorship-oriented Executive Orders. Nixon's Executive Order became "law" when it was published in the *FEDERAL REGISTER* on October 30, 1969.

In the preface to Executive Order No. 11490, Nixon states:

"Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, and pursuant to... the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, it is hereby ordered...."

Now, one would surely assume that such sweeping Presidential powers as spelled out in Executive Order No. 11490 would apply only in case of nuclear attack. Right? Wrong!

The order starts out:

"Whereas our national security is dependent upon our ability to assure continuity of government, at every level, *in any national emergency type situation* that might conceivably confront the nation... "

And who decides that an "emergency type situation" exists which could set in motion the drastic people-control measures provided in Nixon's Executive Order No. 11490? Why, the President, of course. All he has to do is decree that an "emergency" exists.

But would President Nixon decree a 'national emergency' unless it was a case of enemy attack?

He already has.

On August 15, 1971, President Nixon issued Proclamation 4074, which was published in the *FEDERAL REGISTER* on August 17, 1971. In this proclamation, Nixon stated:

"I hereby declare a national emergency during which I call upon the public and private sector to make the efforts necessary to strengthen the international economic position of the United States."

Since when is the "international economic position" of the United States a "national emergency"? Since Mr. Nixon said so!

Although, in this particular instance, Nixon did not invoke all the powers he had given himself in Executive Order No. 11490 -- he could have.

ROLE OF FEDERAL REGIONAL COUNCILS IN IMPLEMENTING EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Executive Order No. 11490, under Section 101, states:

"This order consolidates the assignment of emergency preparedness functions to various (federal) departments and agencies... "

All the President has to do to activate this decree is, as has been pointed out, to declare a "national emergency".

Gary Allen, in an article in the January 1973 issue of *AMERICAN OPINION* magazine, when discussing Executive Order No. 11490, warns:

"This order, empowers (federal) Regional council members, under the color of law, to control all food supply, money and credit, transportation, communications, public utilities, hospitals, and other essential facets of human existence.

"That is what regional government really means!"

CHAPTER IV

NIXON RESTRUCTURES EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO ADMINISTER METRO

How does President Nixon intend to rule the ten federal regions he created by Executive Order on February 10, 1972?

In a column on November 23, 1972, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak reported that "President Nixon is quietly but stubbornly designing a radically new federal bureaucracy which will centralize power inside the White House to a degree never before attempted".

And then the columnists continued:

"The intent of the drastic reorganization has now become inescapably clear: To devise lines of power and authority which will centralize all decision-making in the White House to about the same extent that Henry Kissinger now controls every aspect of foreign policy.

"In blueprint form is a proposal to create four or five new Kissinger-type master bureaucrats working directly under the President... These White House super-aides (would be) no more answerable to

Congress than Kissinger himself."

Nixon's March 1971 reorganization plan called for taking seven of the present eleven cabinet-level departments and regrouping them into four conglomerate departments to be known as: Department of Natural Resources, Department of Human Resources, Department of Economic Development, and Department of Community Development.

According to Evans and Novak, these new "master bureaucrats" would have "responsibilities cutting across existing departments and agencies just as Kissinger's own responsibilities routinely cut into the State, Defense, and Treasury Departments."

In February 1972, when Nixon signed the Executive Order dividing the United States into ten federal regions he noted that the restructuring of the Executive Department would have to await Congressional approval.

However, after Nixon received his "mandate" in the the Presidential election of 1972, he proceeded to act unilaterally in the matter.

[CDR NOTE: Be clear that all of the Federal Agencies which have been established were established by decree of the United Nations. The federal agencies are being duplicated on a state level by state legislators who go along to get along simply because their constituents -- the "people" -- have been led for decades by the Phony Conservatives, including the John Birch Society, to believe that the problem can only be solved at the federal level.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has established a 'department' called the Department of Community and Economic Development, which is purchasing hundreds -- maybe thousands -- of acres of land. We have no idea from where the purchasing funds are procured and no clue as to "who" or "what" owns the land. Each state will have a similar department with a similar name.

To illustrate the importance (to the planners) of this department: Globalist Governor (and aspiring VP candidate) Tom Ridge has changed the state pin from its original -- an outline shape of the state bearing the state name, "Pennsylvania" -- to a key-shape with the letters "DCED", for Department of Community and Economic Development. Take heed, people.]

NIXON'S SUPER-SUPER CABINET

The [*NEW YORK TIMES*](#) of January 7, 1973, reported the following:

"Last Friday... Richard Nixon proclaimed a massive reorganization of the Executive Branch -- the most sweeping in history. He rolled out a super Cabinet and a super-super Cabinet -- a total of eight trusted aides and official Cabinet members -- who will be superimposed on the existing government machiners...

"The President wants a Department of Human Resources... so he is bringing Caspar Weinberger to the White House as Counselor... to run Human Resources... Mr. Weinberger will keep the title of HEW Secretary.

"Similarly, James Lynn, the quick-study lawyer who has been appointed as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, will be Counselor in charge of community (and) regional development...

"Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz will be Counselor for natural resources in charge of resource use, lands and minerals, environment... "

In commenting on Nixon's increasing consolidation of power, Gary Allen, in an article in the March 1973 issue of *AMERICAN OPINION*, stated:

"Ultimately, of course, all of these supercrats and super-supercrats are doing the personal bidding of Richard Nixon, and reporting as directly as possible to him. Little wonder that, with this kind of vast power being centralized in the Executive offices, columnist Richard Wilson has observed that 'there is no point in downgrading (President Nixon's) enthusiasm for the **new federalism**. It is an obsession with him'.

"Power *is* an obsession with him. And President Nixon's 'New Federalism' is NewSpeak, where love is hate and war is peace and centralization is decentralization.

"Under the revolutionary slogan 'Power to the people', Richard Nixon is delivering 'Power to the Presidency' -- which means power to himself."

[CDR NOTE: When you hear state legislators and governors talking about the New Federalism, keep in mind that New Federalism is Regionalism. Remember, too, that the U.S. President is no more than a talking head for the real controllers of the U.S. Government, Inc. Richard Nixon did NOT bring power to himself. Nixon and all presidents at the least since Woodrow Wilson are powerless puppets for their masters, which in essence are also our masters. This will remain the case until the American people are willing to stand up, get involved in local and state governmental processes and return the power to whom/where it belongs... the people and the states... in that order.]

COST OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH SKY-ROCKETS

An Associated Press dispatch of November 27, 1972, reported that since 1969, the annual cost of operating the Executive Office of the President has more than doubled -- from \$31 million to \$71 million. But even that figure does not actually portray the true cost of running the Nixon White House.

A study by the AP of budget documents and testimony at appropriations hearings revealed that the real cost may approximate \$100 million a year. And this does not include the expenses of the Office of Management and Budget, the Office of Emergency Planning and some other arms of the President's Executive Office.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET—OVERSEER OF FEDERAL REGIONAL COUNCILS

In Executive Order No. 11647, which established the ten Federal Regional Councils, Nixon announced:

"I have assigned to the Office of Management and Budget the responsibility for assisting the President in developing efficient co-ordinating mechanisms to implement government activities and to expand inter-agency cooperation. Three years ago, I directed that the senior regional officials of certain of the grant-making agencies convene themselves in regional councils to better coordinate their services to Governors, mayors, and the public." [emphasis ours]

The previously-referred-to report of the *NEW YORK TIMES* listed Roy Ash as one of the members of Nixon's "super-super" Cabinet.

In this connection, Gary Allen, in his article, had this to say:

"Another new man on the Nixon team is Roy Ash, who will serve as Director of the Office of Management and Budget. As such, he will control the funding of all federal programs and all programs at State and local levels in which the federal government has a financial interest. This makes Ash the national General Manager in charge of all programs, organizations, and personnel at all levels of government".

The *WALL STREET JOURNAL* of November 29, 1972, had this comment to make regarding the appointment of Roy Ash:

"With Mr. Ash in the saddle, OMB should come closer to realizing its potential as an instrument for government reform."

To which Gary Allen retorted:

"All of that 'reform' means control of State and local governments by the ten federal subdistricts. Which is what Messrs. Nixon and Schultz and Weinberger and Ash really mean when they talk about 'decentralization' and 'taking power away from Washington'."

Reporter John Herbers wrote in the *LONG BEACH PRESS TELEGRAM* of November 23, 1972, that the President's reorganization revolves around "more authority in regional offices..."

And then he continued:

"While the machinery of government is being decentralized, the policy-making process is expected to be further centralized, taken out of the departments and moved to the White House."

REAL REASON FOR NIXON'S REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Incisively cutting through the propaganda emanating from the White House, Gary Allen gave the following as the real reason for Nixon's restructuring of the government:

"Richard Nixon has correctly assessed the anti-government, anti-bureaucratic temper of the country and has figured out a way to take advantage of it while at the same time increasing the power of the government and the bureaucracy.

"Today, when things go wrong in the government, people have a pretty good idea who is to blame. They blame Washington with its army of entrenched bureaucrats. Now Mr. Nixon is going to take the heat off Washington by scattering the bureaucrats into the ten federal sub-capitals, at the same time increasing their power and his own.

"Under the Nixon reorganization, government becomes more sinister by becoming more anonymous."

What is behind Nixon's power-grab via by-passing the sovereign States and establishing ten Federal Regional councils?

How long has this plan been in the making?

CHAPTER V

THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS IN METRO

The foremost exponent of the destruction of the United States as a Constitutional Republic is the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR).

THE C.F.R.—AMERICA'S UNELECTED RULERS

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT of July 20, 1964, described the CFR as follows:

"The people elected and appointed to manage the affairs of the United States Government have in large measure become puppets, controlled by powerful persons working in and through a network of tax-exempt organization.0

"At the center of this network is the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Members of the CFR occupy top positions in government, in foundations, in educational institutions, in communications, in banking.

"They are an elite who set policies of our federal government; and through a vast, interlocking combine

of educational and opinion-forming agencies, they influence or control propoganda which persuades Congress and the public to accept the policies.

"In short, the Council on Foreign Relations *is* the invisible government of the United States. Its tentacles of power and influence are wrapped around levers of power in Washington; reach into schools, colleges, big unions, churches, and respected civic organizations; dominate communications; and have a grip on the prestige and money of many major American corporations".

Speaking on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives on April 27, 1972, Congressman John R. Rarick declared:

"The CFR is the establishment. Not only does it have influence and power in key decision-making positions at the highest levels of government to apply pressure from above, but it also finances and uses individuals and groups to bring pressure from below to justify the high-level decisions for converting the United States from a sovereign Constitutional Republic into a servile member state of a one-world dictatorship."

And, the Council on Foreign Relations continues to increase its power and influence regardless of whether the Democrats or Republicans occupy the White House.

My book, "The CFR", published in 1968, contained a comparison chart of the foreign-policy recommendations of the Communist Party USA and the Council on Foreign Relations. (This same chart appears in my book, "Nixon and the CFR", published in 1972.) A mere glance at this comparison chart shows the chilling parallel between the policies advocated by the Communist Party USA through the years, and the present CFR-controlled Nixon Administration. Thus, in view of such irrefutable documentation, one is justified when referring to the CFR as "Communist-accommodating" and "Communist appeasing."

Such appeasement of the international Communist conspiracy has reached unprecedented proportions since the CFR sent German-born Henry Kissinger to the White House to guide President Nixon's foreign policy.

[CDR NOTE: To discover who is really behind the CFR/Communist control, read the article "Zionist Jews According to the Jewish Encyclopedia".]

C. F. R.'s KISSINGER NOW ASSISTANT PRESIDENT OF U.S.

In an article in *AMERICAN OPINION* of October 1972, Gary Allen put it this way:

"The influence of the Council on Foreign Relations has reached its zenith in the Nixon Administration. No man alive could more effectively represent the CFR than Henry Kissinger, who is for all practical purposes the Assistant President of the United States in charge of foreign policy. Henry Kissinger came to the Nixon Administration from the staff of the CFR and received his appointment at the behest of Nelson Rockefeller (CFR), whose brother David is chairman of the board of the Council."

President Nixon has appointed at least 115 members of the Council on Foreign Relations to key spots in his Administration -- an all-time high for any President.

THE C.F.R.'S "BIG NAMES"

Members of the Council on foreign Relations not only represent all religious faiths, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, but also the following fields: finance, government, business, labor, military, education, and mass communications media.

In order to add prestige and apparent authenticity to its foreign-policy recommendations, the Council

on Foreign Relations has corralled a stable of big names, well-known to the majority of the American people. For example, here are listed only a few of the nationally prominent men who are, or were, members of the CFR:

- Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States;
- Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States;
- Hubert Humphrey, former vice President of the United States;
- Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York;
- Jacob Javits, Republican Senator from New York;
- Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State in the Truman Administration;
- Nathan M. Pusey, President of Harvard University;
- David Dubinsky, President, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union;
- Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Chairman of the Board, New York Times
- William S. Paley, Chairman and Director, Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS)
- Henry R. Luce, Editor-in-Chief, Time Magazine, Life Magazine

In addition to being financed by a number of the largest tax-exempt foundations, the Council on Foreign Relations also receives contributions from various corporations throughout the country, such as Standard Oil Company of California; Time, Inc.; the Chase Manhattan Bank; Ford Motor Company, International Division; the Rand Corporation and IBM.

C.F.R. MAN IN CHARGE OF CARRYING OUT NIXON'S EXECUTIVE ORDERS

It will be recalled that Chapter III detailed Nixon's Executive Order No. 11490 which provides a carefully detailed plan for dictatorship, subject only to Mr. Nixon's declaration that an "emergency type situation" exists.

The President's Office of Emergency Preparedness (OEP) prepares plans to be used in various emergencies decreed by him. According to Alan Stang in his article in the January 1973 issue of *AMERICAN OPINION* : "In an emergency OEP is to the President as a military staff is to a commanding general. Thus it is not an operational unit, but a nerve center." The OEP coordinates activities by supplying them with plans and other information.

Surely, it is not a coincidence that the Director of the OEP is General George A. Lincoln, a member of the Communist-accommodating Council on Foreign Relations.

Alan Stang in his article also made this foreboding observation:

"It is interesting to note that, like other federal agencies, the Office of Emergency Preparedness conforms to the uniform federal regions, which means that its regional offices are located in the capitals of the ten federal regions into which Washington is dividing the country, and which more and more are superseding the State and local governments within them.

"It is perfectly possible that, in the next manufactured 'emergency', the country will be ruled by Washington, with the help of its [appointed -- NOT elected] agents in these ten federal provinces."

* * * * *

Whereas, as its name implies, the Council on Foreign Relations is supposedly concerned with foreign-policy matters, nevertheless, the CFR has a domestic arm — the Committee for Economic

Development (CED) — whose prime function is the promotion and facilitation of metropolitan government — Metro. According to the plans of the CFR, the sovereignty of the States must be destroyed. Why?

Because, as *THE DAN SMOOT REPORT* of July 20, 1964, so succinctly put it:

"The ultimate aim of the Council on Foreign Relations is the same as the ultimate aim of international Communism: to create a one-world Socialist system and make the United States an official part of it."

The role of the CFR's domestic apparatus, the CED, will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VI

THE C. E. D. AND METRO

One of the direct links between the Council on Foreign Relations and the "big business" community is the Committee for Economic Development (CED).

The CED is, actually, the domestic branch of the Council on foreign Relations. Whereas activities of the CFR itself are geared to control the foreign policy of the United States, the CED primarily concerns itself with the domestic policy of this country.

The Committee for Economic Development is the brainchild of Paul G. Hoffman. Hoffman, an influential member of the CFR, was formerly president of the Studebaker Corp., and former president of the Ford Foundation. He founded the CED in 1942 and was named chairman.

A statement in a report by the Research and Policy Committee of the CED, dated July 1966, says that this committee is directed by CED's by-laws to:

"Initiate studies into the principles of business policy and of public policy which will foster the full contribution by industry and commerce to the attainment and maintenance of high and secure standards of living for people in all walks of life..."

Because the purpose of such studies is recommendations, here we see an organization of powerful private citizens admitting that one of its functions is to determine "public policy".

In his article in the October 1972 issue of *AMERICAN OPINION*, Gary Allen revealed:

"You will not be surprised to learn that nine of the fourteen members of the Executive Committee of the CED are also members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Forty-eight of 190 CED trustees we checked were at the same time members of the CFR."

Where the CED obtains a portion of its financing was revealed in a radio broadcast on August 13, 1966, over Station WINC, Winchester, Virginia by Elizabeth Osth, who discussed an issue of *FOUNDATION NEWS*, published by the Foundation Library Center, Baltimore, Maryland. According to Mrs. Osth:

"The Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Ford Motor Company Fund, and many others have granted large sums to such Socialist-planning and propagandizing outfits as the Committee for Economic Development and the National Planning Association."

In July 1967, the Committee for Economic Development issued a study in which the CED made this statement:

"Stagnation and inertia have been characteristic of too many American state government... The business community has an emphatic interest in clearing away basic faults that inhibit potential growth

and development of the national economy and its regional components".

That the sovereign States would be referred to as "regional components", clearly reveals the basic thinking of the CED.

Gary Allen also stated in the aforementioned article:

"Among the collectivist schemes currently being promoted by the CED are... federal control over local law enforcement and metropolitan government.

"If the CED is *for* it, you can bet your last lollipop that it will expand the role of Big Brother in the lives of each of us."

"CREATIVE FEDERALISM"

The CFR and the CED are mindful that as they move forward in their power grab they must employ high-sounding catch phrases so that the voters will be unaware of the real significance of their various moves—until it is too late.

One of these catch phrases is "creative federalism."

John W. Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, in a speech in 1966 said:

"Strictly speaking, 'creative federalism' refers to the relationship between the federal government and the states."

Both the words "creative" and "federalism" have a seemingly innocuous sound. However, there is no need to redefine the "relationship" between the federal government and the individual States. This was done by the U.S. Constitution which clearly defined that the federal government is the creature of the sovereign States -- not the other way around as the CFR and the CED would have it.

Senator Strom Thurmond, on April 11, 1966, in a report to his constituents in South Carolina, refers to "creative federalism" as nothing more than a Madison Avenue misnomer for the practice of injecting the federal government into every conceivable area of human activity under the guise of "aid". He warned that present laws being introduced as a means of strengthening the States, counties and municipalities actually are making these units of government mere "subdivisions" in an all-powerful central government.

In the 1966 report of the Research and Policy Committee of the CED, we find the following under the heading "The New Federalism":
"Sweeping initiatives by the national government, and to a lesser degree by a few state governments, have helped to fill the partial vacuum created **by failures at the local level...**

"Fiscal realities have modified the legal concept that the states are the fountain source of all governmental powers. The states have created the national government, assigning it certain functions and granting it essential powers. The powers of local units were also granted by the states. Realistically, however, capability of response to public desires and adequate financial resources take precedence over legal theory. **The states seem less 'sovereign' with 20 percent of their total annual revenues drawn from the federal treasury**".

And it was planned that way. The sovereignty of the States is *meant* to diminish in direct ratio to the increase in federal "aid".

[Sweet Liberty NOTE: The creatures which have gained control of our governmental system through the CFR, CED and their minions have no shame, and speak as though we — the people, and our duly

elected representatives — are brainless idiots. The above and following paragraphs speak volumes. The usurpers insult our local and state elected officials insinuating that they (elected officials) and we (the people) are incapable of self (local) government and must be ruled. They have restructured our monetary system; instituted a back-breaking tax system (revenue sharing) taking billions of dollars from the States, returning pennies on the dollar and then claim federal control because the States receive "20 percent of their revenues from the federal treasury". This corrupt system has been upheld by the corrupt courts, asserting that local and State governments must 'obey' federal mandates when they use 'federal funds'.]

C. F. R. MEMBERS ON C. E. D.'S RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE

The CED's July 1966 report contained the names of the 43 members of its Research and Policy Committee responsible for the report. Of those listed, the following are also members of the Communist-accommodating Council on Foreign Relations:

- William S. Beinecke, President, Sperry and Hutchinson Company
- William Benton, Publisher and Chairman, Encyclopaedia Britannic, In.
- Emillio G. Collado, Exec. Vice President, Standard Oil Company of New Jersey (Chairman of this CED Committee)
- Douglas Dillon, New York, New York
- Carl J. Gilbert, Chairman, Executive Committee, the Gillette Company
- H. J. Heinz, II, Chairman, H. J. Heinz Company
- William A. Hewitt, Chairman, Deere & Company
- James A. Linen, President, Time, Inc.
- Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman, Scott Paper-Company
- Robert R. Nathan, President, Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.
- Alfred C. Neal, President, Committee for Economic Development.
- Howard C. Petersen, Chairman, Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company.
- Philip D. Reed, New York, New York
- Theodore O. Yntema, Detroit, Michigan

C. E. D. PROPOSALS TO "MODERNIZE" LOCAL GOVERNMENT

It is probable that never before has such an elaborately planned deception of the American people been mounted as that being promulgated by the CFR/CED combine.

For example, the CED's July 1966 report entitled "modernizing Local Government" loftily claims that its proposals are "designed to preserve the basic values in our federal system of government." On page 63 of the report is found this sentence: "The changes we propose are vital to effective local self-government..."

Such statements are deliberately contrived to deceive the unwary and uninformed.

One glimmer of honesty does, however, appear in the CED's report where it states:

"We are well aware of the sweeping scope of these proposals. Taken in combination they amount to a

revolutionary readjustment of local forms... Prevailing conditions and trends demand measures of such strength. But adoption of these recommendations—in whole or in major part—will, of course, face stern resistance."

And, "stern resistance" will increase in every State throughout this nation, as the voters are informed as to what the people-controllers, the Metrocrats, are planning, and, in some cases, now actually carrying out in a number of States.

THE C.E.D.'S CONTEMPT FOR REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

In the CED's 1966 report are found the following scornful comments on local self-government:

"Very few local units are large enough—in population, area, or taxable resources—to apply modern methods in solving current and future problems..."

"Popular control over local governments is ineffective or sporadic, and public interest in local politics is not high..."

"Antiquated administrative organizations hamper most local governments. Lack of a single executive authority, either elective or appointive, is a common fault..."

"We are also convinced that **many local governments are unequal to the challenge**. They are **ineffective in coping with present problems...**"

ABOLISHING MOST ELECTIVE OFFICES AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

Decrying the fact that the people, via the ballot box, in most cases still have control over their local government, the CED's 1966 report calls **for "structural modernization and professional staffing for all local units."**

The CED report puts it this way:

"Each local unit should have a single chief executive, either elected by the people or appointed by the local legislative body, with all administrative agencies and personnel fully responsible to him; election of department heads should be halted."

The CED report makes it clear that it favors the appointment of this "single chief executive" who would then be beyond the reach of the voters, and in a position to carry out the self-admitted "revolutionary readjustment of local forms" proposed by the CED.

According to the CED:

"Adequate control over administrative activities cannot be exercised by an executive when most of the department heads remain responsible only to the electorate or to some quasi-independent board... A full-time chief executive should be empowered to manage and coordinate all administration operations, including appointment and removal of department heads."

Strongly recommending such a "centralized authority", as the CED report puts it, the CED then reveals that such a form of government "removes most administrative decisions from the political arena."

In other words, this local full-time chief executive would not be answerable to the voters as mayors and other local officials elected by the people presently are.

ABOLISHING MOST ELECTIVE OFFICES AT THE STATE LEVEL

The CFR and the CED are certainly aware of the powers reserved to the States by the U.S.

Constitution. It is, therefore, their No. 1 priority goal to nullify the power of the individual States, leaving them at the mercy of the then all-powerful federal government, a government controlled by men belonging to the CFR and the CED (regardless of which party occupies the White House).

A year after its report on "Modernizing Local Government," the CED, in July 1967, released a report entitled "Modernizing State Governments" which called for sweeping governmental renovation at the State level.

Proposing changes that would seemingly strengthen the power of the governors and the State legislatures, the recommendations contained in this report would have the actual effect of *destroying* representative government at the State level.

For instance, the CED study recommended that the *only State elective officials* be the governor and a jointly elected lieutenant governor. All other public officials, such as the Attorney General, State Comptroller, State Treasurer, State Superintendent of Education, etc., would be appointed by the governor.

The report deplored the lack of "executive authority" of the governors and the fact that the power of many State governors is restricted by State constitutional limitations on legislative authority, notably in taxation and appropriations.

An article by Ross Hermann in the *INDIANAPOLIS NEWS* OF September 8, 1967, discussing the CED's report on "modernization" of State governments, stated:

"The CED urges abolition of constitutional restrictions, including debt bans, which it says prevent state legislatures from exercising effective power over financial matters'."

Inasmuch as debt weakens and undermines the economic structure of a State, perhaps one of the real reasons for the CED suggestion of the elimination of debt restrictions is to have the States spend themselves into bankruptcy at which time there would be no other recourse except for the federal government to take over.

Another restriction which the CED recommends be removed is that which limits the terms of governors. The CED would have all governors free to seek re-election without restriction as to number of terms, thus entrenching themselves for possibly a lifetime in that office.

The reasoning behind the CED's recommendations is obvious: How far simpler their proposed takeover of the States would be if State governments were not staffed by numerous elected officials. How much simpler if the CFR-CED conglomerate could deal solely with an all-powerful State governor who could carry out their dictates by simple executive decree.

C. E. D. PUSHES METRO

As discussed in Chapter II, Metro calls for consolidating independent divisions of local government into the collective whole, first by merging townships, cities and counties, and then one State with another State or States into a federal region.

In order to dilute or obliterate the authority of locally elected officials, the CED report of July 1966 called for "comprehensive revisions" in State constitutions, and proclaimed:

"Outmoded forms of local government should be abolished, realignment of boundary lines should be mandated..."

"Each state should create a boundary commission with continuing authority to design and redesign local jurisdictional lines, and to set timetables for consolidations and annexations."

Concerning the State level of government, the July 1967 CED report entitled "Modernizing State Governments," urged:

"Interstate cooperation in solving mutual problems should be exploited actively through interstate compacts. Positive encouragement should be given to counties and other local units seeking collaboration with their counterparts both within the state and beyond its boundaries...

"Active experimentation with new formulas for Federal-multistate cooperation should be encouraged."

What are "interstate compacts"? And what does "Federal-multistate cooperation" mean? The answer to both questions is: *metropolitan government*.

Therefore, what the CFR-controlled Committee for Economic Development is actually recommending is metropolitan government which, as conceived by the Socialist planners, would destroy the whole fabric of constitutional government in the United States.

In his book, "The Invisible Government", Dan Smoot warned:

"Metropolitan government would eliminate the individual States as meaningful political entities, would divide the nation into metropolitan regions sprawling across State lines, and would place the management of these regional governments in the hands of appointed experts answerable not to local citizens but to the supreme political power in Washington."

"PROFESSIONALS" TO REPLACE ELECTED OFFICIALS

As mentioned previously, the 1966 CED report calls for "professional staffing for all local units" of government at the State level.

Who are these unelected "experts" who, according to the long-laid plans of the pushers of Metro, will take over the administration of government at the local level? And who—being appointed, not elected—will be able to control local-level government in all of the 50 States?

What are their theories on local government—and who financed their training for this planned takeover of positions of power—positions formerly occupied by officials elected by the people?

The answer is "1313"—the founding, financing, power and influence of which is discussed in the next chapter.

Go to NEXT PAGE

[Back to the TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

[Council on Domestic Relations Home Page](#)

BEWARE METRO PART 3

http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro3.html

[Home](#) | [Issues](#) | [Perspective](#) | [Audio](#) | [Guests](#) | [Images](#) | [Live Chat](#) | [Links](#) | [Search](#) | [About](#) | [Contact](#)

CHAPTER VII

"1313" - REGIONAL GOVERNMENT'S TROJAN HORSE: THE ROLE OF THE GIANT TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS

When President Nixon, on February 10, 1972, decreed that the United States of America was

henceforth divided into ten federal regions to be run by ten Federal Regional Councils, he was carrying out the meticulously-drawn plans of America's unelected rulers, the CFR/CED combine, financed by the giant tax-free foundations.

This master plan has been in the making for many years.

During the 1954 Congressional hearings on tax-exempt foundations, Thomas M. McNiece, Assistant Research Director of the Reece Committee stated:

"Over the past 50 years sweeping changes have occurred in this country in the function and activity of the federal government... Among these is the increasing participation of the federal government in education, slum clearance, nutrition and health, power generation, subsidization of agriculture, wage control, and other activities...

"Most, if not all, of these newer activities of government are recommended in one place or another in publications of (or)... reports by various educational groups, social science and others, supported by foundation grants.

"They are so foreign to the concept of our government of enumerated powers as we have known it under the Constitution that the departure has been referred to as a 'revolution' by one of its proponents.

"A revolution planned in higher circles by some people at the policy-making levels may be very far advanced toward successful accomplishment before the general public is aware of it. Such a program has been in progress in this country for years."

An idea of how the giant tax-free foundations have managed to infiltrate the stream of government is seen in the book, "The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation," by Raymond B. Fosdick, long associated with the Rockefeller Foundation.

Describing an early program of the Rockefeller Foundation -- one called Public Administration, Fosdick stated:

"This program, which fringed out into broad areas of community planning, had at its core the idea of adequate training for government personnel, particularly in the federal services."

Below is an excerpt from the 1936 Annual Report of the Rockefeller Foundation, which is of particular pertinence in relation to the question of influencing governmental activity:

"The program in Public Administration is designed to bridge the gap that exists between practical administrators in the government service and scholars in the universities in the field of social sciences. Aid has been given to the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Public Administration, which itself sponsors research upon key problems of public administration.

"The (Rockefeller) Foundation supports a number of such research enterprises together with a variety of projects designed to recruit and train a higher type of personnel for career service in the government."

And, remember, the foregoing report of the Rockefeller Foundation was written 'way back in 1936.

Rene A. Wormser, Counsel to the 1954 Reece Committee hearings on tax-exempt foundations, in his book, "Foundations: Their Power and Influence", had this to say regarding the type of thinking and training promoted by the tax-free foundations:

"They (the foundations) have actually supported attacks upon our social and government system, and financed the promotion of Socialism and collectivist ideas."

[CDR NOTE: It is the opinion of this writer that every American who cherishes freedom from tyranny should read Wormser's book, mentioned above. The report and findings of the Reece Committee are contained in an Annex in the back of the book, along with a meticulously thorough index. The book is an invaluable research tool. Purchase from: Covenant House Books, P.O. Box 4690, Sevierville, Tennessee, 37864. (865) 428-5176 for phone orders - Visa/MasterCard - \$12.97 includes s&h.]

Wormser's consternation in 1954 is understandable: What would he say today about Nixon's decreeing ten Federal Regional Councils to eventually supersede the 50 once-sovereign States?

The Rockefeller Foundation wasn't kidding: it puts its millions where its propaganda mouth is!

In order to facilitate the injection of collectivist ideas into various governmental bodies through the nation, the Spelman Fund of New York was created on December 27, 1928, with a capital of \$10 million provided by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.

The Spelman Fund Annual Report of 1947-1948 stated that:

"Grants totaling \$3 million were later made to the Fund by the Rockefeller Foundation... The Spelman Fund assumed as its major responsibility an exploration of the possibilities of cooperation with public bodies for the **improvement of public administration.**"

It should be remembered that when the Leftist-oriented Rockefeller Foundation speaks of the "improvement of public administration", what it actually means is the furtherance of their over-all plan for control of local representative government.

But, to mount such a gigantic project -- the virtual tearing asunder of the safeguards provided the people by the U. S. Constitution -- required that a headquarters be provided.

And, of course, it WAS provided.

"1313" CONSTRUCTED WITH ROCKEFELLER FUNDS

The 1947-1948 Annual Report of the tax-exempt Laura Spelman Rockefeller Fund revealed:

"In 1938, a new building at 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago (constructed under grants from the Spelman Fund) was completed to provide adequate quarters... for the use and occupancy of the national governmental organizations. This building has come to be known as '1313'.

"... An agency known as the Public Administration Clearing House was set up... Endorsement of the Public Administration Clearing House came from the National Municipal League, the American Municipal Association, etc....

"The Public Administration Clearing House manages the building at 1313 E. Sixtieth Street, Chicago."

Further financing for the "1313" has been provided by the Carnegie Corporation, the Julius Rosenwald

(Sears Roebuck & Company) Fund, and the Russell Sage Foundation.

In his article in the January 1973 issue of *AMERICAN OPINION* magazine Gary Allen said that the primary funding now comes from the Ford Foundation which has "poured tens of millions of dollars into scores, possibly hundreds of regional government projects" promoted by "1313".

GROUPS LOCATED AT "1313"

The following 22 organizations concerned with governmental operations at the various levels are located at "1313":

- American Public Welfare Association
- American Public Works Association
- American Society of Planning Officials
- American Society for Public Administration
- Building Officials Conference of America
- Committee for International Municipal Cooperation -- U.S.A.
- Conference of Chief Justices
- **Council of State Governments**
- Federation of Tax Administrators
- Governors' Conference International Association of Assessing Officers
- International Institute of Municipal Clerks
- Municipal Finance Officers Association
- National Association of Attorneys General
- National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials
- National League of Cities
- National Legislative Conference
- Public Administration Service
- Public Personnel Association

*[CDR NOTE: The list of adjunct associations today is much greater. The Council of State Governments created 56 adjunct Associations. Every public **elected** official today, and most or every appointed bureaucrat -- is oriented by the Association designed to fit the office. The Associations are under the control, guidance and manipulation of the One-Worlders.]*

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT of April 3, 1959, described "1313" thusly:

"1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, has become a national center for the production of experts - to fabricate 'progressive' legislation for governments at all levels, to rewrite our 'archaic' State constitutions, and to take over as city managers, or county managers, or metropolitan managers, or regional managers whenever people in any locality have progressed to the point of accepting government by imported experts as a substitute for government by elected local citizens."

Smoot then went on to state that not all city managers and county managers come directly from "1313",

but the "tap roots of their 'contacts', if not their training, can usually be traced to that source."

In her book "Blame Metro", Jo Hindman has this to say:

"Government by appointees is basic Metro strategy. Appointeeship is vital to 1313's tyrannical purpose, because citizens cannot vote appointees out of office, regardless of scandals, misuse of public funds, or the blatant stupidity of the appointees."

An examination of the previously-listed groups headquartered at "1313" clearly shows the scope of these organizations which deal with legislative, administrative and juridical aspects of State, county and local government.

Under the "1313" conglomerate there is a special organization to advise, guide and ultimately control: State governors (Governors' Conference); State legislators (Council of State Governments); State Supreme Courts (Conference of Chief Justices); as well as State Attorneys General, mayors (National League of Cities); city managers (International City Managers' Association) and State budget and purchasing officials and officeholders throughout the governmental structure of each State.

It is the trainees of the various organizations clustered around "1313" -- men steeped in the Liberalism-collectivism promoted by the tax-free foundations -- men indoctrinated with a disdain for the Constitutional concept of the rights of the sovereign States -- who are now implementing Metro-government in various sections of the country. And [it is they] who will staff and/or advise the ten Federal Regional Councils established by President Nixon via Executive order.

MAIL-ORDER STATE CONSTITUTIONS AND LAWS FROM "1313"

Although Metro's nerve center is located at 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, the mastermind of the "1313" clearing house is the National Municipal League (NML) situated on East 68th Street in New York City. Which makes for great convenience for the CFR/CED combine, as the NML is right across the street from the headquarters of the Council on Foreign Relations! It is the NML which determines over-all policy for "1313".

On May 13, 1968, the NML mailed out quantities of a pamphlet entitled, **"Let's Junk Our Obsolete State Constitutions"**.

The National Municipal League has published two series of books which are recommended reading for delegates to State Constitutional Conventions.

Series I contains the following:

- "The Model State Constitution"
- "Salient Issues of Constitutional Revision"
- "The Future Role of the States"
- "The Constitutional Convention: A Manual on its Planning, Organization and Operation"
- "How to Study a State Constitution"

In Series II is found the following:

- "State Constitutions: The Shape of the Document"
- "State Constitutions: Reapportionment"
- "State Constitutions: The Governor"
- "State Constitutions: The Structure of Administration"

- "State Constitutions: The Bill of Rights"

The theme of these NML publications is that State Constitutions must be revised and "reformed" in accordance with regional and Metro concepts, and to that end: The power of the Governor should be greatly expanded and any checks and balances within the executive department eliminated; a drastic slashing of offices now subject to election -- these to be filled by appointees; and membership of most State Legislatures should be reduced to "expedite" the legislative process.

In her written testimony submitted on June 4, 1971 to the Urban Affairs Subcommittee, U.S. Congress Joint Economic Committee on regional planning issues, Mrs. Jo Hindman stated:

"The NML writes sample Metro city and county charters, also State constitutions.

"You can recognize a Metro charter or constitution by its 'general grant of power', the exact opposite of 'reserved power' charters and constitutions which are drafted under the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

"Power-reserved-to-the-people charters and constitutions limit the ruling body, but Metro charters and constitutions give all power to the ruling body, stripping the citizens and voters of self-rule and self-government".

In an article in the May 1962 issue of the DAR MAGAZINE, published by the Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. Hindman discussed what she termed "a political law factory in Chicago" which drafts legislation embodying the aims of the Metrocrats.

Referring to the "oddly uniform bills, appearing simultaneously in various State legislatures during 1959", Mrs. Hindman revealed that "aroused citizen curiosity... led to detection of the amazing law factory in the Council of State Governments (CSG) at the collectivistic Metropolitan Government capitol" -- "1313" in Chicago.

Within the CSG is its Committee of State Officials on Suggested State Legislation. The CSG circulates a mail-order catalogue of laws, prepared by this committee, entitled "Suggested State Legislation -- Program for..." (year). The catalogue is issued annually.

According to Mrs. Hindman:

"States of the Union hold 'membership' in the CSG, pay tribute in the form of 'dues' and take orders written up in the form of 'model' and 'uniform' State laws."

An article in the February 1968 issue of the DAR MAGAZINE quoted Mrs. Hindman, as follows:

"The 1313 law factory publishes the prepackaged laws in a form convenient for copying, with a bland space for insertion of a bill number. The whole thing can be handed to a legislator to be introduced to the State legislature."

The obvious purpose of such prepackaged, uniform State laws is to eliminate all legal obstacles, as provided by State constitutions, to the staffing of Nixon's ten Federal Regional Councils and the implementation and facilitation of Metro government -- government by unelected appointees.

Not only are the experts at "1313" now drafting laws for State legislatures, and county and city legislative bodies to rubber-stamp, but the "1313" Metro syndicate also issues a barrage of propaganda to State and local officials selling the Metro concept. In addition, "1313" also concerns itself with creating local citizen-support for various aspects of Metro, which usually masquerade under such deceptive slogans as "home rule" and "efficiency."

CHAPTER VIII

HOW METRO OPERATES AT THE LOCAL AND STATE LEVEL

The April 1969 NEWSLETTER of the National Service to Regional Councils reported that President Nixon, on February 14, 1969, had established by Executive Order a federal agency to be known as the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.

The purpose of this new agency is to coordinate the activities of federal agencies in their dealings with governments at the State and local levels.

The newsletter quoted the White House as explaining, "It (the new agency) will help to establish more decision-making authority at the federal regional offices...". An obvious allusion to the ten Federal Regional Councils later decreed by Nixon by his Executive Order of February 10, 1972. (See Chapter I)

According to the newsletter, the newly created Office of Intergovernmental Relations "will be working closely with the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and will serve as an information advisor on intergovernmental affairs to the new cabinet-level Council for Urban Affairs".

In her previously-mentioned testimony submitted on June 4, 1971, to a Congressional subcommittee, Jo Hindman stated:

"Created by Congress in 1959, approved by President Dwight Eisenhower, the (federal) Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) is completely controlled by Syndicate 1313. The nominating system gives the syndicate majority control of the 26-member commission."

Mrs. Hindman then went on to say that the ACIR writes voluminous reports and studies, as well as sample State and federal laws, pushing for their enactment through legislatures and Congress.

In her book, "BLAME METRO", Mrs. Hindman said that the ACIR was set up as a "beachhead within the federal government from which to bombard Congress and the 50 States with Metro laws and to have them enacted by 1313 'plants' acting as legislators".

As for the National Service to Regional Councils (NSRC) mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, it was formed by the joint action of "1313's" National Association of Counties.

Acting as a type of clearing house, the NSRC distributes a massive volume of pre-Metro propaganda to regional councils, opinion leaders, and the mass communications media.

The National Association of Counties (NACo), although its headquarters are located at 1101 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036, is a unit of "1313", assigned to reconstitute county governments along Metro lines.

According to Mrs. Hindman, the advisory committee of NACo includes members of the National League of Cities; International City Managers Association; Public Administration Service (all headquartered at "1313" in Chicago) as well as the League of Women Voters, and the Committee on Economic Development (CED).

The National Association of counties has received substantial grants from the Leftist-oriented, tax-free Ford Foundation.

LIST OF CITY-COUNTY CONSOLIDATIONS SINCE 1957

The July 1971 issue of the REGIONAL REVIEW QUARTERLY, published by the National Service to Regional Councils, quoted from a report of the National Association of Counties which listed the

following city-county mergers which had taken place since 1957:

- Miami-Dade County, Florida (partial) 1957
- Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee, 1962
- Virginia Beach-Princess Anne County, Virginia, 1962
- Jacksonville-Duval County Florida, 1967
- Juneau-Greater Juneau Borough, Alaska, 1969
- Carson City-Ormsby County, Nevada, 1969
- Indianapolis-Marion County, Indiana, 1969
- Columbus-Muscogee County, Georgia, 1970

The 1971 NACo report stated that "Twenty-seven areas in the nation are now considering this alternative in restructuring their local governments."

Worthy of note in the NACo report is their observation that of the foregoing city-county consolidations, all except Indianapolis-Marion County were accomplished by referendum vote. Which brings up this question: How many of the voters of these areas would have voted for "metropolitanizing" their communities if they had had the facts about what Metro really means?

The January 1971 issue of *PUBLIC MANAGEMENT*, in discussing the consolidation of Columbus-Muscogee County, Georgia, stated:

"The Columbus-Muscogee plan provides for a professional city manager who is given strong executive powers similar to those set forth in the National Municipal League's "Model City charter". The manager has appointive and removal powers and broad supervisory authority over governmental departments and agencies. The new government also provides for a small governing body which is primarily responsible for policy determination."

Inasmuch as the National Municipal League is the mastermind of "1313", it is seen that all city-county mergers modeled on charters emanating from that quarter will ultimately result in great diminution of the power of the voter to control his local government.

In 1969 the Indiana House of Representatives and Senate voted to adopt "Unigov". Under this plan the boundaries of the city of Indianapolis were pushed outward to include the suburbs, thus incorporating Marion County's more affluent suburbs into the Indianapolis tax base.

Because Unigov became law by State legislative action, the voters of the area involved were denied the opportunity to express themselves.

The New Orleans (Louisiana) *TIMES PICAYUNE* of January 29, 1970 quoted a local interview with Indianapolis Mayor Richard G. Lugar:

"... 'No, we didn't have a referendum on this,' admitted Mayor Lugar. 'But a poll we had taken indicated that it was getting support by the people by about a 63-37 margin'."

Government by public-opinion poll, yet!

The article described Lugar as "the dapper young mayor, president-elect of the National League of Cities". (The NLC is headquartered at "1313" in Chicago.)

REGIONAL COUNCILS - "1313's" APPARATUS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

At an increasing rate, regional councils are being formed throughout the United States. The names vary in different localities, but the objectives are always the same. For instance, there's the Denver Regional

Council of Government (COGs). In California there's the Association of Bay Area Governments (SKAG) [sic] and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), but mostly the names contain the name of the city followed by the words "Council of Governments" or "Regional Council of Governments". (Note the plural "s" on the word "Government", thereby showing that such regional councils are each composed of several local governmental structures.)

[CDR NOTE: We've just discovered that the word "Soviet" -- as in Union of Soviet Socialist Republics -- means "Council". Think about THAT! In your mind, as you read, replace the word "Council" with the word "Soviet". How does that sound/feel? Soft and safe and warm and fuzzy?

An editorial in the Charleston (South Carolina) *NEWS AND COURIER* OF February 15, 1973, stated:

"The newly organized Regional Council of Governments should not be underestimated. They are formidable new governmental divisions which most citizens have yet to comprehend..."

Regional councils of governments (COGs) are deeply involved in local allocation of Federal funds.

In this connection, the *NEWS AND COURIER* editorial had this to say:

"As it happens, some administrators, who have no direct responsibility to the people hold positions of considerable power. A professional planning staff, operating under the auspices of the Charleston County (South Carolina) Planning Board, an appointive body, screens and reviews each funding application.

"Five of the ten members of a Regional Council subcommittee, including the chairman, are non-elected appointees. This subcommittee considers the planners' recommendations and decides on its own recommendation before passing applications to the Governor's office. In Columbia, other non-elected personnel funnel applications to non-elected bureaucrats in Washington, where a final decision is made..."

"In sum, the local picture of regional government shows a new governmental system with burgeoning authority functioning primarily under the direction of non-elected individuals."

A REPORT ON A C.O.G. CONVENTION OF METRO PROMOTERS

The *OREGON STATESMAN* of March 3, 1969, carried a column by J. Wesley Sullivan concerning the Third Annual Conference of Regional Councils. Sullivan described councils of regional governments as follows:

"COGs are units of local government, such as cities and counties, which have joined in voluntary association to tackle regional problems on a regional basis."

According to Sullivan:

"Regional Councils of Government are being formed in most States, encouraged by the federal government. The encouragement takes the form of federal money to get them organized and help pay for staff.

"In addition, the federal government grants regional development money, in many cases, only to such councils with regional rather than merely local jurisdiction."

Indicative of how such COGs in the Metro apparatus operate beyond the reach of the voter, Sullivan

had this to say:

"Armed both with federal money and appropriations from local governments, the regional councils don't report directly to the public. The voter never passes on their budgets."

Sullivan reported that of the nearly 400 present at the Third Annual Conference of Regional Councils, only a small minority were elected officials. The vast majority were, as he put it, "the new breed of regional civil servant, along with an important selection of federal officials who were there encouraging the regional concept".

HOW REGIONAL COUNCILS OPERATE

What Metrocrats at the local or national level say and what they plan for the future bear no relationship to each other. Metrocrats have gulled the voters and officials at the local-government level into believing that their sole aim is "home rule", "more efficient" and therefore, "less expensive" government.

It is only when one reads publications of adjuncts of "1313" -- wherein Metrocrats talk to each other, does the true picture emerge.

For example, the *REGIONAL REVIEW QUARTERLY* of January 1971, published by the National Service to Regional Councils, confides to its readers:

"Regional councils, as presently organized, are not operating, taxing units of government.

"They do not provide direct services to the public. If they did, they would probably not be supported by their member local governments. The voluntary, non-governmental nature of regional councils is what makes them acceptable to existing local governments. As presently structured, regional councils are not a threat to local government powers or resources.

"In five years, regional councils, without any authority or power have changed local government relationships with each other, within the federal system. There is now a process, a stage, for cooperation between the central city and its suburban or rural communities."

Truly, the foregoing is a remarkable confession on the part of the promoters of Metro. Note the words: "As presently structured, regional councils are not a threat to local government powers." The key, of course, is "as presently structured", and even while those words were printed by one of "1313's" propaganda mouthpieces, the *REGIONAL REVIEW QUARTERLY*, the Metrocrats had already made their plans to change the structure of regional councils, so that such regional councils would, indeed, present a grave threat to local representative government. (This to be discussed later in this chapter)

And then, there is that bragging confession in the foregoing quote that the Metro promoters "without any authority or power have changed local government relationships".

The Metrocrats, smarting under this self-confessed "lack of authority or power", are determined to get that "authority and power" and all that goes with it.

An article candidly entitled "Regionalism: The Quiet Revolution", which appeared in the January 1971 issue of *REGIONAL REVIEW QUARTERLY*, contained a wealth of information -- not known to the general public -- concerning the comparatively recent growth of these "1313"-directed, Metro-promoting regional councils, or councils of governments, and how they are financed.

The aforementioned Metro publication reported that, as of then, January 1971 there were about 560 regional councils in the United States. These councils involve 80 per cent of the nation's population and 55 per cent of its land area. Fifty-five percent are in metropolitan regions; 45 per cent are located in non-metropolitan, less densely populated areas.

Only 10 per cent of existing regional councils were formed prior to 1960. The bulk [of regional councils] have been created since 1966.

Another indication of the rapid growth of Metro's work-horses (COGs) was the increased attendance at the Fourth Annual Conference of Regional Councils, which was held in Atlanta.

According to *REGIONAL REVIEW QUARTERLY* of April 1970:

"The attendance of more than 600 people was a 50 per cent increase over the 1969 conference in San Francisco. In Atlanta, one-fourth of those attending were policy people -- members of regional council policy bodies...

"More than 100 member regional councils were present and voting at the annual conference...

"The new Board includes representatives who are both policy leaders and staff directors of regional councils, with the majority being policy leaders.

"Finally, the new Board broadens the partnership of the regional council movement with cities and counties by provision of Board seats to the National League of Cities and the National Association of Counties.

As for the Fifth Annual Conference of Regional Councils, held in New Orleans in 1971, it was attended by more than 800, with one-third of the attendees being policy makers of regional councils.

Thus it is seen that the Metro operation throughout the country is proliferating at an alarming rate. And why not -- when the general public is unaware of the ulterior aims of the Metrocrats, and when regional councils are able to obtain ever-increasing funding!

HOW REGIONAL COUNCILS ARE FINANCED

REGIONAL REVIEW QUARTERLY of January 1971 reported that the typical budget of a regional council is between \$100,000 and \$200,000. Councils receive their funds from four sources: federal, State and local government -- and tax-free foundations.

On the average, regional councils (or councils of governments) receive 60 per cent of their funds from federal grants for functional planning (i.e., land use, transportation, housing, etc.) Local communities provide about 34 per cent of a council's funds, and about 15 State governments provide general-support funds to the COGs. About one per cent of funds channeled direct to the regional councils comes from tax-exempt foundations.

All in all, as of 1971, this adds up to a whopping \$80 to \$100 million a year -- for the purpose of destroying representative government in the United States.

[CDR NOTE: Given "Beware Metro" was written nearly 30 years ago, can you imagine the cost today? Remember. Regionalism creates a new "layer" of government, which creates a new level of taxation.... WITHOUT REPRESENTATION.]

REGIONAL COUNCILS SEEK TO BECOME SUPER-GOVERNMENTS

The lead editorial in the April 1971 issue of *REGIONAL REVIEW QUARTERLY*, WRITTEN BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE National Service to Regional Councils, Richard C. Hartman, states that the key question is whether regional councils "will evolve from the role of voluntary planning agencies to a more meaningful role of implementing their planning decisions."

To "implement" or carry out their "planning decisions" means, of course, that regional councils would assume the mantle of government. Inasmuch as no mention is made of running for public office where the approval or disapproval of the voters can be registered, such implementation of "planning decisions" can only mean rule by these unelected Metrocrats.

In an article in the aforementioned Metro publication, we find the following statement by Robert D. Farley, Executive Director, Denver Regional Council of Governments:

"Citizens and public officials ought to cry out now for new governmental institutions at a regional level, and not only study regional problems, but propose and carry out action programs for the implementation of solution to those problems..."

"New tools and policy direction must be forthcoming from state government to the regional institutions for controlling and guiding growth and assisting the development of metropolitan areas..."

"Regional councils must activate citizen participation at the regional level. Citizens of the region must be marshalled into a broad-based regional citizen constituency." [Like sheep to the slaughter - Emphasis ours]

The executive director of Denver's COGs also states that this "citizen constituency" should "identify the region as a single community", and should "look at new institutional devices which have the ability to implement solutions".

This blatant Metro power-grab advocated by a regional council official certainly deserves some comment.

Just what "new governmental institutions at a regional level" does this Metrocrat propose? He doesn't say, but it most certainly can be assumed that such new institutions, with governing powers, would be staffed by "1313" indoctrinated, unelected Metrocrats.

And just what is a "broad-based regional citizen constituency"?

The dictionary defines constituency as "A body of constituents, as the voters in a representative district." But how can regional councils possibly have a "regional citizen constituency" when the voters never have a chance to vote for these Metrocrats?

And, finally, the "new institutional devices which have the ability to implement solutions", urged by the Denver COGs' official, adds up to just one thing: A super-government, over all layers of existing government, but this one staffed and directed by Metrocrats -- beyond the reach of the voters to recall or impeach.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND METRO'S REGIONAL COUNCILS

In discussing the reasons for the accelerated growth of regional councils, the *REGIONAL REVIEW QUARTERLY* of January 1971, in the article entitled "Regionalism: The Quiet Revolution", states that one of the primary reasons for the growth was "stimulation from the federal government in terms of the legislative and administrative requirements for federal aid".

The April 1971 of that Metro publication carried an excerpt from a speech made at the Fifth Annual Conference of Regional Councils in New Orleans by Samuel C. Jackson, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Planning and Development, U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. In that speech Jackson told the assembled Metrocrats:

"You now have amply demonstrated your value to the federal government. You now have an opportunity to demonstrate to state and local governments that your contribution is essential to good planning and effective implementation".

There's that word again: "implementation".

In another speech at this conference, David D. Dominick, Acting Commissioner, Water Quality, U.S. Environmental Protection agency, Washington, D.C., had this to say:

"An important and vital element of any successful regional approach, be it a council of governments, a river basin commission or interstate compact is the willingness of the individual community members to subordinate some of its own particular or special authority to its regional agency in achieving effective regional solutions.

"...it is the lack of such commitment to delegate adequate authority to the regional body by member communities that has been the Achilles heel of the council-of-governments movement."

And, it should be observed, it is this "lack" to "delegate adequate authority to the regional body", on the part of local communities, that has, so far, prevented a complete Metro take-over at the local level.

Thomas Bradley, president of the National Service to Regional Councils, in the previously-mentioned issue of the *REGIONAL REVIEW QUARTERLY* stated:

"The impact of revenue sharing and federal reorganization [see Chapter IV] on regional councils could be substantial and crucial to our survival."

Another conference speaker, Robert S. Newhouse, Chairman Indian National Council of Governments, Tulsa, Oklahoma, expressed these views:

"What is needed in the long run, is the establishment of an agency at the federal executive level that not only would support general policy development needed for management at state, regional and local levels, but would also provide subsistence funding to regional units that qualify and in fact are bona fide 'umbrella-type' agencies under uniform federal criteria."

Newhouse then went on to state that "local regional entities" should serve a "key role" in the federal-state-local partnership.

Claiming that "experiences has demonstrated the problems cannot be resolved by state and local initiative", Newhouse urged that "the U.S. Office of Management and Budget be designated to provide the forum and process for resolving the problem."

To sum up: When President Nixon, on February 10, 1972, established ten Federal Regional Councils, whose authority will ultimately supersede that of the sovereign States, he was following the dictates of the "1313" syndicate.

But the machinery of regional government -- like any machinery, needs oil to keep the parts and the COGS (councils of [regional] government) moving.

And the "oil" is provided by the infusion of federal funds into the COGs -- federal funds provided by taxpayers' dollars -- the only source of money the federal government has.

The "oiler" is, of course, the federal Revenue Sharing Act -- possibly one of the biggest hoaxes ever foisted, not only on the individual taxpayer, but also on local and state officials throughout the nation.

The next chapter will document what 'revenue sharing' really means -- and how, tragically, local and State officials, in their greed for, seemingly something-for-nothing federal funds, are betraying their own integrity and the voters who put them into office.

[Next Page](#)

[Previous Page](#)

[Back to the TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

[Council on Domestic Relations Home Page](#)

CHAPTER IX

"REVENUE SHARING" BRINGS INCREASED FEDERAL CONTROL

Seldom has there been a more concerted propaganda drive by an administration to sell the American people on proposed legislation than that by the Nixon Administration to promote the sharing of federal revenues with the States.

Of all the schemes which have been used to further centralize power in Washington, few have been as effective as the offer of federal funds to State and local governments, accompanied, of course, by a promise of "no strings attached".

In this connection, an article by Reed Benson and Robert Lee in the March 10, 1971, issue of *THE REVIEW OF THE NEWS* HAD THIS TO SAY:

"It is a familiar story. In the early days of federal farm programs, for instance, farmers were assured that federal subsidies would not necessitate submission to federal controls. Yet such controls were quickly instituted. And, when they were tested in court, unhappy farmers learned that **'it is hardly lack of due process for the government to regulate that which it subsidizes'**. (Supreme Court, *Wickard vs. Filburn*, 1942)."

The U.S. Supreme court was justified in making this ruling because sound fiscal policy requires that the unit of government which provides funds should control and watch over their expenditure. For this reason, government subsidies -- in any form -- always mean government controls.

REVENUE SHARING NOW LAW

On June 22, 1972, the U.S. House of Representatives by a vote of 272 to 122 passed H.R. 14370, the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, known as revenue sharing. On September 12, 1972, by a vote of 63-20 it passed the U.S. Senate. The House-Senate Conference Report was adopted October 13, 1972, by a vote of 59 to 19 by the Senate.

Following are the amounts appropriated for federal revenue sharing, according to a table inserted in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* of October 13, 1972:

1-1-72 through 6-30-72	\$2,652,390,000
Fiscal year beginning 7-1-72	\$5,642,280,000
Fiscal year beginning 7-1-73	\$6,054,780,000

Fiscal year beginning 7-1-74	\$6,204,780,000
Fiscal year beginning 7-1-75	\$6,354,780,000
7-1-76 through 12-30-76	\$3,327,390,000

The above figures total \$ 30,236,400,000 (billions)

Discussing the previous record of federal aid, Congressman George H. Mahon, on June 21, 1972, stated:

"With reference to the grants to the States and local communities in 1960, what did we spend? We spent \$7 billion.

"For the fiscal year which ends this month -- fiscal 1972 -- how much are we spending in grants to the States and local communities? Not \$7 billion -- but \$37 billion."

And this does not include revenue sharing.

For 21 States, federal aid in the past has proven no bargain. For example, an editorial in *THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR* of March 30, 1973, pointed out:

"For each dollar in federal aid received last year, the people of Indiana paid a 54-cent 'premium' in taxes, according to Tax Foundation, Inc. The private research corporation said Indiana was one of 21 States that paid more in taxes to pay for federal aid programs than they received in grants. Residents of Indiana paid \$841 million in taxes for aid programs and received \$545 million in federal grants during the fiscal year.

"The grant figures don't include the cost of administering the grant programs, such as salaries, expenses, travel, etc., the foundation said."

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS NOTHING TO SHARE -- BUT DEBT

Even as the U.s. House of Representatives was debating the revenue-sharing bill on June 2, 1972, it had scheduled for the following week a bill which extended the government's debt limit to the highest level in history.

Since neither Congress nor the Nixon Administration made any provisions for raising the money by hiking taxes or cutting out other federal programs, the funds for the first year of the revenue-sharing program had to come out of deficit federal financing -- meaning that the government had to borrow an additional \$5.6 billion just to finance this program for one year.

During the debate, Congressman Watkins M. Abbitt pointed out that "any money that is borrowed is actually owed by the people of the United States and must be paid by American taxpayers."

Discussing how the federal government is going further and further into debt, Congressman George H. Mahon stated:

"Here are the federal funds deficit figures for the four fiscal year, 1970 through 1973: \$13 billion, 430 billion, 432 billion, \$38 billion -- climbing, climbing, climbing."

Congressman H.R. Gross summed up the dangers of revenue sharing as follows:

"The federal government in Washington has nothing to share with the States, counties and municipalities but a huge deficit, in this fiscal year alone estimated at \$38 billion, and a staggering federal debt of more than \$450 billion.

"Every dollar of the more than \$30 billion that Congress has approved for 'sharing' will have to be borrowed and interest paid on the money. It will cause more inflation and further erosion of the dollar."

PRESENT FEDERAL-GRANT PROGRAMS WILL NOT BE ABOLISHED

Opposing the revenue-sharing bill, Congressman John W. Byrnes declared:

"It is alleged that the bill will diminish categorical grants, and the red tape associated with these programs.

"Let us first recognize that we will be providing federal aid through categorical grants to State and local governments totaling \$38 billion in fiscal 1973. But this (revenue-sharing) program is not a substitute for any of the categorical grant-in-aid programs. It does not convert any of these programs into general revenue sharing or bloc grants. This program simply piles still another tier on the existing mess. This bill will not alter the structure nor diminish the magnitude of these existing programs."

Further, an editorial in *THE RICHMOND (Va.) NEWS LEADER* of September 19, 1972, noted that revenue sharing:

"...will not be subject to an annual review by Congressional appropriation committees."

WELFARE COSTS CONTINUE TO RISE

Among the recipients of this new federal windfall are those on welfare, particularly those under Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)-- the more children such "welfare mothers" produce the higher the welfare check each month.

In his column of March 7, 1973, Ralph de Toledano quoted from a study, "The Financial Outlook for State-Local government in 1980", by the Tax Foundation. According to that study, the number of welfare recipients rose from 7.8 million in 1965 to 13.8 million in 1970, and by June 1972 had reached 15 million. In 1980, it is estimated that the figure will have grown to 21 million.

In his annual Budget message for Fiscal 1973, President Nixon boasted that the federal government for the first time will spend more in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare than is to be spent in the Defense Department.

An article by Dan Smoot in the April 19, 1972 issue of *THE REVIEW OF THE NEWS*, contained an even higher total figure of welfarists: According to Smoot:

"Latest available information reveals that 16,133,000 Americans are on relief -- about one in every twelve of the total population... Projected nationally, the 34-State HEW survey indicated that 2,581,280 of the relievers are getting tax money in violation of existing law -- 1,774,630 (11 percent of all relievers) are getting more than the law allows; 806,650 (5 percent) who are getting relief are not entitled under the law to get any at all"

Terming the approximately 16 million people on relief "a 77 percent increase in the last four years", Smoot added:

"Assuming that costs have gone up accordingly, this means that every working American labors at least one full month each year to support reliefers -- who are being goaded by radical Leftist politicians (and organized into angry, militant mobs by radical Leftist organizations like the Welfare Rights Organization and the poverty war agencies) into demanding more."

TIE-IN BETWEEN "1313" AND WELFARE

As noted in Chapter VII, one of the groups headquartered at 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, is the American Public Welfare Association (APWA), which also maintains a lobby office in Washington, D.C.

In her column, "Metro News", dated March 29, 1973, Jo Hindman stated:

"One purpose of the 1313 syndicate is to have political pressure on tap at all times as it seeks to force political and social change in the regional dictatorship of Metro governance. APWA is 1313's arm into the public welfare function."

Mrs. Hindman then went on to say that in 1972 the Nixon Administration gave "1313's" APWA the sensitive position of liaison between the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the public welfare agencies in the federal regions. A grant of \$601,885 to APWA from HEW provided financial support for a project to assist the States and federal departments "to implement major unidentified changes in social service delivery."

YOUR TAXES TO BE INCREASED

Because the federal government only has those funds it extracts from the taxpayers in taxes, it is the taxpayer who, ultimately, is footing the bill for this federal largess called revenue sharing.

An editorial in *THE NEWS* of Lynchburg, Virginia of September 14, 1972, referred to a report by the Brookings Institution which pointed out that Congress already has allocated all revenues it can expect, even from a full-employment economy, for the next few years. This leaves no funds for new projects and no funds for emergencies.

Senator Harry Byrd, Jr., has stated that revenue sharing "will not take the place of any other program. It will be piled on top of everything else that the federal government is spending".

For this reason, federal revenue sharing, according to economic and financial experts, can only lead to new federal taxes.

THE REVIEW OF THE NEWS of September 6, 1972, quoted Congressman John Ashbrook as having pointed out earlier in the year:

"Since the money isn't in the government coffers to give, taxes will sooner or later have to be raised to fund this revenue-sharing plan. If taxes are not raised to pay for it, we will only continue the inflationary trend...."

"For the Nixon Administration to present revenue sharing as a gift to local and State governments, when actually it will only bring an increase in the individuals' tax burden, is to perpetrate a fraud on the taxpayer."

An editorial in the *CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS* of December 1, 1972, discussed this aspect as follows:

"But what if States, counties and cities add federal revenue sharing to their spending,

establish programs that use up all that money, and then in a few years find the nation disenchanted with revenue sharing and the handouts stop? There would then have to be huge new local taxes to fill the gap caused by discontinued revenue sharing. And the federal government would still have the prospect of an added tax burden to pay for what already has been handed out".

REVENUE SHARING AIDS CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

On June 21, 1972, congressman John W. Byrnes in a speech opposing revenue sharing in the House of Representatives, declared;

"The President has called this an historic piece of legislation. I agree thoroughly. This bill would have long-range adverse effects upon our system of government, the relationship of the federal government to the States, the responsibility of local governments, and government responsibility generally...

"The bill, in my judgement, is wrong in principle. Once the federal government assumes the responsibility of raising the money local government spends to provide basic services from garbage collection to police protection, we will have completely altered the governmental relationships underlying the success of our pluralistic system...."

"Revenue sharing is the most insidious type of centralization. It centralizes the burden of taxes and decentralizes the dispensation of benefits. It makes the benefits immediate and the burden remote. This is the road on which we embark as we get into federal government financing of the general operations of State and local government."

In short, revenue sharing is another scheme to turn our Republic into a collectivist state.

INCREASING DEPENDENCE OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ON WASHINGTON, D.C.

An editorial in the *CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS* of November 18, 1972, discussing federal revenue sharing, made this comment:

"Philosophically, local governmental dependence upon federal grants through revenue sharing lessens the independence of action and decision by local government, thus becoming... (a) threat to the degree of freedom we have experienced and should guard carefully."

In the future, State and local governments will look to the federal government to provide them with funds rather than to their own initiative. As a consequence, they will become increasingly more dependent upon the federal government and increasingly more impotent themselves.

Under revenue sharing, the federal government drives itself deeper and deeper into debt in order to finance greater and greater surpluses at the State and local government levels. The point has been overlooked, but according to the American Enterprise Institute, which has projected State finances and local finances, as well as federal finances, the federal budget is subject to continued deficits while State and local budgets face growing surpluses.

The aggregate State and local fiscal surplus amounted to approximately \$5 billion in fiscal 1971. In the second quarter of fiscal 1972, the aggregate State and local surplus climbed to \$14 billion on an annual basis.

In some States, local officials, not knowing what to do with this windfall from Washington, are investing in U. S. Treasury obligations -- lending the funds back to the federal government with interest!

Concluding his remarks on revenue sharing in the debate in the House of Representatives, on June 21, 1972, Congressman Durward G. Gall declared:

"Having established that we have no source of revenue from which to refund this mythical largess to the various States and localities; my basic question is: Why not leave the money in the communities or States in the first place rather than bringing it here where notoriously the inefficient federal personnel inexorably use too much of it for administrative purposes before sending it back to the needy States and communities?"

Congressman Hall is indeed correct. But then, the *raison d'être* of federal revenue sharing is not to "aid" the States but, rather, to centralize control of the States and units of local government.

When federal funds are first proffered to States and local governments little mention is made of the federal controls which will accompany this outpouring of federal funds. The reason is that the federal bureaucrats well know that once federal funds are incorporated into the budgets of States or cities, their overall budgets become almost completely dependent on the continuation of such federal funds. When local dependency has been firmly established, the federal government can start cracking the whip, threatening to withdraw these funds unless there is immediate compliance with bureaucratic demands and guidelines.

FEDERAL CONTROL CLEARLY SPELLED OUT IN REVENUE-SHARING LAW

Officials of local, county and State governments who have hailed the passage of the Revenue Sharing Act, as a means of obtaining "no strings attached" funds for Washington, have obviously not read the bill itself.

H.R. 14370, State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, (federal revenue sharing) fairly bristles with controls and limitations as to how States and localities can and must spend these federal funds.

All power rests in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury. In the Act, when the term "Secretary" is used it means this government bureaucrat or his delegate. The term "Secretary" of the Treasury" means the Secretary of the Treasury personally, not including any delegate.

Following are extensive excerpts from H.R. 14370 clearly setting forth these federal controls:

"Sec. 105. General Provisions

"In order to qualify for any payment under this sub-title for any entitlement period beginning on or after July 1, 1972, a local government must establish -- in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and after an opportunity for review and comment by the Governor of the State in which such local government is located -- to the satisfaction of the Secretary --

"(1) that the local government will establish a trust fund in which it will deposit all payments it receives under this sub-title;

"(2) that it will use amounts in such trust fund -- including any interest earned thereon while in such trust fund -- only for high-priority expenditures...

"(3) that the local government will --

"(A) use such fiscal, accounting and audit procedures as will conform to guidelines established therefor by the Secretary -- after consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States.

"(B) provide to the Secretary -- and to the Comptroller General of the United States -- on reasonable notice, access to, and the right to examine, such books, documents, papers or records as the Secretary may reasonably require for purposes of reviewing compliance...

"(C)" make such annual and interim reports to the Secretary as he may reasonably require.

"(4) that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or sub-contractors in the performance of work on construction financed in whole or in part out of its trust fund established under paragraph (1) will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor...

"In order to qualify for any payment under this sub-title for the entitlement period beginning on January 1, 1972, and ending on June 30, 1972, a local government must establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary that it will use such payment only for high-priority expenditures and will comply with such other requirements... as may be established by the Secretary.

"WITHHOLDING OF PAYMENTS

"If the Secretary determines that a local government has failed to comply substantially with any provision of this sub-title... or any regulations prescribed thereunder... he shall notify the local government that if such local government fails to take corrective action within 60 days from the date of receipt of such notification, further payments to such local government shall be withheld for the remainder of the entitlement period and for any subsequent entitlement period until such time as the Secretary is satisfied that the appropriate corrective action has been taken, and that there will no longer be any failure to comply...

"The Secretary shall provide for such accounting and auditing procedures, evaluations, and reviews as may be necessary to insure that the expenditures of funds by the local governments comply fully with the requirements of this sub-title...

"NON-DISCRIMINATION PROVISION

"(A) No person in the United States shall on the ground of race, color, national origin or sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this sub-title.

"Whenever the Secretary determines that a local government has failed to comply with subsection (a) or an applicable regulation, he shall notify the Governor of the State in which the local government is located of the non-compliance and shall request the Governor to secure compliance. If within a reasonable period of time, the State fails or refuses to secure compliance, the Secretary shall have the authority to refer the matter to the Attorney

General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted..."

BETTER COMMUNITIES ACT -- NEWEST VERSION OF REVENUE SHARING

A UPI dispatch of April 19, 1973, reported that President Nixon had on that date proposed to abolish urban renewal and six other federal domestic programs, and to give 'local communities \$2.3 billion a year in revenue-sharing funds to help them "solve their problems."

Because of the widespread scandals and mis-use of funds in the urban renewal program, this was doubtless good news to a large segment of the population.

But taxpaying citizens should not jump to grab what can quickly be proven to be merely "bait" on the federal hook.

It should be noted that this federal aid is to go direct to the cities -- bypassing the duly elected State governors, thus eroding the power of the individual State governments.

In a message to Congress on March 8, 1973, the President employed all the phrases calculated to calm the fears of those suspecting a power-grab by the White House or federal bureaucrats. Following are a few of such statements by Nixon in that message:

"The Federal policy that will work best is one that helps people and their leaders in each community meet their own needs in the way they think best..."

"People today want to have a real say in the way their communities are run. They want to feel that, once again, they can play a significant role in shaping the kind of world their children will inherit..."

"But the Federal government can and should eliminate some of the barriers that have impeded the development of that feeling by returning resources and initiatives to the people and their locally elected leaders."

No Constitutionally-minded American can quarrel with those sentiments. But did Mr. Nixon mean what he said -- or were such statements a mere snare to trap the unwary?

Turning to his proposed Better Communities Act, Nixon stated that it is

"... intended to replace inflexible and fragmented categorical grant-in-aid programs, and to reduce the excessive Federal control that has been so frustrating to local governments."

To those who see only what they want to see, whether it be from a Liberal or Conservative viewpoint, this statement by the President was interpreted to mean that he intended to cut back on a number of wasteful federal programs. Liberals decried such seeming cutbacks; Conservatives rejoiced. This was the way this particular portion of the President's message to Congress was portrayed in the nation's press.

But was Nixon actually proposing a cutback in federal spending? Of course not! As such newspapers would have known -- if they had carefully read Nixon's statement in which he unequivocally stated that under the proposed Better Communities Act "no city receives less money for community development than it has received under the categorical grant programs."

When introducing the Better Communities Act in the U.S. House of Representatives on April 19, 1973, Congressman William B. Widnall stated:

"President Nixon in his fiscal year 1975 budget will ask that Congress appropriate \$2.3

billion for the first year beginning July 1, 1974. This is more than the total of funds currently allocated under the categorical community development programs... Of the major users of the replaced programs none will receive less than what they have received during the recent past...

"I would like to emphasize that activities funded by the replaced categorical grants programs could be continued or expanded." (Emphasis added)

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL CONTROLS IN NEW PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Glossing over the federal controls which will accompany this \$2.3 billion under the proposed Better Communities Act, Congressman Widnall casually remarked:

"The Government interest would be protected through reporting procedures, post-audits, and public disclosure."

Nixon's message to Congress on March 8 was more specific. He proposed a Responsive Governments Act to be a companion to his Better Communities Act.

According to the President, this Responsive Governments Act would "assist State and local governments" by:

"Developing reliable information on their problems and opportunities:

"Developing and analyzing alternative polices and programs:

"Managing the programs;

"And evaluating the results, so that appropriate adjustments can be made"

In actual fact, any local government official who is not blinded with greed for federal dollars will quickly realize that far from allowing "each community (to) meet their own needs in the way they think best", as the President stated on March 8, the reverse is the truth.

According to Nixon's proposed Responsive Governments Act, any local official is free to spend these federal dollars provided he is willing to:

1. Allow a bureaucrat of the federal government to decide what is "reliable information" on the problems of their community;
2. Allow a federal bureaucrat to "develop and analyze alternative programs";
3. Allow a federal bureaucrat to make "appropriate adjustments".
4. And finally, the federal government would be given the power, in Nixon's words, of "managing the programs".

One can only conclude that the repeated pronouncements by President Nixon that he intends to take power away from Washington, D.C., and return it to the people -- the taxpayers -- are a deliberate deception of the American people. He, obviously, hopes that the majority of the American people don't have ready access to *THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* where the full text of his pronouncements is printed.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CAN NOW COLLECT STATE INCOME TAXES

As long as State governments are able to raise revenue via State income taxes, they can maintain a modicum of independence from the increasingly all-powerful federal government.

However, this source of State revenue is now being pre-empted by the federal government according to the federal Revenue Sharing Act.

In addition to providing payments to localities "for high-priority expenditures", as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, H.R. 14370 also authorizes "federal collection of State individual income taxes".

In other words, 100% of State income tax revenue will no longer be spent within the State. It will be sent to the federal "processors" with a portion returned to the individual State. And even that portion of State income taxes which formerly remained in the State, when returned to the State will be wrapped in the chains of federal guidelines and controls, and can only be spent in Washington bureaucrats' dictate.

Here are two examples of federal control in this regard:

The bill states that the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate "shall collect and administer" State income taxes. And, of course, the word "administer" in this context means just what it says.

Under the ominous paragraph heading of "Finality of Administrative Determinations", the federal Revenue Sharing Act states:

"Administrative determinations of the Secretary or his delegate as to tax liabilities of, or refunds owing to, individuals with respect to qualified State individual income taxes shall not be reviewed by or enforced by any officer or employee of any State or political subdivision of a State."

It can certainly be safely assumed that the ultimate purpose of this section of the federal Revenue Sharing Act is a re-distribution of the nation's wealth. From the "haves" to the "have-nots" in accordance with the Communist Manifesto. Wealthy States, composed of industrious, hardworking citizens will have a considerable portion of their federally-collected State income tax dollars channeled to big-city States in order to support federal programs such as welfare payments for non-workers.

So what do such states, which receive back only a portion from the federal government of State income taxes collected, do? That's simple: Such States will simply grab for any revenue they can -- revenue which will not be first "processed" by Washington -- tax revenue which will remain in the State. This can only mean increased State taxes on real estate, sales, services, etc.

* * * * *

How federal revenue sharing, as now passed by Congress, and Nixon's proposed Better Communities Act and Responsive Governments Act, are a decisive step toward the establishment of federal regional government in the United States will be shown in the next chapter.

CHAPTER X

TIE-IN BETWEEN "REVENUE SHARING" AND METRO-REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Gary Allen, in his article in the March 1973 issue of *AMERICAN OPINION* quotes an editorial in the *NEW YORK TIMES*, which stated:

"Metropolitan and regional planning are essential, and the financial power of the federal government is the best available lever to compel local, county and state officials to take a broader view of their problems and to cooperate more effectively with one another."

An article in the February 23, 1970 issue of *BARRON'S* National business and Financial Weekly

contained extensive quotations from an article which had appeared in *THE NEW REPUBLIC* by Professor Richard A. Cloward, a member of the faculty of the Columbia University school of Social work.

Discussing how in many cases when voters are allowed to express their views at the ballot box regarding the subject of consolidations, such as city with suburbs, they vote "no", Professor Cloward said:

"Nevertheless, local autonomy is being overcome. For what cannot be done electorally is being done administratively, as a result of federal intervention.

"The federal government is beginning to force localities to subordinate themselves to new area-wide planning bureaucracies. Localities which do not come together to establish cross-jurisdictional agencies will soon find it difficult to obtain federal grants-in-aid. In this way, a new domain of government is emerging."

How revenue sharing ties into the concept of metropolitan government was contained in an article by Michael Harrington which appeared in the Washington, D.C., *WASHINGTON STAR* of August 5, 1969. In that article Harrington declared:

"... it is increasingly clear that problems like education, employment, housing and pollution of all kinds spread out over entire metropolitan areas and multi-state regions. And they simply will not be solved if Washington invests billions of shared revenue to make the ancient borders even more rigid."

The "ancient borders" at which Harrington sneers are, of course, the borders of the sovereign States. And then Harrington continued:

"But now revenue-sharing provides a tremendous opportunity for making more meaningful political units in America. The funds should not simply be earmarked for broad categories of social expenditure, although that is basic. Beyond that, the law should provide that no state or city could qualify for its money unless it had presented plans for regional and metropolitan action in the critical areas which were up for subsidy."

On January 21, 1971, when introducing the Humphrey-Reuss bill entitled "The State and Local Government Modernization Act of 1971, Congressman Henry S. Reuss stated:

"The administration approach to revenue sharing omits any incentive to states to get on with the job of updating and streamlining local government in this country.

"The heart of this bill is a requirement that states qualify for revenue sharing, in the second and subsequent years of the program, by preparing a master plan and timetable for modernizing state-local government."

(It is not surprising that both Congressman Reuss and Senator Hubert Humphrey are members of the Council on Foreign Relations. See Chapters V and VI regarding the role of the CFR in the metro-regional government scheme.)

It will be recalled that Chapter VI dealt with proposals of the CFR-controlled Committee for Economic Development (CED) for "modernizing" State and local government. The specific provisions of the Humphrey-Reuss bill prove that it is based on the CFR-CED proposals which will facilitate metro and

regional government.

According to the bill, States should take "constitutional, statutory and administrative" action to bring about the following changes:

"Restricting local popular elections to policy-makers -- the short ballot; (Author's note: This would greatly diminish the voters' voice in their local government.)

"Easing restrictions on the borrowing and taxing powers of local governments; (Author's note: This would pave the way for local tax increases.)

"Liberalizing municipal annexation of unincorporated areas;

"Restricting zoning authority in metropolitan areas... in order to prevent zoning by smaller municipalities which excludes housing for lower income families.

"Authorizing the formation of metropolitan planning agencies to make recommendations to local governments concerning such matters as land use, zoning, building regulations and capital improvements;

"Encouraging the formation of multi-county and regional bodies;"

The bill proposed that such "modernization" of State and local government in order to qualify for revenue sharing be accomplished by:

"... interstate compact or otherwise, for dealing with interstate regional problems, including those of metropolitan areas which overlap state line, and for regional cooperation in such areas as health, education, welfare, conservation, resource development, transportation, recreation, housing."

FUNCTION OF TEN FEDERAL REGIONAL COUNCIL DECREED BY NIXON

Although, as of June, 1973, when this chapter was written, the Humphrey-Reuss bill had not been passed by Congress, it becomes increasingly clear that so vast are the powers granted to the Secretary of the Treasury under the Revenue Sharing Act of 1972, and the Better Communities Act of 1973, that passage of the Humphrey-Reuss bill may be deemed unnecessary by the Metrocrats. By bureaucrat determination, or interpretation, of the two aforementioned pieces of legislation, the proposals of the Humphrey-Reuss local-government-destroying bill can now be implemented.

As discussed in chapter I, on February 10, 1972, President Nixon, by signing an Executive Order, decreed the establishment of ten Federal Regional Councils in order to -- as he put it, "streamline the structure and processes of federal agencies in the field."

It is these ten Federal Regional Councils, cutting across State boundaries, thereby inestimably eroding sovereignty of the States, which will be in charge of allocating federal revenue-sharing funds. In the future, it will be the bureaucrat-staffed Federal Regional Councils which will control the ten federal regions, formerly the 50 States. Because the rulings, decrees and guidelines -- after being drafted in Washington -- will be issued by these ten federal regional headquarters, this unconscionable federal power-grab will be sold to the American people as "modernized local government" and "home rule".

Paul Scott, in his column of January 15, 1973, discussing the White House's Office of Management and Budget (OMB), revealed:

"The OMB now monitors and coordinates the approval and administration of grants-in-aid to the States and municipalities, including direct oversight of federal regional office coordination. These programs involve billions of dollars and give OMB officials responsibilities which make them far more than advisors to the President."

WHERE "1313" COMES INTO THE PICTURE ON REVENUE SHARING

As you know, Chapter VII described the founding and activities of the Metrocrat headquarters in Chicago, known as "1313". One of the members of the CFR-CED-Metro conglomerate at "1313" is the National League of Cities.

The National League of Cities in conjunction with the United States Conference of Mayors on January 29, 1973 sent out a memorandum to "member cities".

In that memorandum they stated that their organizations "had been requested by the Department of Housing and Urban Development" to inform their "member cities" of "a new program to help small and medium-sized local governments meet the planning and management challenges implicit in general and special revenue sharing".

The memorandum went on to state that HUD "has initiated the Urban Technical Services (UTS) Program which will help provide full-time, trained urban specialists to 150-200 local governments having a population of 200,000 or less".

It is these imported Metro-trained urban specialists who will first become advisors, and then the controllers of federal revenue-sharing funds in the States and local communities -- operating out of the ten Federal Regional Councils decreed by President Nixon.

* * * * *

Metro and regional government is not just new political theories or philosophies of government. Far from it. The various ramifications of this revolutionary aspect of governance personally affect every individual in this nation, his personal property, his children, and yes, his personal safety. These aspects are covered in the following chapters.

More to be added soon...

Next Page

Previous Page

Back to the TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Council on Domestic Relations Home Page](#)

CHAPTER XI

METRO AND URBAN RENEWAL

Thus far we have dealt with the various aspects of Metro-regional government as it relates to centralization of power in the hands of the federal government and federal appointees.

Now let us see how this revolutionary concept of government affects the individual and his private property.

In her book, "Terrible 1313 Revisited", Jo Hindman states:

"When a government controls a man's property, civil rights, his home and the power of human decision, then he is captured and not free. Metropolitan government is accumulating such power; if completely victorious, in it will repose all control."

URBAN RENEWAL — VEHICLE FOR SEIZING PRIVATE PROPERTY

Amendment V of the U.S. Constitution spells out: "No person shall... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation".

Thus government has the power to take private property for "public use" if "just compensation" is given. Known as the principle of "eminent domain", it was intended only for such public facilities as roads, public schools, parks, sewers, etc.

However, a Supreme Court ruling in 1954 permitted the seizure of private property for *private* use.

This assault on property-owning citizens is called urban renewal.

For years the American people have been propagandized to the effect that urban renewal means slum clearance, and thus a deterrent to crime. But the fact is that slums do not breed crime and delinquency. Delinquency and crime breed slums.

An article in the November 21, 1970 issue of HUMAN EVENTS cited a report by the General Accounting Office which demonstrated conclusively that urban renewal has been a multi-billion-dollar hoax, enriching a few speculators at the expense of low- and middle-income residents. The report showed that tens of thousands of people have lost their homes and that the urban renewal program contributes to the spread of slums.

HUMAN EVENTS then stated:

"During the 20 years ending December 31, 1968, the federal government spent \$7 billion for the ostensible purpose of rehabilitating big-city slums. Yet during that period, the government accounted for a new loss of 314,000 housing units.

"For every unit put up, the federal bulldozer leveled 3.5 others. The housing destroyed was almost always that of poor middle-income residents. The beneficiaries were usually upper-income taxpayers who moved into the spanking new developments."

Therefore, if, as has now been proved, urban renewal has not solved the problem, what is the ulterior and ultimate aim of the promoters of urban renewal -- and how did it all start?

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT of July 10, 1961, defines urban renewal thusly:

"Urban renewal is a federally-financed program of city planning which requires city governments to seize homes and other private property from some citizens and resell them, at below cost, to real estate promoters and other private citizens for developments that the city planners consider desirable."

How did city governments acquire power to eliminate private property rights? On November 22, 1954, in the aforementioned ruling, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed a lower federal court ruling in a Washington, D.C., urban-renewal case. The lower court had said:

"One man's land cannot be seized by the government and sold to another man merely in order that the purchaser may build upon it a better house or a house which better meets the government's idea of what is appropriate or well-designed."

The supreme Court held, in essence, that Congress, in the District of Columbia, has unlimited authority to determine what the public good is, and unlimited power to use any mean to achieve that good. The Court said that State legislatures have the same power over all communities in their States.

Since this 1954 Supreme Court decision, most State legislatures have enacted special urban-renewal laws authorizing city government to confiscate private real estate for urban-renewal projects.

Urban renewal, with federal tax money, was authorized in the National Housing Act of 1949, and enlarged in scope by amendment to the Housing Acts of 1954, 1956, and 1956; but it did not become a vigorously promoted nationwide program until late in 1957, after the Council on Foreign Relations, through its domestic arm, the Committee for Economic Development, started pushing it.

And, as could be expected, urban renewal has long been promoted by the master planners at "1313" headquarters in Chicago.

In December 1958, William Zeckendorf delivered a speech before the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce. Zeckendorf is president of Webb & Knapp, Inc., one of the nation's largest real estate developers and in a position to profit handsomely from the urban-renewal program.

Here's what Zeckendorf had to say when addressing the leading business and political figures in New Orleans:"

"(1) You must have a master plan..., (2) You must be able to dedicate or to pledge the responsibility for the re-development concept in the hands of an objective-minded... commission that will declare what areas are blighted and what are sub-standard; what areas must be re-zoned and re-developed for the benefit of the community."

And then Zeckendorf showed his contempt for property owners by saying:

"This is the only area in which I say you must depart from the pure form of democracy in which the individual rights must be observed. This is the case where the community right is more important than the individual because it is a matter of license rather than a matter of privilege for any one individual to be allowed to flourish excessive worship of the idea of private property, to be able to stand out against the development project which is in the interest of the community." [Emphasis ours]

CDR NOTE: The above comment coincides with the UN planners' plan for Global Governance. To confirm that all aspects of Regional Governance, including "urban renewal", emanate from the United Nations - following is an excerpt from a 1967 UN Report, (UNP Sales No.: 67.IV.5) titled PLANNING OF METROPOLITAN AREAS AND NEW TOWNS... page iv of the Foreword...[Ephasis Ours]

"Another front presenting renewal opportunities to co-ordinate development activities is the region. Planning on a regional scale may help guide both urbanization and industrialization... a common meeting ground for linking local physical planning and national economic planning, as well as the planning for social services and community development. However, we must recognize that our administrative machinery is still woefully inadequate to bring about the level of integrated planning and action which is required.

There is, consequently, an urgent need for national land policies which can help guide this transition into desired channels. The physical planner's role in this crucial period is an extremely essential one. Through appropriate land-use planning, it is his job to help this transfer of land to occur in an orderly fashion by reconciling the rights of the individual with the interests of the community....

"A number of general conclusions seem to be emerging: ... (2) Our world society must learn to guide the process of urbanization through judicious regional development of industry and agriculture...."

The above-mentioned report was based on two UN meetings:

1. Meeting of the United Nations Group of Experts **on Metropolitan Planning and**

Development; Stockholm, 14-30 September 1961 and

2. The United Nations Symposium on the **Planning and Development of New Towns**; Moscow (USSR), 24-August-7 September 1964.

Although the report was not published until 1967, please notice the time-line of the acceleration of political changes which began taking place in the U.S of America beginning in the early to mid 1960's along with the federal and state legislation implementing the UN plan for regionalizing the world.]

FEDERAL METRO FORCES CITY-SUBURBS MERGER

With the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the passage of the Model Cities Act, the urban renewal concept went regional. Model Cities programs now involve approximately 150 cities -- or, to be more accurate, areas -- forcing regional government by buying federal funds to its creation.

Jo Hindman, in her Metro News column of July 27, 1968, put it this way:

"In 1966, the regional trap was tightened by Section 204 of the Model Cities law (Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966) calling for regionalism, a 'review by an agency which is designated to perform... regional planning'."

The portion of this law which deals with metropolitan planning is called Title II. According to Sec. 103 (4) of Title II, HUD can require cities to be a part of a metropolitan planning program.

CDR Note Re. HUD: "... But it is now recognized that housing and urban development are important for the stability of labour and for productivity of industry in urban society." (Excerpted from the UN Report mentioned in the above Note) The Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) was created by Congress in 1965, just after the 1964 meeting of the "group of experts" in Moscow.

In this connection, Congressman Paul A. Fino, on February 21, 1967, declared:

"But can HUD force the suburbs of big cities to be part of a metropolitan scheme? The answer is "yes".

"Under Title II of the omnibus cities bill of 1966 — the metro title — all applications for federal aid under ten programs such as sewers, construction of hospitals, highways, libraries, airports, etc., must soon be submitted to a metropolitan-wide planning body — metro government — for recommendation before they are forwarded to Washington. The metro government to which the applications must be submitted must be a joint planning body for the central city and suburbs."

As a result, big-city, urban-renewal projects are being integrated with the suburbs, forcing "scattered-site" public housing upon quiet, formerly pleasant, suburban communities.

A column in THE INDIANAPOLIS NEWS of March 27, 1968, by W.J. Griffith III, revealed:

"Acting under provisions of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has withheld \$600,000 in matching funds for the Broadway Park, 17th and Broadway, because a regional planning agency does not exist to review such applications. Preparations are underway to create a multi-county council of governments which would fulfill this function."

On August 7, 1967, THE INDIANAPOLIS NEWS had reported remarks of HUD Secretary Robert

Weaver, saying the Demonstration Cities Act would require an areawide or regional agency which must be a "form of government which has both the jurisdiction, the power and the will to carry out what is provided for in the comprehensive metropolitan plan". Weaver also said that, "in most instances", this would have to be a "metropolitan council of governments".

In a lengthy statement on June 11, 1971, President Nixon said the federal government will encourage but not require the nation's suburban communities to open up housing opportunities to the poor of all races.

"We will not seek to impose economic integration upon an existing local jurisdiction", Nixon said. "At the same time", he continued, "we will not countenance any use of economic measures as a subterfuge for racial discrimination".

Three days later, the Justice Department filed a suit against the newly incorporated suburb of Black Jack to force it to accept a federally subsidized low-income housing project.

Black Jack is a predominantly white city of about 3,000 in North St. Louis County, north of St. Louis.

A city ordinance enacted in October 1970, two months after Black Jack was incorporated, prohibits multi-family housing. According to an AP dispatch, this ordinance was adopted in the wake of public opposition to a development intended to provide racially integrated housing for low-income residents.

Announcement that the suit had been filed in federal court in St. Louis was made in Washington on June 14, 1971, by Attorney General John N. Mitchell, who said the government will move against any municipality where it can show racial discrimination.

Commenting on this action by the Nixon Administration, THE RICHMOND (Virginia) NEWS LEADER had this to say:

"At the same time, the Department of Justice announced that several suits would be filed in other States -- in a move that could be interpreted only as an attempt to force economic integration on unwilling suburbs."

And then the RICHMOND NEWS LEADER continued:

"Never mind that the vast majority of zoning ordinances are passed to preserve the character of a neighborhood. Federally subsidized housing, as the record clearly shows, creates instant slums with high crime rates, rampant vandalism, and a disproportionate burden on tax-supported services. They represent a real threat to a neighborhood's sense of community, but the federal government couldn't care less."

A column by Paul Critchlow in THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER of December 21, 1972, discussed a housing plan that would require Philadelphia suburban counties to increase substantially their low-income housing or lose federal funds.

According to Critchlow:

"The plan, presented by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, would force several counties to nearly double by the year 2000 both their low-income housing, for families earning \$5,000 a year or less, and their moderate-income housing, for families earning between \$5,000 and \$10,000.

"If any county failed to meet its allocation, the commission could block that county's application for federal funds for projects ranging from parks to sewers.

"The plan is also necessary under federal guidelines for the region to keep its eligibility for up to \$250 million in annual federal funds for such projects."

MERGING CITY AND SUBURBS TO COMPEL INTEGRATION OF SCHOOLS

Jo Hindman, in her book, "Blame Metro", revealed the tie-in between Metro and the schools. According to Mrs. Hindman:

"Persons alarmed by Metropolitan government's take-over have asked if Metro also has designs on the nation's schools.

"Metro 1313 has declared that there would be no separate school districts in this country whatsoever under Metropolitan Government. Metro experts have stated that it is 'unwholesome' for the educational system to remain autonomous, and that separate school districts stand as obstacles to the spread of Metro's reorganization (consolidation) of American government into collectivized Metropolitan Government."

Title III of the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967 provides the following techniques for federally directed integration:

"Careful site selection to locate new schools so as to maximize integration of residentially segregated student populations.

"Creation of metropolitan school districts to include urban and suburban areas."

Congressman Paul A. Fino, in discussing the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, declared on February 21, 1967:

"The federal government already has the power to force communities to set up multi-jurisdictional school programs in order to achieve integration or racial balance in the schools. Title II of the 1966 Demonstration Cities bill requires Metro governments which can impose (such) criteria on communities as the price of aid under ten federal programs."

* * * * *

As this book is written, still another federal law is being considered by Congress which goes even further in promoting the Metro-regional government concept. This is covered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XII

WHY METRO PROMOTES LAND-USE LAWS

In a publication entitled "Tax-Reverted Properties in Urban Areas", by A.M. Hillhouse, published by the Public Administration Service in 1942, is found the following:

"Lands suitable for private uses would be returned to private hands, but the city would retain the necessary land-use control over such sites. This would be more effective in the long run than zoning ordinances... Land, in other words, can be passed through a period of public ownership during which the public agency can re-plat the land, clear the title, and adjust land-use patterns.

"But the city can go one step further. It can limit the future use of the land sold back into private ownership. Deed restrictions and other covenants will accomplish much more than zoning, building laws, or any other exercise of the police power. Only temporary public ownership is necessary to effect long-term land-use plans."

Needless to say, the Public Administration Service is a part -- an important part -- of the burgeoning

Metro empire, and is located at "1313" headquarters in Chicago.

Thirty years later (the Metrocrats have been working at this for a long time!) a State-sponsored Planning Conference was held in Richmond, Virginia, on October 17-19, 1972. As reported by THE NEWS of Lynchburg, Virginia, one of the participants made this suggestion:

"Private property in this state eventually should be transferred to government or state agency ownership and then be leased back to individuals under rigidly controlled regulations."

In his article in the January, 1973 issue of AMERICAN OPINION magazine, Gary Allen quoted Robert C. Weaver, former Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as having stated:

"Regional government means absolute federal control over all property and its development regardless of location, anywhere in the United States, to be administered on the federal officials' determination. It (regional government) would supersede state and local laws... Through this authority we seek to recapture control of the use of land...."

Concerning which Allen warned: "Land control is people control."

CDR NOTE: We will be allowed to 'own' the land in order to pay taxes. See Tugwell article — [GOVERNMENT TO CONTROL ALL LAND](#)

As has been seen so far in this book, the long-range plans of the pushers of Metro or regional government are being implemented in a number of ways, i.e., Presidential Executive Orders, housing and urban renewal laws passed by Congress and by judicial rulings.

Comes now the latest (as of 1973) attack on local self-government and the right to own and manage one's private property -- land-use legislation.

ANOTHER FEDERAL "POWER GRAB"

On January 9, 1973, Senator Henry M. Jackson introduced S. 268 entitled, "Land Use Policy and Planning Assistance Act of 1973". The stated purpose is:

"To establish a national land-use policy, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to assist the states to develop and implement state land-use programs, to coordinate federal programs and policies which have a land-use impact, to coordinate planning and management of federal lands and planning and management of adjacent non-federal lands, and to establish an Office of Land Use Policy Administration in the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes."

Here we see it blatantly admitted that one of the purposes of this federal land-use bill is for "planning and management of adjacent non-federal lands". In other words, privately owned property.

In introducing the bill, Senator Jackson said it would provide "federal technical and financial assistance to the states.... For land-use planning and management so as to remedy increasingly evident inadequacies..."

The bill itself refers to "the existence of poor or ineffective planning at the state and local levels", and that this "poses serious problems of broad national or regional concern".

Every time the federal government attempts a power-grab with the resultant diminution of the power of State and local government, the attempt is made to charge "inadequacies" or inefficiency as a justification for such increasing centralization of power in the hands of federal bureaucrats.

"1313" BACKS LAND-USE LEGISLATION

In his speech introducing S. 268, Senator Jackson boasted that the Interior Committee had had "numerous executive sessions and consultation with the National Governors' Conference, the League of Cities-Conference of Mayors", and that it had received their endorsement as well as that of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR).

The federal ACIR is financed by taxpayers' dollars but is controlled by the CFR-CED-"1313" conglomerate.

According to Jo Hindman in her book "Blame Metro":

"The 1313 syndicate makes the nominations that control the 26-member ACIR through the Governors' Conference, National Association of Counties, Council of State Governments, and National League of Cities. All are 1313 syndicate groups."

The Land Use Policy and Planning Assistance Act of 1973 proposes to "provide state government with funds — \$170 million over five years — to develop state land-use data inventories, to improve the size and competence of professional staff, and to establish an appropriate state planning agency".

Just what does the term "land-use data inventories" mean? Would this be a massive dossier on every property owner in each State as to how he uses his property?

And, of course, the "professional staff" would be composed of Metrocrats indoctrinated by "1313".

LAND-USE LEGISLATION CONTINUES THE ASSAULT ON PRIVATE PROPERTY

The Senate bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior "consult with heads of other agencies and to form a national advisory board on land-use policy to provide interagency communication concerning the land-use impacts of and polices embodied in federal and federally assisted programs".

Among the members of the National Advisory Board on Land Use Policy will be representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The reason for the inclusion of HEW and HUD on the board is that the bill states:

"The Congress finds that federal, regional, state and local decisions and programs which establish or influence the location of land uses often determine whether people of all income levels and races have or are denied access to decent shelter, to adequate employment, and to quality schools..."

In other words, one purpose of the federal land-use proposal would be to mandate federally assisted low-income housing in the suburbs regardless of the wishes of suburban property owners.

This is amplified in another section of the bill which states that the bill "does require state governments to develop a process of planning and a state land-use program which is 'balanced'... (that) provides for necessary social services (welfare), and housing and residential development".

And who is to decide whether a State land-use program is, in the bills' words, "balanced"? Why, the federal Metrocrats, of course.

"LAND-USE" — VEHICLE FOR REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

The federal land-use bill contains a section entitled "Interstate Coordination". This is another way of saying "regionalization". In this section is found the following:

"Subject to the approval of Congress by the adoption of an appropriate Act, Congress hereby authorizes states possessing coherent geographic, environmental, demographic, or economic characteristics which would serve as reasonable bases upon which to coordinate land-use planning, policies, and programs in interstate areas to negotiate interstate compacts for the purpose of such coordination: Provided, that

such compacts shall provide for an opportunity for participation in the coordination process by federal and local governments and agencies..."

Inasmuch as "interstate compacts" is also a term for regional government, here, clearly, is a mechanism for regionalization of the United States in accordance with President Nixon's Executive Order decreeing ten federal regions.

When introducing his land-use bill, Senator Jackson said:

"Guidelines for the Act are to be promulgated through an inter-agency process with the principal responsibility of formulating those guidelines residing in the Executive Office of the President."

Acting in the capacity of "observers" on the proposed National Advisory board on Land Use Policy will be members of the Office of Management and budget. It will be recalled that in Chapter X, columnist Paul Scott revealed that the OMB now "monitors and coordinates the approval and administration of grants-in-aid to the States and municipalities, including direct oversight of federal regional office coordination".

The bill specifically delegates authority to the "1313"-controlled Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations when it states:

"The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations shall conduct a review of federally established or authorized interstate agencies, including, but not limited to... regional development agencies, and interstate compact commissions, for the purpose of coordinating land-use planning, policies, and programs in interstate areas."

Thus are the "1313" Metrocrats given awesome power by this bill.

Here we see a coming-together of President Nixon's decree of February 10, 1972, establishing ten Federal Regional Councils, the accumulating power of the Office of Management and Budget to act as overseer of these Federal Regional Councils -- and the ubiquitous CFR-CED-"1313" power syndicate acting as mastermind of this long-plotted conspiracy to destroy local government and the rights of private property.

Not only does the bill provide, as previously mentioned, funds for the establishment of "State land-use data inventories," but it also stipulates that the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Proposed Office of Land Use Policy Administration, "shall develop and maintain a Federal Land Use Information and Data Center, with such regional branches as the Secretary may deem appropriate."

In other words, one of the functions of the ten Federal Regional Councils will be to also monitor every property owner and decide whether that property owner's use of his property is in keeping with the "balance" decreed by the federal Metrocrats.

Reacting to mass communications promotion of the theme "protect the environment", a majority of State Legislatures have either passed, or are considering land-use legislation, having been tipped-off that federal funds were in the offing to finance such planning commissions.

But, how many of these State Legislators, believing that "land-use" means only protecting the wilderness lands and pollution control, have read the text of Senator Jackson's bill on land-use?

How many know what a federal land-use bill really means? And how, if this bill passes, such State Legislators will become mere rubber-stamps for legislation drafted by the "1313" Metro syndicate to be administered by the ten Federal Regional Councils?

CHAPTER XIII

FEDERAL FUNDING FOR METRO-REGIONAL GOVERNMENT VIA L.E.A.A.

*CDR NOTE: **Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.** According to Betty J. Mills LEAA was never disbanded. Because of the vast numbers of people opposing the LEAA the name was changed. Today it is called FEMA, and according to Betty, all the policies laid down under LEAA are now being played out under FEMA.*

The late Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, once declared:

"Effective law enforcement is basically a local responsibility. In the area of self-government reserved for the States, counties and cities, the enforcement of the laws is not only their duty but also their right.

"Law-abiding citizens and local officials should vigorously oppose ... the devious moves to negate local authority and replace it with federal police power."

And yet, most Americans are unaware that for some years there has been a campaign to institute an eventual federal police force via various programs of federal aid to States and communities.

WHY CRIME CONTINUES TO INCREASE DESPITE VAST ANTI-CRIME OUTLAYS

Reacting to the ever-increasing crime rate in the United States, the Congress passed the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 which became law on June 19, 1968.

Under this Act, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) was established within the Department of Justice under the authority of the Attorney General.

On March 20, 1973, Congressman James V. Stanton, in discussing the crime problem in this country, pointed out that \$2.5 billion of taxpayers' dollars had so far been spent in financing the activities of LEAA.

And what have the American people received for this vast federal outlay?

On August 28, 1972, Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst made public the FBI index of serious crime in the United States for 1971. According to his statement, total serious offenses reported during 1971 stood at more than 5,900,000. Conceding that "crime is still increasing", Kleindienst revealed that law enforcement agencies had reported making a total of 8,600,000 arrests for all criminal acts (excluding traffic offenses) in 1971, which was an increase of 3 per cent over 1970. On June 28, 1973, the FBI reported that violent crime within the U.S. increased 6 per cent during the first three months of 1973.

An editorial in the December 17, 1972, issue of THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR furnished this information:

"Criminology experts say that of all reported major criminal offenses only 12 per cent lead to arrests, only 6 per cent to convictions and only 1 per cent to prison. They say the chances of being punished for a serious crime in the United States are 3 in 100.

"That explains a lot. In the U.s. justice is not only blind. She is crippled."

On March 13, 1973, Congressman John R. Rarick charged that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, which was supposed to make the streets safe from crime by "pouring billions in tax dollars into local and State police agencies, continues to develop its bureaucratic threat to locally-controlled law enforcement."

Congressman Rarick then inserted in THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech he had made on June 10, 1970, opposing passage of the LEAA bill. At that time Rarick declared:

"We are being asked to ignore the cause of the problem -- the many crime-favoring Supreme Court laws. We are being urged to hoodwink our people into thinking that by massive expenditures of federal money, by so-called upgrading our local and State police officers, and modernizing our correctional

facilities, we can deter the criminal threat."

Pointing out that "fancy-sounding names on legislation will not stop criminals nor deter crime", Rarick continued:

"The gut problem is that as we continue to talk about reducing crime, our law enforcement agencies are denied the freedom to enforce the laws. This bill offers no solution. It but provides more than \$2 billion to be doled out over 3 years for grants to local and State police who agree to comply with various edicts and guidelines laid down by the Attorney General of the United States and enforced by the administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act."

Warning of the ultimate danger of the LEAA, Rarick asserted:

"With federal funds necessarily comes federal control.

"It is ridiculous to believe that we can hand out federal money and not end up with federal control and domination over our local police."

A FEDERAL POLICE FORCE?

An editorial in THE HOUSTON TRIBUNE of June 10, 1971, terming a national police force "the first essential to a totalitarian state", quoted the associate administrator of the Law enforcement Assistance Administration as having just stated:

"Today, in this country, we have 40,235 law enforcement agencies, ranging from one-man departments to New York City with more than 40,000 police officers. This many units form a completely ungovernable body."

Reacting to this statement THE HOUSTON TRIBUNE posed this question:

"What does he mean by "ungovernable"? Each community is capable of governing its police force. The people of each community know the nature and extent of their law enforcement problems. They know how to deal with them.

"No, what this official evidently means is that 40,235 law enforcement agencies are ungovernable by the central government. And that is exactly as it should be.

"Police powers should remain local powers, as they have been historically in this country. This is an essential safeguard against totalitarian power."

HOW METROCRATS PLAN TO TAKE OVER LOCAL POLICE

The "1313 Metrocrats have long promoted consolidation of local police departments and sheriff's offices into metropolitan police forces under a political appointee responsible to a Metro manager.

In his article in the January 1973 issue of AMERICAN OPINION, Gary Allen quoted the following excerpt from a manual published by the International City Managers Association of 1313 East 60th St., Chicago:

"The police function should be administered through a regular city department headed by a police chief directly responsible to the chief administrator of the city (manager).

"...Appointment of the police chief should be made by the chief administrator of the city... rather than by a separate board, commission or the city council."

In other words, the "chief administrator of the city" -- the appointed Metrocrat -- would control the local police chief.

REGIONAL REVIEW, published quarterly by the National Service to Regional Councils -- a

Washington, D.C., brand of "1313" -- in its April 1969 issue informed its subscribers as follows:

"Law enforcement planning has emerged as a major regional program as a result of the Omnibus Crime Control and safe Streets Act (of 1968). The Act stipulates that 40 per cent of the funds awarded to the states for planning should be channeled to local governments. To insure the greatest return for each planning dollar expended... the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has strongly urged states to utilize regional agencies for planning."

Illustrative of how the Metrocrats are now moving into the area of law enforcement, REGIONAL REVIEW of April 1969 went on to state:

"Thirty-eight states, in compliance with this (LEAA guideline, have designated regions as local planning units. Existing regional planning agencies, councils of governments, and state planning districts are working in this field. Several states have also established regions especially for law enforcement planning."

STRENGTHENING REGIONAL COUNCILS VIA L.E.A.A.

In a speech in the U.S. House of Representatives on May 14, 1973, Congressman Robert B. Mathias, citing the fact that the channeling of billions of dollars into the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to the "states and cities, will not, by itself, check the growing crime rate", offered an amendment to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

In introducing his amendment, Congressman Mathias said:

"There remains a task aimed at reducing crime which has just barely begun... and that is the task of uniting the government with the people of a metropolitan area in an effort to control crime throughout a metropolitan.

"It is absolutely senseless.... To permit jurisdictional lines and political jealousy to thwart progress and, in the case of criminal justice, to thwart safety.

"The metropolitan areas which make up many cities and subdivisions within a state must all join together..."

That, according to Mathias, is the task which regional agencies, such as regional planning councils and councils of local governments, have begun.

It will be recalled that Chapter VIII dealt with the subject of "1313's" apparatus at the local level -- regional councils. In that chapter the Metrocrats house organ, REGIONAL REVIEW of January 1971 revealed:

"As presently structured, regional councils are not a threat to local government powers or resources."

Later in the chapter Robert S. New house is quoted as having said:

"What is needed in the long run, is the establishment of an agency at the federal executive level that... would provide subsistence funding to regional units..."

Congressman Mathias' amendment to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 would not only restructure regional councils, thus posing a direct threat to local government, but would provide federal funds direct to such regional councils.

Mathias particularly referred to the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments which includes four major counties and a city in Virginia, two very large counties in Maryland, and the District of Columbia in its entirety. He stated that for Washington's COG to obtain federal money for planning, it had to go to each State involved because "interstate planning agencies and councils of government have never been eligible for direct planning grants."

This, Mathias deplures. Therefore, in offering his amendment to the anti-crime Act of 1968, he said that his amendment would "permit interstate regional metropolitan area councils of local governments or regional councils which are interstate (to be) directly eligible for a specially earmarked amount of planning-grand funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration."

The price tag for his proposal to strengthen the power of regional councils is \$1.5 million in fiscal year 1974.

In the past, federal grants have been given to elected governments at the local or State level. Mathias' bill would change that to include "organizations composed or predominantly composed of local elected officials... within any interstate metropolitan area."

In other words, if an interstate regional council is composed of 51 per cent elected officials and 49 per cent federally appointed bureaucrats, it would be eligible for a federal grant. Because these unelected Metrocrats would be working full-time, while the elected officials would be able to devote only a relatively small portion of time because of other duties, it would not take long for the "1313"-indoctrinated Metrocrats to take complete charge.

Whereas the Mathias bill would provide these grants to interstate regional councils for "developing an effective comprehensive planning and coordination process to cope with the regional law enforcement and criminal justice needs and problems within such interstate area," how long, once the precedent has been established by this bill, would it be before federal funds would be flowing at an ever-increasing rate to these interstate councils of government for a variety of other purposes?

The Mathias bill also would provide federal funds for interstate regional planning for the purpose of "proposing organizational systems and administrative machinery for implementing plans and policies."

The words "organizational systems", "administrative machinery" and "implementing plans" clearly indicate that once federally funded these interstate regional councils have no intention of remaining mere planners.

CDR NOTE: Another excerpt from the UN Report mentioned above: " We will, however, have to add new work tools to planning, in addition to zoning, building codes and subdivision regulations to achieve.... suitable arrangements for public administration on a regional rather than local scale.

Congressman Mathias also said that:

"It does not appear likely that state governments will act to strengthen interstate councils".

He gave as one reason the fact that:

"States tend to be reluctant to ...invest state funds in organizations whose jurisdiction and governmental allegiance lies outside the state's boundaries."

As well the States should be.

Because of such reluctance on the part of the States, Mathias claims that:

"Federal policy seems to be the only realistic potential means for bringing about an increase in the effectiveness of these organizations", that is, strengthening the power of "1313"-directed regional councils of government.

TEN FEDERAL REGIONAL COUNCILS READYING PLANS TO RULE THE 50 STATES

In December 1972, a conference of regional councils representing interstate areas was convened in New Orleans under the auspices of the National Association of Regional Councils.

According to Congressman Mathias, in his speech of May 14, 1973:

"From this conference arose specific recommendations and mandates for action."

The use by Mathias of the phrase "mandates for action" should be noted. Webster's New Collegiate dictionary defines "mandate" as: "The instruction given by a constituency to the elected legislative body or one of its members".

But the Metrocrats gathered in conference in New Orleans have no constituencies. They speak only for the CFR-CED-"1313" conglomerate.

The second definition in the dictionary for "mandate" is: "an authoritative command". The second definition aptly describes the attitude of those attending the conference sponsored by the National Association of Regional Councils.

These "1313"-indoctrinated bureaucrats obviously consider that they now have, or soon will have, the authority to issue commands.

Here are a few of the recommendations of this conference:

- "Legislation should be sought authorizing and requiring the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to certify a single areawide regional council in interstate urban areas as the administrator of all federal programs concerned with areawide planning or coordination for that area... (Emphasis added)
- "In new federal legislation involving areawide planning and coordination within interstate areas... the Executive Office of the President should be responsible for assuring that the areawide regional council is designated to carry out the programs... (Emphasis added)
- "OMB, Federal Regional Councils, and the states should seek to achieve consistency among federal agency guidelines in specific functional areas."

Here, clearly, is the spelling out of the activities and authority for the 10 Federal Regional Councils established by President Nixon when he signed Executive Order No. 11647 on February 10, 1972.

As pointed out in Chapter I, Nixon's action was indisputably unconstitutional.

Note the use of the words "as the administrator" and "to carry out" in the recommendations of the National Association of Regional Councils in New Orleans in 1972.

This can only mean that the 10 Federal Regional Councils, decreed by Nixon, will soon be given administrative -- or governing -- power over the once-sovereign 50 States.

As for the OMB, mentioned in the "mandates for action" at the December 1972 regional council conference, it already is acting as federal overseer of the 10 Federal Regional councils with an aim to gradually increasing their power.

And, finally, there is that phrase "consistency among federal agency guidelines", in the aforementioned recommendations. Is this not a euphemism for synchronization of all areas of federal control over the States and the inhabitants thereof?

CHAPTER XIV

HOW TO IDENTIFY A METRO OPERATION

The Leftwing-controlled press in the big cities has proved an invaluable ally of the pushers of Metro-regional government, giving full coverage to all public statements by Metrocrats and officials of regional councils of governments, as well as adding editorial support.

"REDUCING COST AND INCREASING EFFICIENCY"

Always, the advocates of Metro present it as leading to "reducing cost of government", increasing efficiency of local government", and finally, "home rule".

All of the foregoing statements are false.

THE DENVER POST, in an editorial on February 27, 1973, headlined "At Last, Regional Government Near at Hand for Denver Area", discussed the proposed creation of a regional service authority which would come up for a vote by the residents of four counties in the Denver metropolitan area.

According to the editorial:

"Hopefully, if the people of Adams, Arapahoe, Denver and Jefferson counties vote to create this new government, a regional service authority will deliver to them higher quality services, or more economical services, or both, than they have now."

It should be noted that THE DENVER POST correctly, and perhaps unwittingly, termed the proposed regional service authority "this new government". And, indeed, it is just that. A new government to be superimposed on the present city and county governments to avoid the appearance of immediate radical change. Thus, actually, taxpayers will be paying for two governments — their present form of government plus the superimposed top-layer of Metrocrats to administer the proposed "regional service authority".

On the subject of consolidation in the interest of efficiency and economy, THE UTAH INDEPENDENT on October 6, 1972, stated:

"The plea is that we will have better government if it is consolidated into a larger unit.

To that plea, THE UTAH INDEPENDENT answers that big government never has protected the rights of the people either politically or economically. A consolidation of government is the creation of bigger government.

"Big government always tends to infringe the rights of its individual citizens and always costs more to run. The added cost of administering it must be borne by the taxpayer in the form of increased taxes. The added power of that government must be paid for by the citizens in a corresponding loss of personal power over their own individual lives."

"SHORT BALLOT" MEANS ABOLISHING MANY ELECTIVE OFFICES

In the interest of "efficiency", the Metrocrats favor what they term "the short ballot".

Article IV, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution states: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government". A "republican" form of government means that the power resides in the people and is exercised by representatives elected by, and responsible to the people. This applies at all levels of government in this country.

But this Constitutional safeguard, providing the citizens a voice in their government, has long been a stumbling block in the path of the Metrocrats' bulldozer of the rights of individuals. Hence, the "1313"-spawned "short ballot" to provide "efficiency" in local government.

Mrs. Theo. F. (Virginia) Meves, State coordinator of the Wisconsin Legislative and Research Committee, Inc., in an article in the MILWAUKEE COUNTY NEWS of December 7, 1972, quoted from a book by Congressman Henry S. Reuss entitled "Revenue Sharing" published by Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. (Congressman Reuss is a member of the Council of Foreign Relations, and therefore could be expected to promote the Metro-regional government aims of the CFR-CED-"1313" conglomerate.)

In his book, Reuss stated:

"Two of those who ought not to be elected any longer are the sheriff and the coroner...

"The number of elected officials of state and local government units could be greatly reduced...

"By the end of the 1970s, elected policy-makers could increasingly be confined to local legislators of enlarged governmental units, and to single appointed or elected chief executives for each unit. The swarm of town trustees, coroners, elected tax commissioners, and flotsam inspectors could be fast disappearing..."

In other words, the policy-making functions of your local and county government would be administered by appointed "1313"-type bureaucrats for whom you were given no chance to vote, and who would not be subject to recall by the voters.

HOME RULE

The most frequently-used label under which the Metrocrats travel when they seek to impose metropolitan government on an area is that it is "home rule". This deliberately deceptive device is employed by the Metrocrats because they are aware that "home rule" is what all Americans want.

The propaganda line promoted by the Metrocrats to local communities is:

"Why can't we, a progressive community of Americans, have home rule -- rule ourselves as we see fit. Why must we be beholden to the state capital for every change we want to make in our home government? Let us have a home-rule charter!"

Sounds good, doesn't it? And, how many communities throughout this nation have been hoodwinked by the Metro plotters as they press on to destroy local self-government?

What this "home rule" really means is that a local segment of a State is cut off from the State Government and the guarantees of the State Constitution. Said local or metropolitan area is then free to deal directly with the federal government and the Nixon-decreed 10 Federal Regional Councils which supersede the powers of the 50 formerly sovereign States.

* * * * *

Those who take lightly the warnings contained in this book will do so at their peril -- and peril to the survival of the United States of America as a republic wherein, as previously pointed out, the sovereign power resides in the people and is exercised by representatives elected by, and responsible to them.

It is the destruction of this nation as a republic that the CFR-CED-"1313" power-mad conglomerate has been planning for so many years. And, as this book proves, this America-destroying plot is now proceeding at an ever-accelerating pace.

But will these arrogant Metrocrats -- planning to soon become America's unelected rulers -- be able to take over the reins of government of the United States?

NOT if the American people have the documented facts regarding this conspiracy, the most serious internal threat to self-government our nation has ever faced!

CHAPTER XV

WHAT YOU CAN DO

The purpose of this final chapter is to offer suggestions as to what you can do if you oppose Metro-regional government.

Make no mistake about it; the setting up of the 10 Federal Regional Councils to eventually demolish

the sovereignty of the 50 States is now a fact.

Here are the addresses of the offices:

Federal Regional Council, Region I
JFK Building, Room 2303
Boston, Mass, 02203

Federal Regional Council, Region II
26 Federal Plaza, Room 3541
New York, New York, 10007

Federal Regional Council, Region III
Room 900, Curtis Building
6th and Walnut Streets
Philadelphia, Penna. 19106

Federal Regional Council, Region IV
Room 404, 500 Seventh Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Ga., 30323

Federal Regional Council, Region V
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Ill., 60606

Federal Regional Council, Region VI
Federal Center, 1100 Commerce Street
Dallas, Tex., 75250

Federal Regional Council, Region VII
Federal Office building, Room 1906
911 Walnut Street
Kansas City, Missouri, 66101

Federal Regional Council, Region VIII
Room 242, Building 40
Denver Federal Center
Denver, Colo., 80225

Federal Regional Council, Region IX
Federal building and U.S. Courthouse
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, Calif., 94102

Federal Regional Council, Region X
Arcade Plaza building
1321 Second Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

In order to find out what the Federal Regional Council bureaucrats plan [have planned and implemented] for you in your federal region, you may wish to write them for brochures, etc.

OPPOSITION RISING

Jo Hindman, in her Metro News column, which appeared in THE UTAH INDEPENDENT of December 7, 1972, reported that several communities, when given a chance to vote on November 7, 1972, on Metro-type local government, voted "NO".

According to Mrs. Hindman, the proposed charter for Jefferson County, Missouri, contained provisions which would have given the governing bodies power to do anything they wish except actions specifically forbidden to them by law.

And then Mrs. Hindman stated:

"Government by administrative non-law and all-powerful county executive were additional Metro features in the charter. It was beaten down, 18,597 to 16,209 votes."

Another proposed charter before the voters, that for Linn County, Oregon, also contained Metro features such as abolishment of certain elective offices. Commenting on this charter, Mrs. Hindman said:

"Woven together, the various Metro filaments in the document provided for a two-headed elective board of county commissioners whose legislative powers would be restricted, but whose administrative (non-law) powers, outdistancing the legislative, would be practically unlimited."

When given the opportunity to express themselves, the voters of Linn County rejected the Metro charter by sixty per cent.

In her Metro News column of February 8, 1973, Jo Hindman reported further evidence of opposition to Metro-regional government.

- In late 1972 Decatur, Ark., withdrew membership from the Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning commission.
- In January 1973, the citizens of Coos County, Ore., congratulated their commissioners for withdrawing from the Coos-Curry council of Governments, according to a local newspaper article.
- The Stevens Point (Wis.) DAILY JOURNAL of December 16, 1972, reported: "Officials of four of five northern Wisconsin counties do not want to be included in a five-county regional planning commission suggested by Governor Patrick J. Lucey's office, they said, Friday."

GROUPS ORGANIZING TO OPPOSE

Spearheading a national movement opposing Metro-regional government is the Committee to Restore the Constitution, Inc., under the leadership of Archibald E. Roberts, Lt. Col., A.U.S., ret. This organization, which publishes a monthly bulletin, as well as other literature, is located at [current address 7-00] P.O. Box 986; Fort Collins, Colorado, 80522; phone 970-484-2575. [CDR NOTE: Col. Robert still publishes a monthly bulletin and has quantities of specific bulletins available for a bulk rate. His web site URL is: <http://www.webaccess.net/~comminc/> Highly recommended]

One of the State organizations associated with the Committee to Restore the Constitution is the Wisconsin Legislative and Research Committee, Inc. Mrs. Virginia Meves, State Coordinator, P.O. Box 45, Brookfield, Wis., 53005; Phone 414-782-4832 [CDR NOTE: The address and phone is current. Virginia also publishes the WISCONSIN REPORT, a weekly paper for only \$20 per year subscription. She has back-issues available which are "loaded" with pertinent info on regionalism, local and state government issues, as well as United Nations issues. Highly recommended]

CDR Note: We have no knowledge of the following and will insert them as appeared in the book.

A weekly newspaper, the MILWAUKEE COUNTY NEWS, 4124 S. Austin St., (200E) Milwaukee, Wis., 53207, usually carries a definitive article by Mrs. Meves and other members of her organization, in each issue on the subject of Metro-regional government as it affects Wisconsin and the United States.

Among other State groups are Save Our Suburbs, Mrs. Clarence W. McIntosh, President, Box 29, Winetka, Ill., 60093, and the Pennsylvania Committee to Save Our Local Governments, P.O. Box 16042, Philadelphia, Penna., 19114. Both groups publish bulletins opposing Metro-regional government.

CDR NOTE: "... AND THE OUTCRY WAS SILENCED.... See our section "Wolves in Sheep Clothing".

It will be recalled that Chapter XIII analyzed some of the recommendations of the December 1972 conference of the National Association of Regional Councils. The final recommendation arrogantly proclaims:

"The National Association of Regional Councils and individual regional councils should seek to educate the Congress and the state legislatures on the problems of interstate areas on a continuing basis."

Well, this book does not presume to "educate" the Congress of the United States and the State legislatures. Rather, its purpose was to organize in convenient reading form the salient features of the drive to regionalize the United States -- and to point out the dangers to self-government such a drive presents. The information in this book, for the most part, has not appeared in the nation's press.

Therefore, many Congressmen and State legislators are unaware of this threat to our system of government.

If you oppose Metro-regional government, then here are a few suggestions as to what you can do.

BUY AND DISTRIBUTE EXTRA COPIES OF THIS BOOK

You may wish to send copies to:

1. Your Congressman and two Senators;
2. All of the members of your State Legislature;
3. The Governor of your State;
4. The mayor of your city, as well as other local elected office-holders in your city and county.

If you do not know the names and home addresses of your State Senator or State Representative, or wish a list of all legislators, write the Governor's office at your State capital, requesting this information.

Perhaps you will wish to send an accompanying letter to your State Representative and State Senator, your mayor and other local officials, pointing out how the Metrocrats plan to either cut down on their authority or, in the case of certain elected local officials, abolish their positions altogether -- in the interest of "efficient regional government". Their jobs would, under the Metro system, then be filled by bureaucrat appointees.

In order to help inform the voters in your community, write letters to the editor of your local newspaper whenever some aspect of Metro-regional government makes news, using the documented facts in this book to back up your views.

Your purchase and distribution of this book to your friends and neighbors, members of civic and property-owners' organizations, can help mobilize citizen opposition in order to thwart or halt the plans of the Metrocrats in your community and your State.

The only reason this plot by the Metrocrats to destroy self-government in this nation has proceeded as far as it now has, is because the vast majority of the American people have not had the facts.

In communities where the citizens have been alerted, and had an opportunity to vote on various Metro-regional government, these Metro proposals have been defeated.

Will you help?

* * * * *

CDR FINAL NOTE, from Jackie:

I first read Phoebe Courtney's book two or three years ago. Believing it to be an important — critical, actually — reference source in an easily understood format I began making attempts to contact Phoebe in Colorado. After leaving several messages on her answering machine with no response, I wrote a letter. In the letter, I introduced myself, gave references from people who knew and worked against Regional Governance along with Phoebe in the 1960s and '70s, and requested information regarding the availability of the book so I could recommend it to our networkers and listeners of the Sweet Liberty broadcast.

In response to the letter, I received several copies of the book (all of them, save one, given away now) along with a letter from her secretary. The letter explained that Phoebe is no longer publishing her newsletter; she is foregoing the copyright so long as her address and contact information is excluded; and a reference was made to the book other than the copies sent. Since copyrights expire in 25 years

I've taken the liberty to transcribe it in its entirety for posting to our website for all of you who are willing to take the time to read and then hopefully take action.

What action? My only thought is that we still have local governments in place and are still electing officials to fill those slots. While Regionalism has progressed to the point where it "appears" there is no return... I hold onto the KNOWING that "... with God (our Heavenly Father/Creator) ALL things are possible". I also know that the perpetrators of Regional Governance want us to believe, as Dr. Day said to the group of doctors in Pittsburgh back in 1968, "Everything is in place and nothing can stop us now". (See the New Order of Barbarians in the [Shadow Government](#) section of our web site.)

I also know, as 'they' do that if we do nothing they shall have their way. Many of you believe that the only 'something' that can be done at this point is armed revolution. I ask you to consider that that action would be playing into the hands of the global elite who have orchestrated every single war ever fought since the founding of America and before. We are expendable "cannon fodder" in their eyes and it is my belief they anxiously await another 'revolution'.

Keep in mind that nothing was ever "taken" from us. The entire plan for Regionalizing America was carried out by the acquiescence of State and Local Governments, and by We, the People, for our lack of involvement in the governmental process. We did NOT hold our local and state elected officials' feet to the fire.

The plan to create a World Government under their control can only be fulfilled by the fulfilling of their plan to Regionalize the World. They have used force in weaker nations to install their national leaders. In America, they have used Vote Fraud at the ballot box to install their puppet presidents; they have bought and paid for the U.S. Congress; they have tucked the governors into their back pockets; in the state legislatures only those who go-along-to-get-along become legislative "leaders"; and, in both local and state governments they have installed many of their trained seals from "1313" — Public Administration Clearing House.

Admittedly, the picture looks bleak. However, thus far the process has been accomplished by political action. The power remaining to the people resides in our local and state governments. Since none of us has a "crystal ball" in which to see the future, let us NOT project the past into the future and by so doing, crucify ourselves in the present. Let us earnestly pray for guidance and instruction; call on our Father/Creator for intervention in this unGodly, ghastly, insane asylum; and get our own agendas out of the way that His Will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven. I believe His work will be done through us... not by us, but through us, if we ever learn to 'let go and let God'.

I am considering the possibility of having the text of the book -- as transcribed -- copied and bound neatly. This will only be done if there is enough interest. At that time I will take orders before copies are made. The cost has not been checked out yet, since this last part was just finalized and I'm anxious to get it up on the site. You will be notified further when we have the information necessary to offer them.

Since I was not able to scan the book, and instead had to type the entire book, there is no time to proof read. Spell check only catches mis-spellings and not the correctly-spelled words such as if, it, is, etc., which are out of place. If you find a blatant error, please notify us so we can make proper correction. Thank you, and may our Father bless and keep us all in His Loving Mind.

Jackie

Previous Page
Back to the TABLE OF CONTENTS
[Council on Domestic Relations Home Page](#)

