

County in Washington Ditches Sustainable Development[\[Print\]](#)

Written by Rebecca Terrell

Tuesday, 25 October 2011 08:55

Tweet

0

Like



Activists in Clallam County, Washington are celebrating their government's decision to pull the plug on membership in the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives ([ICLEI](#)), a worldwide association of more than 1,200 local governments dedicated to promoting the United Nations' sovereignty-eroding sustainable development program known as [Agenda 21](#). The county will save \$1,200 in annual membership dues, but ICLEI critics say they've salvaged much more than that.

ICLEI is a threat to private property ownership and constitutional rights. So says Clallam County GOP Chairman Dick Pilling who submitted to the county commissioners in August a [resolution](#) his party passed unanimously to withdraw ICLEI membership and end Agenda 21 programs. His remarks, detailed at [Citizen Review Online](#), include the warning that ICLEI's idea of sustainable development is to promote UN Agenda 21, a plan drafted at the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. He quoted official documents stating the published agenda of UN habitat programs is to protect the environment by moving people from rural areas into cities and that "land ... cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals, [as this] contributes to social injustice."

"Have you guys really signed onto an organization that would eliminate our property rights?" Pilling asked the commissioners.

He reminded them of the comments Earth Summit Secretary-General Maurice Strong made ushering in Agenda 21: "Current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class — involving high meat intake, the use of fossil fuels, electrical appliances, home and work-place air-conditioning and suburban housing — are not sustainable."

Pilling said Strong wants to eliminate so-called wasteful "consumption patterns" but interrupted himself to ask incredulously, "Are you kidding me? We can't eat meat? We can't have labor-saving appliances?"

But Pilling saved the worst for last, pointing out the most damning aspect of Agenda 21 is its planned [core wilderness reserves](#) that would turn 50 percent of America into areas where no human activity would be allowed and "individual right must give way to the collective."

Cautioning the commissioners that ICLEI calls on its members to be prepared to commit to "radical action," Pilling also reminded them of their duty as elected representatives to work for the best interests of their county.

Last week, the commission voted to defund its annual ICLEI membership fee in the county budget. Clallam County has belonged to the association for three years, and its current membership expires at the end of December. The city of Sequim, located in Clallam County, already allowed its membership to expire last month. The latter is still listed as active on the [ICLEI website](#).

It isn't the only one. [Carroll County, Maryland](#); Amador County, California; [Edmond, Oklahoma](#); Albemarle County, Virginia; Carver, Massachusetts; Pinellas County, Florida; Garland, Texas; Sarasota County, Florida; and James County, Virginia have all withdrawn from ICLEI but are still numbered among the association's 533 U.S. members. (The total has, however, significantly declined from more than 600 a mere two years ago.)

Ending an ICLEI contract is "just the first punch" in the battle against Agenda 21 warns American Policy Center President [Tom Deweese](#). Even former members will likely have well-established ICLEI programs in place made up of non-elected boards, regional government councils, and environmental policies. Deweese's warning has played out in [Oklahoma City](#)

2/5/12

County in Washington Ditches Sustainable Development

where residents' delight over leaving ICLEI is tempered by the city's sustainable development plan calling for an end to suburban development. Deweese says "an active campaign to dismantle" such entrenched measures is necessary to protect citizens from future unconstitutional encroachment.

## **BIODIVERSITY "GAME PLAN"**

**It's all those Colored Maps, Agenda 21, Sustainable Development ++++++++**

- 1) Invent a crisis.**
- 2) Hype the crisis on a small scale to "raise awareness" of the issue.**
- 3) Get experts, real or imaginary, to weigh in on the importance of the issue.**
- 4) Hype the crisis on a large scale to "raise awareness" of the issue.**
- 5) Paint detractors negatively.**
- 6) Repeat steps 3-5 until the public agrees with you.**

What are the UN's Agenda 21 and ICLEI?[\[ Print \]](#)

Written by Thomas R. Eddlem

Wednesday, 06 July 2011 10:35

Tweet 0

Like



What is Agenda 21? The constitutionalist movement has heard vague echoes in recent years about a threat to the free economy from this Agenda 21.

Agenda 21 is not new. *The New American* magazine (and its affiliate, the John Birch Society), was one of the few constitutionalist organizations that was present when it was drawn up, back at the 1992 Earth Summit on climate change in Rio de Janeiro. The summit, organized by the United Nations, brought together the most extreme environmental activists from around the world to deal with the supposed threat from global warming, and Agenda 21 was the document they drew up.

*The New American's* William F. Jasper attended the conference as a reporter, and was able to report on events at the Rio Summit as they happened.

Adobe Flash Player not  
installed or older than  
9.0.115!



What came out of the Rio summit was summed up by the radical environmentalists themselves, and one United Nations-approved introduction to the Agenda 21 document claimed that:

Effective execution of Agenda 21 will require a profound reorientation of all human society, unlike anything the world has ever experienced — a major shift in the priorities of both governments and individuals and an unprecedented redeployment of human and financial resources. This shift will demand that a concern for the environmental consequences of every human action be integrated into individual and collective decision-making at every level.

The document left no one alone, stating that:

There are specific actions which are intended to be undertaken by ... in short, every person on Earth.

What it means for Americans is more than just an end to fossil fuels; it means a lower standard of living.

And the strategy for implementing Agenda 21 was much broader than ever attempted before by the environmentalist movement. They sought global treaties and national legislation, as in the past. They also sought to shame individuals and corporations into changing their behavior on a voluntary basis. That, too, was not new. But they began fighting for "soft-law" changes to consumers' living standards. "Soft law" is the use of centralized governments to bribe with aid either smaller government sub-units (states or localities) or private companies for following ever-more stringent eco-standards with tax breaks or outright cash "aid."

On the state and local level, the push for "soft law" is led by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, or ICLEI, which had been founded a couple of years before the Rio Summit. More than 1,000 state, county, and municipal government organizations around the world are ICLEI members, and are pushing this radical environmentalist agenda with bribes and stiffer regulations. In many American towns, local officials boast about the impact of ICLEI in the form of putting state rebate checks on display for properly following new environmentalist incentives. For example, John Birch Society New England Regional Director Hal Shurtleff was able to point out that:

Here is what's disturbing. Here is a check, made out to the City of Newburyport from the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs. And why is this check on display? This is the second such check that I have found in a city or town that belongs to the ICLEI, the International Council on Local Environmental Initiatives, which is a government-to-government entity, unconstitutional on its face. And their goal is to implement Agenda 21, what they call "soft law" that came out of the Rio conference in 1992, very hostile to property rights, freedoms.

ICLEI has become a big part of the subsidy and regulation regime on the state and local level, but it's not the only part of the eco-subsidy agenda. That also extends to the White House, where President Obama has called for government to start picking winners and losers in the markets for more energy-efficient products. President Obama boasted in his May 6, 2011 weekly address to the nation that he would continue to "invest" in green jobs.

This is part of the reason why huge corporations such as General Electric were able to claim a \$3.25 billion tax credit in 2010, paying no corporate income taxes last year. GE cashed in on federal "tax credits" for green projects, such as its wind turbine projects.

Of course, nobody objects to private companies offering more fuel-efficient automobiles or creating products that don't fill up landfills. The problem with ICLEI and Agenda 21 is that they primarily seek governments to pick winners and losers in the marketplace. Governments usually pick the wrong winners. That was the lesson from the housing bubble of the last decade. The federal government promoted home ownership by subsidies, tax credits, and suppression of interest rates, and crashed the economy. Government doing the same thing on green jobs will do the same thing to the economy on a much larger scale.

Sustainable Development Means a Wrenching Transformation of Your Life[| Print |](#)

Written by Tom DeWeese

Sunday, 11 September 2011 18:00

Tweet &lt; 0

Like



Recently W. Cecil Steward, dean emeritus of the UNL College of Architecture (Lincoln, Nebraska), launched what can only be described as a diatribe against a talk I gave recently in Lincoln. My topic was Sustainable Development and how it is transforming our nation. In his article, Mr. Steward, rather than provide any substance on the issue, prefers instead to use words designed to paint me as an extremist playing on people's fear.

Specifically, Mr. Steward accuses me of misrepresenting Lincoln's local Comprehensive Development Plan, and its imposition of Sustainable Development as a "cover for a United Nations based international conspiracy." I have worked on this issue for more than 18 years and have routinely experienced similar attacks against my message and my character in cities where I have appeared. For some reason those working to enforce Sustainable Development policies scramble to discredit me and blow a well orchestrated smokescreen to cover their work. Apparently honest debate and disagreement are not part of their plans.

But debate and discussion is the traditional American way. I'll present my case point by point. First, there is a very clear connection between the United Nations and local Lincoln comprehensive development plans. The very term "Sustainable Development" first appeared in a 1987 report entitled "Our Common Future," produced by the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development. The term was first offered as official UN Policy in 1992 at the Earth Summit in a document that is today simply referred to as Agenda 21. In their own words here is what proponents of Agenda 21 said it is: "Agenda 21 proposes an array of actions which are intended to be implemented by EVERY person on Earth.... it calls for specific changes in the activities of ALL people.... Effective execution of Agenda 21 will REQUIRE a profound reorientation of ALL humans, unlike anything the world has ever experienced." *Agenda 21: The Earth Summit Strategy to Save Our Planet* (Earthpress, 1992).

At that Earth Summit, President George H.W. Bush signed American acceptance of the Agenda 21 plan. The next year, in compliance with Agenda 21, President Bill Clinton signed Executive Order 12858 establishing the "President's Council on Sustainable Development" in order to "harmonize" U.S. development policy with UN policy as outlined in Agenda 21. The Executive Order directed all agencies of the Federal Government to work with state and local community governments in a joint effort to "reinvent" government using the guidelines outlined in Agenda 21.

What are these guidelines and policies, and do you see them today in Lincoln? Agenda 21 calls for reduction in energy use; reduction in water use; enforcement of alternative energy use, specifically wind and solar; controls over development, specifically the creation of mixed-use neighborhoods that contain high-density housing units (high rise or extremely small lots) along with office space, stores, and open space that will eliminate the use of cars; development of public transportation and high-speed, light rail trains; etc. All of these policies are based on the scare tactic that man is creating global warming, a charge that is now in great disrepute throughout the world. Yet, proponents continue to press these policies. Literally everything related to sustainable policy leads to higher prices, shortages of goods, and calls from planners for sacrifice by citizens.

In Lincoln, literally all of these Agenda 21 guidelines can now be found. Lincoln has "smart growth" policies that enforce high-density housing with a mix of commercial and residential properties, bike-friendly streets, and walking space. The goal is to eliminate the use of cars as much as possible. Residents are instead encouraged to walk and ride bikes to work and shopping. Electric companies are now installing smart meters that take away homeowner control of electric use. Energy audits are being conducted to determine the energy efficiency of homes. If Lincoln follows suit of other cities that are using this practice to set energy-reduction goals, then soon city government will set strict standards for energy use. Homeowners

will have to spend thousands of dollars to comply. Non-compliance will bring fines. To enforce alternative energy schemes, there are plans to force homeowners to cut back on trees in their yards in order to allow open access to solar panels on roofs. And, of course, there is the very important policy to force drivers to "share the road" with bikes — the "complete street," they call it. In short, Lincoln sustainable policies match perfectly those outlined in Agenda 21. Coincidence?

The bottom line is, city planners, and those like Mr. Steward, have set themselves up as an elite force that believes it knows better how the rest of us should live. They have "reinvented" Lincoln government as top-down control to enforce a life style on us, rooted in a one-size fits all international policy called Agenda 21, on the excuse of a questionable environmental risk called global warming. And they certainly don't want to be questioned by anyone as they do it.

Well, here are some very specific questions I would suggest every citizen of Lincoln ask their planners who are busying themselves in your personal lives: Ask them to name a single thing you can do on your private property without their permission. Ask them what guarantees for protection of private property rights they have included in their comprehensive plans. And above all, ask them, especially Mr. Steward, how often they ride their bikes to work.

**Tom DeWeese** is one of the nation's leading advocates of individual liberty, free enterprise, private property rights, personal privacy, back-to-basics education and American sovereignty and independence. Go to [americanpolicy.org](http://americanpolicy.org) for more information"

[< Prev](#)

[Next >](#)

The Freedom "Brain Trust" That Sparked an Agenda 21 Revolt[\[Print\]](#)

Written by Tom DeWeese

Saturday, 10 September 2011 12:30

Tweet 0

Like



A little over one year ago I sponsored the Freedom Action National Conference at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania on August 12-14. It turned out to be an historic gathering, because this was the event that essentially sparked the current national firestorm against the UN's Agenda 21. Here activists from around the nation heard from the foremost Agenda 21 experts about why this United Nations' policy is such a threat to American society. And from this event, those activists returned home, inspired to take on the battle to oust such policy from their local communities.

Those experts bringing the message to the conference included Michael Shaw, founder of Freedom Advocates; Mike Coffman of Sovereignty International; and myself. The three of us have been a team for more than 15 years, detailing every aspect of the Agenda 21 threat. At the Freedom Action National Conference we again teamed up to bring the very latest Agenda 21 information — including how it is being spread in community after community, the wide variety of names it hides behind, who are the perpetrators, what is ICLEI, and how Agenda 21 can be defeated.

In addition to these direct presentations on Agenda 21, the conference featured an incredible line up of leaders in the growing movement for constitutional liberty. One attendee told me I had assembled the "brain trust" of the freedom movement. These experts connected the dots to Agenda 21 from such seemingly unrelated issues including healthcare, illegal immigration, the growing international surveillance system and the threat of fusion centers, the IRS and how to legally stand up to it, and the reasons why the push for a Constitutional Convention is a very bad idea.

The Freedom Action National Conference was also a gathering place for several influential state legislators, including Rep. Charles Key of Oklahoma, Rep. Matt Shea of Washington State, Rep. Daryl Metcalfe of Pennsylvania, and Rep. Sam Rohrer of Pennsylvania. These legislators met together during the conference and began working on legislation to take back to their states, and to recruit more legislators to the cause. The conference allowed them the opportunity to learn, compare notes, and network with activists.

Best-selling author Tom Woods discussed the issue of Nullification and how it can be used to turn back bad policy like Agenda 21. Larry Pratt of Gun Owners of America connected the dots from gun control to Agenda 21. And Marc Morano, the nation's leading expert on the global warming hoax, kept the crowd in constant laughter as he related the panic that global warming scare mongers are experiencing as they see their issue collapsing around the world. Former presidential candidate and Constitution expert Michael Badnarik gave the conference key note address, calling on the attendees to dedicate themselves to the principles of the Constitution. And Sheriff Richard Mack taught the gathering how county sheriffs can and should be the most powerful locally elected officials, fully able to keep intrusive federal officials under control.

From these dynamic presentations, the Freedom Action participants went into workshops to learn how to fight back against these policies. Education expert Beverly Eakman presented a workshop detailing how to disrupt pre-planned consensus meetings — the tactic most often used to enforce Agenda 21 policy on the local level. Dan Byfield of the American Stewards of Liberty delivered a powerful workshop on a valuable new tool for the fight on the local level — called "Coordination." This was the major tool used to stop the Trans-Texas Corridor, and it is now being used in communities across the nation against Agenda 21 and intrusive federal policies. Campaign expert Barry Sheets taught attendees how to run an effective local campaign on very limited funds. And finally, media experts Sam Bushman, Gary Franchi, and George Sheperd united to teach how to use the media and social networks to get the message out and bypass a biased mainstream media. Each workshop was an invaluable lesson in effective activism.

As a result of the Freedom Action National Conference, activists started what has become a revolution in the fight to stop

Agenda 21. Firestorms against Agenda 21 have erupted in communities across the nation — in city council and county commissioner meetings; in state legislatures; and, most recently, in the current presidential race. Major Tea Party leaders have voted Agenda 21 to be one of their top two issues, and many candidates for local and state office are making it a major issue in their campaigns. As a direct result, nine communities have now voted to end Agenda 21 policies and hundreds more are working toward that goal.

This major push against Agenda 21 started last August 2010 with the Freedom Action National Conference on the same hallowed ground where George Washington revitalized his starving and defeated troops to go on to win American freedom. And it looks like history may be repeating itself. The Freedom Action National Conference was an amazing, unique event that created a starting point where Americans can begin the process to diminish the growing tyranny of government.

Even though the conference took place more than a year ago, dedicated, concerned activists who want to learn and join the fight don't have to miss it — even now. Because the entire conference is available in an complete 12 disk DVD set, including all the speeches and all the workshops. You can use these presentations as programs for your activist meetings and for training sessions. The information is in more demand today than when the conference was first held. This 12-disk DVD set is available today on Amazon. More information can be found [here](#).

Buy them today on Amazon:

For Freedom Action Conference DVDs, click [here](#).

For Workshop DVDs, click [here](#).

**Tom DeWeese**

---

[< Prev](#)

[Next >](#)

Sustainable Development Means a Wrenching Transformation of Your Life[| Print |](#)

Written by Tom DeWeese

Sunday, 11 September 2011 18:00

Tweet &lt; 0

Like



Recently W. Cecil Steward, dean emeritus of the UNL College of Architecture (Lincoln, Nebraska), launched what can only be described as a diatribe against a talk I gave recently in Lincoln. My topic was Sustainable Development and how it is transforming our nation. In his article, Mr. Steward, rather than provide any substance on the issue, prefers instead to use words designed to paint me as an extremist playing on people's fear.

Specifically, Mr. Steward accuses me of misrepresenting Lincoln's local Comprehensive Development Plan, and its imposition of Sustainable Development as a "cover for a United Nations based international conspiracy." I have worked on this issue for more than 18 years and have routinely experienced similar attacks against my message and my character in cities where I have appeared. For some reason those working to enforce Sustainable Development policies scramble to discredit me and blow a well orchestrated smokescreen to cover their work. Apparently honest debate and disagreement are not part of their plans.

But debate and discussion is the traditional American way. I'll present my case point by point. First, there is a very clear connection between the United Nations and local Lincoln comprehensive development plans. The very term "Sustainable Development" first appeared in a 1987 report entitled "Our Common Future," produced by the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development. The term was first offered as official UN Policy in 1992 at the Earth Summit in a document that is today simply referred to as Agenda 21. In their own words here is what proponents of Agenda 21 said it is: "Agenda 21 proposes an array of actions which are intended to be implemented by EVERY person on Earth.... it calls for specific changes in the activities of ALL people.... Effective execution of Agenda 21 will REQUIRE a profound reorientation of ALL humans, unlike anything the world has ever experienced." (Earthpress, 1992).

At that Earth Summit, President George H.W. Bush signed American acceptance of the Agenda 21 plan. The next year, in compliance with Agenda 21, President Bill Clinton signed Executive Order 12858 establishing the "President's Council on Sustainable Development" in order to "harmonize" U.S. development policy with UN policy as outlined in Agenda 21. The Executive Order directed all agencies of the Federal Government to work with state and local community governments in a joint effort to "reinvent" government using the guidelines outlined in Agenda 21.

What are these guidelines and policies, and do you see them today in Lincoln? Agenda 21 calls for reduction in energy use; reduction in water use; enforcement of alternative energy use, specifically wind and solar; controls over development, specifically the creation of mixed-use neighborhoods that contain high-density housing units (high rise or extremely small lots) along with office space, stores, and open space that will eliminate the use of cars; development of public transportation and high-speed, light rail trains; etc. All of these policies are based on the scare tactic that man is creating global warming, a charge that is now in great disrepute throughout the world. Yet, proponents continue to press these policies. Literally everything related to sustainable policy leads to higher prices, shortages of goods, and calls from planners for sacrifice by citizens.

In Lincoln, literally all of these Agenda 21 guidelines can now be found. Lincoln has "smart growth" policies that enforce high-density housing with a mix of commercial and residential properties, bike-friendly streets, and walking space. The goal is to eliminate the use of cars as much as possible. Residents are instead encouraged to walk and ride bikes to work and shopping. Electric companies are now installing smart meters that take away homeowner control of electric use. Energy audits are being conducted to determine the energy efficiency of homes. If Lincoln follows suit of other cities that are using this practice to set energy-reduction goals, then soon city government will set strict standards for energy use. Homeowners

will have to spend thousands of dollars to comply. Non-compliance will bring fines. To enforce alternative energy schemes, there are plans to force homeowners to cut back on trees in their yards in order to allow open access to solar panels on roofs. And, of course, there is the very important policy to force drivers to "share the road" with bikes — the "complete street," they call it. In short, Lincoln sustainable policies match perfectly those outlined in Agenda 21. Coincidence?

The bottom line is, city planners, and those like Mr. Steward, have set themselves up as an elite force that believes it knows better how the rest of us should live. They have "reinvented" Lincoln government as top-down control to enforce a life style on us, rooted in a one-size fits all international policy called Agenda 21, on the excuse of a questionable environmental risk called global warming. And they certainly don't want to be questioned by anyone as they do it.

Well, here are some very specific questions I would suggest every citizen of Lincoln ask their planners who are busying themselves in your personal lives: Ask them to name a single thing you can do on your private property without their permission. Ask them what guarantees for protection of private property rights they have included in their comprehensive plans. And above all, ask them, especially Mr. Steward, how often they ride their bikes to work.

**Tom DeWeese**

[< Prev](#)

[Next >](#)

The Reality of a Green World: 3 Wolves and a Sheep Voting on What to Have For Lunch[| Print |](#)

Written by Tom DeWeese

Tuesday, 01 February 2011 12:37

Tweet &lt; 0

Like



After fighting the radical environmental movement for more than 20 years, I have come to one basic conclusion: the people who understand and care for the environment the least are environmentalists. My experience has shown that the leaders of this once-popular and still powerful force simply use the environment as an excuse to impose a radical, socialist agenda. Meanwhile, the faithful rank and file of the movement believe anything if it is attached to the label "green," rarely questioning if the statement is true or not.

For example, it is an accepted fact in environmental circles that man is not part of the ecology, only its destroyer. Say the Greens, man's every action results in damage to the environment and to the plants and animals which are forced to co-exist with him.

Based on that premise, the entire economy of the United States has been transformed to reduce man's earthbound "footprint," as human civilization recedes back to that of cave dwellers freezing in the dark. The result is not only a new dark ages for the community of man, but also for the environment.

The anti-human policy says forests must be left alone, never cared for by man. This leaves dead trees to lie on the floor of the forest to rot. Say the environmentalists, this is the natural way. For centuries man has taken care of the forests, clearing out dead wood, improving their ecologic health. No more. The National Forest Service demands that the dead trees stay on the floor, rotting away — in a "natural" habitat.

The fact is, such policy is actually more destructive to the environment. That's because leaving the dead trees to rot builds up tinder on the floor of the forest. When a forest fire breaks out the fires burn so hot it is nearly impossible to put them out. We've all read about how much hotter the fires seem to be today. This is the reason. Moreover, in some cases the floor of the forest is so full of dead and rotting wood that the kindling reaches as high as ten feet, making it nearly impossible for animals to move through it. But that, say the Greens, is the natural, and therefore the right way.

One more thing: the rotting trees bring disease and termites to the other trees, causing more trees to die. In addition, the termites produce about one fourth of the methane that the Greens so fear as a cause of global warming. So, the correct course is clear — clean out the dead trees and make a termite homeless — for the environment. But the Greens refuse to budge to logic.

Environmentalists loath the concept of private property. Only man, they say, can come up with the concept of buying and selling land that is not his. Only man can conceive of fencing in the wilderness. The rest of the natural world lives in harmony, they say, taking only what they need. The idea of ownership of private property is inconceivable to the natural world, say the environmentalists.

Here's a question I've always wanted to ask an environmentalist. Have you ever stuck your hand in a bee hive? If so, do you have any doubt that the bees have a concept of private property, ready to defend it to the death? Other animals move about the land, marking their territory as a warning to others to stay away. Why? Because it's HIS land. Is there any difference between marking your territory with urine and building fences (other than the obvious sanitary issue)? Bears have territory. Lions have territory. And anyone truly in tune with the environment understands that fact. Only self-appointed environmental experts fail to grasp the massive natural property rights claims that exist throughout the animal world. Apparently, if they can't see a physical fence as man tends to build, then it doesn't exist, according to the myopic view of the Greens.

✓ The worst environmental lies come in the policies of endangered species and reintroduction of dangerous predators. For several hundred years our ancestors worked diligently to remove predators from the land so they could live in peace, without fear for their children and live stock. Over the past 20 years, environmentalists have forced government policy to bring back the wolves and Grizzly bears that the ranchers and farmers fought so hard to get rid of. We need to replace the natural environment that man has destroyed, say the Greens. Nature demands it, they claim. Disaster will befall us if we don't, goes the mantra.

When the people protested, saying the wolves and Grizzlies would destroy their lives and livelihood, the Greens said it wasn't so. Man could live in harmony with these predators, they claimed. In one classic community meeting, when residents expressed their fear of Grizzlies living next door and the possible results that could have on the safety for their children, they were comforted by the local Fish and Wildlife agent who said, just put bells on your children. If there is a "bad" bear out there, the bells will scare them away. Such comforting words caused one wise resident to respond, "seems to me the only way to tell a good bear from a bad bear is if it has bells in its poop." Such is the lunacy of "going Green." It has nothing to do with true conservation of the environment."

*is Founder and President of the American Policy Center and editor of The DeWeese Report. The above article was originally published in April 2010 by the American Policy Center and is reprinted here with permission*

[< Prev](#)

[Next >](#)

source <http://www.newswithviews.com/Levant/nancy119.htm>

# THE FEDERAL LAND LORDING AGENDA

By Nancy Levant  
February 14, 2009  
NewsWithViews.com

*"The cancer that infected our economy was housing."* — Sen. John Ensign, Republican from Nevada, the Senate Policy Committee Chairman

Senator Ensign's statement is a truth worth screaming and clarifying. The cancer that infected our economy was and remains the intention of politicians and their financial and career string pullers to eliminate private property rights. If you choose to call that "housing", so be it. But masking this truth by manipulating the American people with Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, AIG failures, etcetera, etcetera, ain't gonna fly.

In 1992, the United Nations stated in its blueprint for the 21st century (Agenda 21) that there is to be no privately-held property — be it land or the homes that sit upon the land — for anyone. All property, according to Agenda 21, is to be "owned" by government. Agenda 21 also details the plan for "human relocation" stating that all member nations must implement "human relocation" plans. So today, we witness flood, fire, snow and ice, and power-grid relocations — annually — and with Homeland military assistance/insistence. We, as the people of this nation, are indeed "relocating."

And to where are we relocating? That depends upon the decisions your local regional councils have made — the appointees whose names you do not know — regarding which locale will receive development dollars and which areas are to be closed down for nature's sake. It's funny how the nation's rural areas are in annual "natural crisis" while specifically-identified urban areas are highly and solely developed. Small towns and burbs are dying and jobs, mostly \$7 to \$10 per hour jobs, are increasing in regionally-identified and funded urban areas.

And then, we have "stimulus" dollars in the billions going to national parks, and state and federal wilderness areas while no dollars go to small towns, rural, and dying America. So to our politicians I ask: How, exactly, does one live in a designated "human settlement", as so stated in Agenda 21, on an \$8 to \$10 per hour job? How does one support a home or rent, utility bills, cable/internet bills, automobiles, transportation to and from work, insurance, and food with low-wage part time jobs?

The urban areas, as we know, are completely overtaken by corporate chain businesses which pay minimum wages to their part time employees. Equally, we know that good jobs always go to community movers, shakers, their friends, families, and social development associates. We also hear that higher education is being cut off from the minimum wage masses as universities are turning away college applicants and cutting off financial aid opportunities.

So as we get poorer, less and less educated, and transplanted to new areas, new lifestyles, and with no "social" contacts to ensure full time employment, the question is very simple. What percentage of the American population is required to fulfill the "equity" clauses of Agenda 21? How many people in America are designated to live like poverty-stricken third-worlders to achieve global equity and a "local" third-world labor force for political corporations?

And one more question: Since the "government" now owns the nations largest mortgage holders (Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, AIG, etc.), do they own your homes and property as well? You know, the homes and property you can no longer pay for? I suggest you watch for the federal rental solution. Soon, America, you will be paying rent to the feds to live in "their" housing. One plus one equals two. Even the uneducated masses can figure that one out.

## " LEARN MORE ABOUT PROPERTY RIGHTS "

### EXCELLENT REFERENCE INFORMATION ( RETAIN for future reference)

TV stations have been doing recent stories on The Nature Conservancy telling listeners that you and others may not know what they're really up to and what their real true agenda is !

As Paul Harvey says ~ **" Now for the rest of the story "**

Conservancies and similar environmental organizations like Councils on Governments (NEMCOG etc.), Land Trusts, Farm Trusts, Watershed Councils, Sierra Club, Audubon Society, Ducks Unlimited, Wildlife etc. are nothing but NGO ( non governmental organizations) private activists stirring the pot under the guise of environmentalism without any legal authority.

If you've never heard of the **United Nations " WILDLAND'S PROGRAM "** - Please check it out ! The U N Charter whose ultimate true agenda is says **NO private property rights for anyone**. This **includes all land and water everywhere on earth**.

**"The Nature Conserverancy" ( TNC ), Sierra Club , Audubon Society & Wildlife are members of the U N ( IUCN~ International Union and Conservation of Nature) and are one of the main ones promoting the UN Agenda thru the Wildland's Program, ESA (Endangered Species act), Wetlands, Heritage Rivers, Scenic Highways, Viewsheds, Rails to Trails, Road Closings, Urban Sprawl, Heritage/Historic designations, Growth Management, Comprehensive Planning, American Planning Ass'n, Biodiversity, Habitat, Agenda 21 & Sustainable Development programs all eliminating private property land & water rights using land/resource restrictions to implement global control over all populations & private property.. They do it a slice at a time so people don't notice the depth & scope of the operation.** TNC is deceptively accomplishing this by getting unaware and unsuspecting property owners to sign **'Conservation Easements'** etc. like **' Grassland Reserve programs' , 'Land Trusts' & 'Farm Trusts'** etc. that forever inhibit owners and heirs property rights leading them to believe it's the right thing to do for the environment when the true intent is to forever take away, eliminate & control private land & water property rights .

People **usually don't read the fine print that discloses dire consequences** that renders property rights and values useless. They try to get property owners to fall for diversionary tax incentives which lowers the County's tax base resulting in remaining tax payers picking up the lost tax revenue tab ( What a kind thing to do to your fellow neighbors).

**Biospheres** are also known as **Sanctuaries , Nature Preserves , Preserves & Wildlife Refuges. whose ultimate intent is " Little or NO HUMAN ACTIVITY".** ( These are or will be interconnected by **Corridors & Buffer Zones** to form new Biospheres etc., on & on etc. till the red and yellow areas are all complete.)

How many people know and realize that the **University of Michigan on Douglas Lake in MunroTwp, Cheboygan & Emmet Counties** is a **United Nations BIOSPHERE** and has been **under control of the United Nations** since the late 1970's. Also **Isle Royale National Park** in the upper peninsula is a **U.N. Biosphere under United Nations control.**

**A picture is worth a thousand words ~ Check Out your State's MAP ( Mi & Wi ) on the 'website below ' or 'double click on the attachments' and enlarge if desired - Note that the RED & YELLOW areas are ultimately not intended for any HUMAN activity.**

**Check out other maps to see their ultimate plan and agenda thru-out the United States.**

**Check out the entire website, you will learn a lot about what's going on to take away and destroy your property rights !**

**<http://propertyrights.org>**

**Additional hard Copies of the Guide for Public Officials " Understanding Sustainable Development" can be obtained by calling 1 ( 731) 986-0099**

**Highly recommend purchasing** the 3 set DVD at the back of the guide to hear and learn more information on this from gifted individuals for your personal review, to show at local government meetings, forums and public events. **Call :**

# Review of " CONSERVATION EASEMENTS "

Something to remember when "The Nature Conservancy " knocks at your door !

[http://www.klamathbucketbrigade.org/Byfield\\_ReviewofaConservationEasement031506.htm](http://www.klamathbucketbrigade.org/Byfield_ReviewofaConservationEasement031506.htm)

## Review of a "Conservation Easement"

By Dan Byfield

March 15, 2006

Make no mistake, conservation easements (CE) and Purchase of Development Rights (PDRs), as defined in the IRS Code, are perpetual and virtually "non-negotiable."

In order to realize the full tax benefit described, CEs and PDRs must be put in place for one of four specific conservation purposes, including public outdoor recreation and education, protection of habitats or ecosystems, preservation of "historically important land areas," or preservation of open space that will clearly yield a "public" benefit.

The owner must convey specific rights to a non-governmental organization (NGO) or a government entity, and it must be in perpetuity. The ultimate purpose of a CE and a PDR is to control the use of the land, and, some say, the eventual transfer of ownership of the land, in part or whole, to a third party. Both PDRs and CEs will be referred to in this paper as a CE.

A conservation easement is conveyed by the owner of the land, known as the "Grantor" to a non-governmental organization or a government entity (federal, state, local), who becomes the "Grantee." The landowner, or Grantor, becomes the subservient (lesser) owner, while the Grantee becomes the controlling owner. Therefore, the Grantee becomes the managing partner of your operation, and your land. Jim Burling, with Pacific Legal Foundation, calls it "serfship."

A management plan is created, and applied to your land, in perpetuity, placing the Grantee in full control. While the Grantor cannot alter or modify the management plan, the Grantee can, using the catch-all phrase, "any methods not consistent with the terms of the easement."

The following restrictions, rights, obligations, and requirements come directly from a "model" conservation easement form supplied by The Nature Conservancy:

1. A "**baseline**" report is created to describe the original condition of the property, to assure any future changes in the use of the property are consistent with the terms of the CE.
2. The CE is granted **in perpetuity**. You, nor your heirs or assigns, can alter the agreement. The grant in perpetuity is what creates the tax benefit. It is the only real estate transaction that does not violate the Rule Against Perpetuities (RAP). RAP is an interest in real property that, when transferred, must vest (be conveyed) within a specified time – twenty-one years being a common length of time in which an interest in land must vest. If it does not vest in the required length of time, the transaction is void, and a court can strike it down. RAP does not apply to CEs, because they have been specifically exempted in the law, through efforts of groups like The Nature Conservancy.

3. CEs create **negative easements**, by restricting the original landowner from performing specific acts. Normal easements for roads, power lines, etc. are positive easements, and don't restrict the use or stop the landowner from using his land, constructing buildings, subdividing, putting up fences, etc.
4. **Purpose Clause** – to ensure the land will remain, forever in its natural and scenic condition. The purpose clause is the most important paragraph in the entire agreement. Here, the Grantor promises never to perform any act "inconsistent with the purposes of the conservation easement." In other words, the Grantee has the sole discretion regarding what is required of the landowner, and the landowner is bound to abide by any changes made to the purpose or the management obligations under CE.
5. **Property Uses** – Virtually none. "Any activity on or use of the property inconsistent with the purposes of this CE is prohibited."
  1. Property may not be subdivided.
  2. No construction of structures or improvements is allowed, except those negotiated and agreed upon when the CE is signed.
  3. Normal repair and maintenance is allowed, but is closely monitored.
  4. Limited mineral extraction allowed. No surface mining allowed. Must have limited, and localized, impact on land, and must not interfere with purposes of easement. All extraction facilities must be concealed.
  5. Grazing is allowed, but only on "existing fields" at the time the agreement is signed. Set-aside acreage might be considered an "existing field." You can not establish or maintain a commercial feedlot on the property.
  6. No timber harvest, except to provide firewood for residences on the property, and for maintaining structures like residences, barns, corrals, fences, etc. No other timber harvesting for commercial purposes allowed.
  7. Buffer areas along rivers and creeks will be required, and no grazing will be allowed within a specified distance from the water. This provision will be updated periodically to ensure that soil stability, water quality, and "other conservation values" are protected.
  8. Home business allowed as long as the business is located within the home.
  9. Hunting is allowed, but no form of motorized transportation can be used.
  10. No "ditching, draining, diking, filling, excavating, dredging, removal of topsoil, sand, gravel, rock, minerals, or other materials, mining, drilling, or removal of minerals, nor any building of roads or change in the topography of the property, or disturbance in the soil in any manner" will be allowed. Those activities will not be allowed in river or creek beds, either.
  11. Grantor can cut and remove diseased or exotic trees, shrubs, or plants, but only with prior approval, and only if they are activities permitted under the easement. Firebreaks can be cut without prior approval, but only in emergencies. No planting of any non-native trees, shrubs, or plants will be allowed.
  12. No use of fertilizers, plowing, introduction of non-native animals, or disturbance or change in the natural habitat, in any manner, will be allowed, except to accommodate expressly-permitted activities of the easement.
  13. Surface water: Other than wells to serve the activities of the easement, there can be no alteration, depletion, or extraction of surface water, natural water courses, lakes, ponds, marshes, subsurface water, or any other water bodies on the property.
  14. No dams, impoundment structures, or low water crossings are allowed.
  15. No pesticides or biocides, including, but not limited to, insecticides, fungicides,

- rodenticides, and herbicides can be used, except as approved.
16. No dumping of trash, garbage, or other offensive material, hazardous substance, or toxic waste, nor any placement of underground storage tanks, no land fill or dredging spoils, and no activity that causes erosion is allowed.
  17. Predator control allowed, but no broadcast method, such as poisoning, is allowed, and only on an "as-needed" basis.
  18. No commercial or industrial use of or activity on the property, other than those related to agriculture, recreational, home businesses, or mineral extraction is allowed.

### **Rights, Obligations Retained by the Landowner**

1. Right to continue any existing activity or use at the time the easement is signed.
2. Right to transfer, sell, give, mortgage, lease, or otherwise convey the remaining interest in the land. However, those rights will remain subject to the terms of the conservation easement.  
Remember, the CE is forever.
3. Right to pay taxes on remainder of property.
4. Sole right to upkeep and maintain property.

### **Rights Retained by an NGO**

1. **Right to Enforce:** The right to protect and preserve the conservation values of the property, and enforce the terms of the CE. Any other person, or NGO, can bring a third party action/lawsuit, to enforce the terms of the agreement, if they determine the original grantee is not adhering to the original agreement.
2. **Right of Entry:** Right of staff, contractors, and associated natural resource management professionals to enter, at least four times a year, for the purpose of inspecting the property to make sure landowner is complying with the covenants and purposes of the CE.
3. **Monitor and research** plant and wildlife populations.
4. **Right to manage,** control, or destroy exotic non-native species, or invasive species of plants and animals that threaten the CE.
5. **Legal Action to enforce the CE.** Grantee shall give written notice of a violation, and within 60 days, Grantor must begin good faith efforts to correct any violation. Grantee or third party has the right to go to court to obtain an injunction to force the Grantor to abide by the conditions of the CE. The Court can order the Grantor to restore the property to its original condition.
6. **Right to Transfer.** The Grantee shall have the right to transfer, or assign, the CE to any private NGO or a land use government entity, which means another NGO or government entity, like the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, would be the managing partner on your land.

### **Termination of the Easement occurs when:**

1. Conditions on or surrounding the property have changed so much that it is impossible to fulfill the purposes of the CE, a court may, at the joint request of the grantor and grantee, terminate the CE.
2. Condemnation of part, or all, of the property by a public authority terminates the CE.  
Interestingly, this action would then allow the government, or its assigns, to develop the land previously restricted from development under the CE, because once terminated, the restrictions of the CE are lifted, and whoever has title to the land can develop, subdivide, or perform any action they desire. The original landowner has been paid a third of the value of the land, and has given up the opportunity to develop it in the future, which now resides with the government or their assigns.

Grantee has immediate vested real property rights. A split estate is automatically created where the Grantor becomes the subservient owner of his own property, while the Grantee becomes the dominant owner with management powers. If the property is sold, or taken for public use (condemned), the Grantee shall be entitled to a percentage of the gross sale proceeds or condemnation award, equal to the ratio of the appraised value of the easement to the unrestricted fair market value of the property, as determined on the date the CE is executed.

**It is imperative that landowners fully research, and understand, the long term consequences of signing a Conservation Easement, of any kind.**

Note, seek competent legal and accounting advice *before* signing any agreement.