

Under the Tower of Babel
Conspiracies and International Parks

by Dean Isaacson

Cominus Books, Inc.

Under the Tower of Babel

Copyright © 1995 by Dean Isaacson
All rights reserved

Cover art: Eve Hackenberg
Cover art copyright © 1995 Cominus Books, Inc.

ISBN 1-887008-00-4

Printed in the United States

No part of this book may be reproduced in any manner without written permission from the publisher, except in the case of quotations with credits embodied within critical articles and reviews.

~~Cominus Books, Inc.~~
~~Monroe, WA 98272~~
Dean Isaacson
PO Box 178
Hayden, ID 83835

Dedication

to my wife

I have read this same dedication within so many books and my first thought has always been to wonder. Why did the author dedicate the book to his wife? These books were not romance novels or even lively stories. They were legal books and technical journals. I could not understand how the subject of such books could inspire a dedication of such affection.

Now that I have written this book I understand that after finishing the work the author is grateful to still have a wife. So like these other authors, I dedicate this book to my wife. She inspired me and encouraged me while enduring my spiritual and emotional absence. She faithfully executed her duties as a wife, maintaining household and offspring while I was off in another world, getting up early and staying up late, trying to meet a deadline.

Thank you Robin. You have my undying love.

My friend, Clay Anderson, first apprised me of the park when I ran into him in Ellensburg, quite by providence. He had just been to an outfitters' convention where the international park subject had raised quite a stir. Because I was writing for our local newspaper at the time, he was anxious to give me documents. I pursued the information, partially with the hope that it would lead to dead ends, but somehow knowing this incredible movement was probably alive and bigger than imagined.

I am grateful for the people who aided my work by providing important documents. Several friends helped to edit and critique this book. I thank everyone who helped. I thank God for His guidance and strength and for sending me all these friends.

I hope that you enjoy this book.

Your country is desolate, your cities burned with fire; your fields are being stripped by foreigners right before you, laid waste as when overthrown by strangers. Isaiah 1:7 (NIV).¹

¹NIV is the *New International Version* of the Holy Bible. Copyright © 1978 by the New York International Bible Society.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	6
THE INTERNATIONAL PARK IS COMING.....	12
Nationalizing Parks in America.....	12
North Cascades National Park.....	14
International Cooperation.....	15
North Cascades International Park.....	17
“Nature Has No Borders,” the Conference.....	18
Future Parks.....	22
FAST PLAYERS IN THE GAME OF POLITICS.....	24
Newspeak Politics.....	25
The White House Connection.....	30
Bruce Babbitt, Water and Dams.....	34
Gorbachev and the International Green Cross.....	39
WHAT IS SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT?.....	41
Who are the Villains?.....	43
Favoring Tourism over Production.....	44
Keynesian Economy.....	48
Socialism and Selfesteem.....	51
“NATURE HAS NO BORDERS”.....	57
Nationalizing Private Property.....	59
Peace at the NonBorder.....	60
Animal Rights and Roads.....	62
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION.....	67
The Selling of Paganism.....	67
Religious FreedomÇ for Pagans Only.....	69
Resolving Indian Conflicts With UN Troops.....	71
PEOPLE ARE NATURAL RESOURCES.....	80
Outcome Based Environmentalism.....	80
Centralization and Micromanagement.....	83
Managing the Population Crisis.....	88
THIS IS FOR OUR CHILDREN.....	94
Outcome Based Educators.....	95
Backyard Environmentalists.....	98
Spending Our Children’s Inheritance.....	99
SCIENTISTS WILL BE SOCIOLOGISTS.....	102
A Young Science.....	103
Stretching the Truth.....	104
Evolution or Conservation?.....	105
AN UNHOLY UNION.....	107
Christian Environmentalism.....	108

Biblical Answers to Environmental Problems.....	112
EXTORTING OUR CONSTITUTION.....	117
Placing Law Above the Constitution.....	118
Judicial Precedent Over Constitution.....	126
SOLUTIONS WITHIN THE STATES' RIGHTS MOVEMENT.....	128
Conference of the StatesÇ A Dangerous Plan.....	129
Judicial Resistance to States' Rights.....	131
Legislative Opportunities For States' Rights.....	136
CONSPIRACIES.....	141
Nations and the Laws of God.....	141
The Role of Conspiracies.....	145

Introduction

We learn only one thing from history: that history repeats itself. It would be helpful if we learned from our mistakes or from those before us. Nonetheless, it seems that the primary benefit of experience is that it enables us to recognize our error when we are in the middle of repeating it again.

The Tower of Babel is a very important part of man's history. For it was at the Tower that man made his first attempt to set up a oneworld government. This 'New World Order' defied the command of Creator God to subdue the earth and to fill it. Instead mankind determined to centralize civil government, to settle into one place and make a name for himself. The Biblical account explains that the tower was built of brick instead of stone.² I sometimes wonder if their intent was to build the edifice using manmade materials in opposition to natural or 'Godgiven' materials.

An early encyclopedia noted that the tower was erected under the supervision of a semidivine being called Etanna.³ This is interesting because a short while ago I watched a documentary on the Tower of Babel. They claimed that the bricks for the tower were heated just right to take on the characteristics of quartz crystals. The purpose was to give them the ability to communicate with extraterrestrial beings. If this is true, the tower was essentially a giant crystal radio kit.

Many cultures have had similar beliefs and towers. The

²Genesis 11:3.

³*The Encyclopedia Britannica, New American Supplement*, (1902 ed.) vol. III, p. 179.

great pyramid of Cholula was consecrated for the worship of the Aztec god, Quetzalcoatl. Legend has it that the people originally built this structure to storm heaven. They did not finish it before the gods destroyed it with fire and confounded their language. According to the tale, this happened shortly after the great flood, contemporary to the Tower of Babel. The Incas of South America, the Mayans of Central America and the Egyptians all had similar structures and religious beliefs.⁴ It is interesting that a symbol of these towers, drawn as a truncated or perhaps unfinished pyramid capped with an allseeing eye, is illustrated on the reverse of our one dollar Federal Reserve note.

God confused the language of the people at Babel. At the moment of mankind's greatest glory, man had fallen again.⁵

History is the account of the rise and fall of man. When we reject God's law we substitute our own. Man's law is oppressive. We tend to regulate everything and create a law for every peeve. One of the Biblical warnings, when the early nation of Israel wanted a king, was that the king would subject the people to servitude and take the best of their lands.⁶

Kings do this. They conquer and take the land. Early accounts of national parks and forests date back to the years of King Solomon of Israel. At that time Hiram, king of Tyre, kept the cedars of Lebanon for royal industry and export. It is recorded that King Artaxerxes of Babylon maintained forests for marketing timber. Alexander the Great kept forests for hunting and timber harvesting. It was not, however, until about a thousand years after Christ that kings and rulers began to understand the usefulness of parks and forests as a tool for managing people and populations. This movement began slowly, but it has built up so much momentum that now it threatens to replace the very foundation of our land.

William, duke of Normandy was hunting in his park at Rouen when the word reached him that Edward the Confessor had died and Harold had assumed the throne of England. A few years earlier, he had allowed Harold to return home only after he promised that he would secure the throne for William. A mighty

⁴Experts claim that the major cities of the Maya were abandoned for no explainable reason and left to rot in the jungles. It may be pure speculation, but I wonder if they had their own problems with environmental regulations and international parks.

⁵Man's failure was three-fold: a) rejecting God's command to fill the earth; b) rejecting God by worshipping supernatural phenomenon rather than the supernatural God; c) rejecting God by glorifying man.

⁶1Samuel 8:10-17.

battle ensued and King Harold II met defeat at the hands of William the Conqueror, just outside Hastings.⁷

Five hundred years of Saxon rule in Britannia ended suddenly. The new king set up brutal taxes and regulations to strip the Saxon land of its wealth. He established Norman bureaucracies and replaced the Saxon priests and judges, fettering all avenues of referendum and appeal.

Toward the end of his reign William instituted the Domesday Book. This was a survey of all the landed property in England, thoroughly described by county, by village and by owner. The book also listed leaseholds, machinery and farm stock. The purpose of the book was to establish the rights of the Crown and inventory the taxable resources of the country.⁸ The effect was to divide the people into classes, the rich from the poor, the bureaucrats (king, barons, knights, viscounts, scribes, friars, monks. . .) from the villein, the servile, the common working man.⁹

Once he had the lands databased, he went on to dislodge the people. Through battles, regulations and confiscation, he drove the landed nobility out of the country. He laid to waste an area known as Hampshire. For thirty miles around, he expelled inhabitants, villages and churches, confiscating the land to establish 'New Forests'¹⁰ for hunting and recreation. He forced the people out of the rural areas and on to the lands of his friends, the lords and the barons. Thus, he altered the economy of the land from one of law and property to a feudal state, which is in modern terms, a fascist¹¹ state.

It was this tyranny that inspired the legend of Robin Hood. Two hundred years after the Battle of Hastings, Royal Forests were

714 October 1066.

8ed. cit., Theodore Plucknett, *A Concise History of the Common Law*, 5th ed., Little, Brown and Co (1929, 1956) pp. 1213.

9The saying goes, "To the victor go the spoils." Most nations are governed by this axiom. That is why there are usually such widely divided classes of rich and poor. Those in political power have the spoils. The United States, however, is not yet accustomed to this philosophy. We have been a constitutional republic which has until recently recognized the laws of God and our Godgiven rights. We are leaving that law and our freedoms are eroding. Now we, like other nations, are beginning to experience this division of the classes. As history repeats itself, we will witness our property being divided amongst the political victors.

10On the 2nd of August 1100, his son, William II died from injuries received while in these forests.

11FASCISM: . . .an authoritarian and antidemocratic political philosophy placing the corporate society, as embodied in the party and the state, above the individual, and stressing absolute obedience to a glorified leader. . . *The New American Desk Encyclopedia*, 3rd ed., Signet Books, pp. 44041, (1984, 1993).

carpeting the countryside. These forests along with all game, wood, water and minerals contained therein were offlimits to all villeins,¹² or common folk.¹³ The peril was great, for those caught in the woods would be subject to harsh penalties, including torture and death. Ironically though, the density of the forests made them the most suitable hiding places for those in rebellion. Thus came the stories of those who hid out in the forests, robbing only those who would siphon from the working poor.

The oppression of the Crown continued to be evermore severe until the noblemen compelled John Lackland¹⁴ to sign the Magna Carta or suffer severance at the neck. Many Godgiven rights were returned to the people at Runnymede, (Runnymede) that 15th day of June 1215. The Magna Carta became a major milestone in the formation of the Common Law. It held the kings and rulers accountable to God and the people.¹⁵ This idea led to a recognition of Scriptural law and mankind's Godgiven rights. These are the principles upon which our nation was founded.

Incidentally, three of the articles of this document relate to

12Villein: "In feudal law, a person attached to a manor, who was substantially in the condition of a slave, who performed the base and servile work upon the manor for the lord, and was, in most respects, a subject of property belonging to him." *Black's Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., West Publishing (1990).

13We are still common folk. We are villeins living under a modern feudal system. Granted, it has the appearance of a 'free market' because it is competitive. You may dispute this because you have a \$30,000 or maybe a \$400,000 salary. Well, try this experiment. Go to your employer and tell them what hours you really want to work. Better yet, tell the government that you want the title to your car. Tell them that you will not get a license nor a passport to travel. Of course this is absurd because we are under contract. That is my point. Free people do not have their lives under contract to the lords and the barons. Where did our freedom go? Well, we traded it for security. We looked to the government to coddle us from cradle to grave. In turn, they took away our independence and gave us a number. They promised us a future but extracted a fee. They took away our money and gave us paper. We are slaves to the 40 hour work week and even our wives are required to tend to the barons' manufacturing plants and stores. We can no longer retire on our modest savings because the government extracts an overhead by taxing our incomes and property. Now we cannot survive economically without their help. So we are not free. We are villeins.

14King John was known as 'Lackland' because he was left without an inheritance and owned nothing until his brother, King Richard I, conferred a large portion of land upon him. op. cit., *The Encyclopedia Americana* (1904-1906 ed.), vol. VII.

15"Know ye, that we, in the presence of God, and for the salvation of our [the king, his judges, police and bureaucrats] soul, and the souls of all our ancestors and heirs, and unto the honour of God and the advancement of Holy Church, and amendment of our Realm. . . . 61. And whereas, for the honour of God and the amendment of our kingdom, and for the better quieting the discord that has arisen between us and our barons, we have granted all these things aforesaid; willing to render them firm and lasting, we do give and grant our subjects the underwritten security. . . ."

oppressive environmental laws.¹⁶ I have taken the liberty to upgrade the language into modern terminology.

1. The king must return all forests and wetlands to the people.¹⁷
2. The king must abolish the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Ecology, etc.¹⁸
3. The king and his bureaucrats must restore all private lands that were confiscated.¹⁹

After signing the Magna Carta, however, King John backed out of his agreement. He obtained a bull from Pope Innocent III annulling the document and he went back to war. He died the following year in Nottinghamshire, the area known as the ‘Sherwood Forests.’ Following in his tradition, King John’s successors seized rights from the people by ignoring the Charter, or by limiting the claims recognized therein. The document, however, struck a spark that would continue to grow until it would give birth to a new land of freedom.

As time went by, freedomloving people fled from the oppression of the European autocrats to a new land called America. It was their commitment to Godgiven rights and their defiance of tyranny that produced our Declaration of Independence. Then, after a bloody revolution, our forefathers founded the United States upon a constitution chartered after the Magna Carta, and Common Law.

History is about to repeat itself again. A modern feudalism is being pursued for the centralized control of property, resource

¹⁶We don’t have time to go into other subjects, but it is worth noting that the Magna Carta also abolished the practice of hearsay evidence (§ 38), and removed international police, or UN troops, from their soil (§ 51).

¹⁷Magna Carta § 47: “All forests that have been made forests in our time shall forthwith be disforested; and the same shall be done with the waterbanks that have been fenced in by us in our time.”

¹⁸Magna Carta § 48: “All evil customs concerning forests, warrens [habitats and ecosystems], foresters, and warreners, sheriffs and their officers, waterbanks and their keepers, shall forthwith be inquired into in each county, by twelve sworn knights of the same county, chosen by creditable persons of the same county; and within forty days after the said inquest be utterly abolished, so as never to be restored: so as we are first acquainted therewith, or our justiciary, if we should not be in England.”

¹⁹Magna Carta § 52: “If any one has been dispossessed or deprived by us, without the lawful judgment of his peers, of his lands, castles, liberties, or right, we will forthwith restore them to him; and if any dispute arise upon this head, let the matter be decided by the fiveandtwenty barons hereafter mentioned, for the preservation of the peace. . .”

and enterprise. It has come upon us so subtly. We began with national parks and forests and have evolved toward national land use controls and regional governments. We, however, never noticed it until it hit us squarely with wetland ordinances, growth mitigations, and environmental regulations. Through various tactics and regulations, we are being ushered out of the country and into the cities. Now the international autocrats are trying to maneuver our nation to surrender more control of land use to their evil agenda. Will we recognize it early enough to overcome them? Will we allow the Royal Forests, to survive in this land of individual liberty?

The purpose of this book is to help you understand the international park movement, what freedoms are at stake and what we must do to get out from *under the Tower of Babel*.

May God save our nation.

Dean Isaacson
31 January 95

The International Park is Coming

What would you do if the Environmental Protection Agency or the Bureau of Land Management served papers on you to cease and desist from normal daily activities at your residence? What if they told you to leave your home? Lest you think that you merely have to wave the Constitution in their face, remember how well it protected Randy Weaver and David Koresh.

Our society has already witnessed severe restrictions and confiscation of private property through wetland policies, public trust, customary right, reserved water rights, etc. Many industries have deteriorated or shut down altogether due to overweening environmental policies. Ask any logger or miner how they feel about the prospects of leaving a lifelong investment in time and equipment to face an uncertain future of extended unemployment benefits and job retraining. How well do you think they welcome the prospect of becoming tour guides for an ecological park?

These restrictions and takings did not come upon us at once. We did not wake up one day and suddenly find the American flag lying on the ground and our rights tossed in the trash. This has been a slow but steady process that has been built one step, one regulation and one court decision at a time.

The international park is not going to be a pleasant place to visit nor will we witness the baby grizzlies frolicking in the meadows. The park is a dangerous usurpation of our Constitution. For it will trample our national sovereignty, rob us of our private property and eliminate free enterprise.

Nationalizing Parks in America

The first national park established in the United States was the Yellowstone National Park. Congress made the park official by statute in 1872.

Steven Mather, a conservationist who was influential in the establishment of the National Park Service, served as the first Director of that bureaucracy from 1917 to 1929. Congress created this agency on 25 August 1916. From a small mustard seed a great tree grows. Today, that agency oversees the operation of over 340 parks, monuments, historical sites, memorials, recreation areas, preserves, military areas and cemeteries.

Because the powers of the Congress are clearly enumerated, it is a stretch of the Constitution²⁰ for the Congress to set aside State lands. Article 1, section 8.17 clearly outlines the limited authority of Congress to set aside any lands for federal use, and prescribes the necessity of the respective States to willingly cede that land.²¹ The establishment of national parks within and transcending State borders is a clear violation of the ninth²² and tenth²³ amendments. These two amendments reserve all rights, that are not specifically granted to the federal government, for the States and the people.

Congress took lands for national parks by de facto²⁴ authority, irrespective of constitutional limitations. In 1906, they decided to share their expropriated powers with the executive branch. They authorized the President to set aside lands and objects of historical or scientific significance by mere proclamation when they passed the Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities.²⁵ Now two branches of our civil government have the legal ability to set aside lands, public and private, while never possessing the constitutional authority to do so.

The judicial branch of our government was designed to be the tangential check and balance of the executive and legislative branches. It is, however, running in tandem with the other two. It tends to affirm their schemes, rather than restrain them within the scope of their granted powers.

The law professor, Laurence Tribe, in his book, *American Constitutional Law*,²⁶ points out that the Supreme Court has systematically rejected a narrow interpretation of article 1, section 8. He cites two early cases that ascribe to Congress “the power of eminent domain as an inherent ‘attribute of sovereignty’²⁷ or as ‘the

²⁰*The Constitution of the United States*, refer to art. 1, sec. 8 for the powers enumerated toward Congress.

²¹Later, in this book, we will discuss specific strategies that Congress has employed to get around these constitutional limitations. We will also look at judicial decisions that have helped to form de facto government.

²²*The Constitution of the United States*, amendment IX: “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

²³*The Constitution of the United States*, amendment X: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

²⁴De facto means that something exists, in fact, irrespective of legality or legitimacy. On the other hand, de jure means that something exists in full accord of the law.

²⁵*The New Book of Knowledge* (1991 ed.), Grolier Inc., vol. 13, p. 43.

²⁶Laurence Tribe, *American Constitutional Law*, 2nd ed., The Foundation Press, (1988), p. 328.

²⁷*Mississippi & Rum River Boom Co v Patterson*, 98 US 403, 406 (1879).

offspring of political necessity.’”²⁸ It is important for us to understand that both of these decisions were rendered *after* the adoption of the fourteenth amendment. This amendment laid the foundation for national government jurisdiction over the person and property of the individual.

North Cascades National Park

In 1957, members of the Mountaineers got together and formed the North Cascades Conservation Council (NCCC). Their focus was on the establishment of the North Cascades National Park and the surrounding Wilderness and Recreation Areas. According to Pat Goldworthy, cofounder of NCCC, who is also working toward the endowment of the North Cascades International Park:

[We] felt for a long time that we didn’t need to stop our thinking at the border. We were thinking internationally even when the [national] park was first formed. We had input from our Canadian counterparts from the very beginning.²⁹

This group was instrumental in the delay of the construction of the Ross Dam and led the effort to halt the construction of the High Ross Dam.³⁰ They also worked with the United States and Canada to form the Environmental Endowment Fund. The goal of this fund has been to facilitate the efforts of non-governmental organizations³¹ working to establish the international parks. The fund was chartered in 1984, with the signing of the Ross Dam Treaty. The treaty itself, in Section 11, laid the foundation for the formation of the North Cascades International Park.³² Since that time the NCCC has formed an alliance with thirteen additional environmental groups from the United States and Canada. This consortium is called the Cascades International Alliance.³³ Their

²⁸*Kohl v US*, 91 US 367, 371 (1876).

²⁹Sean Cosgrove, “NCCC: Almost 40 years of Conservation History and Still Going,” *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter for the Cascades International Alliance, Canadian EarthCare Society, (Summer 1994), Vol. 1, Issue 2.

³⁰*id.*

³¹Non-government organizations are known as NGOs. This is often a misnomer, as most NGOs receive government funding (taxpayer money) and many work cooperatively with bureaucracies to establish policies and regulations. NGOs are the visible and powerfully influential arm of what could be called the ‘shadow government.’

³²Paul Pritchard, President of the NPCA, speech given at the “Nature Has No Borders Conference” (25 Mar 94).

³³The seven United States members of the Cascades International Alliance are: Greater Ecosystem Alliance, Columbia River Bioregional Education Project (Columbiana), National Parks & Conservation Association (NPCA), North Cascades Conservation Council (NCCC), North Cascades Institute, Skagit Audubon Society

main purpose is “to protect the North Cascades ecosystem through the establishment of a Cascades International Park and Reserve.”³⁴

International Cooperation

The objective of the North Cascades International Park (NCIP) is to remove our national, or political borders. One prominent NGO working diligently for the formation of the NCIP is the National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA). Dale Crane, the Northwest Regional Director, calls for international peer pressure and changes in science and economics to make the sale of the international park acceptable to the public.

International cooperation combined with the cuttingedge of conservation biology and economic theory proved to be a successful formula for creating the launching pad for international ecosystem protection in the North Cascades.³⁵

What started as a small movement in 1872, the national parks movement had grown world wide by 1959. That year the United Nations requested the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) to compile and track the *United Nations List of National Parks and Equivalent Resources*. They established an international commission of experts to:

1. Set standards
2. Publish data
3. Aid countries in planning, developing and managing national parks

Robert Standish, Editor Emeritus of *Parks* magazine, explains how this international committee has been able to create the needed peer pressure to coerce sovereign nations to relinquish their authority to the United Nations.

Their work resulted in encouraging countries all over the world to set aside and protect the ‘crown jewels’ among their natural treasures as national parks. . . . Because of the growth and importance of national parks throughout the world, the IUCN has

and The Wilderness Society. The seven Canadian members are: Canadian EarthCare Society, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Okanogan Similkameen Parks Society, Sierra Club of Western Canada, Steelhead Society of British Columbia, Thompson Institute For Environmental Studies and Western Canada Wilderness Committee.

³⁴Cascades International Alliance, “*Nature Has No Borders*,” brochure, published by National Parks and Conservation Association (11/93).

³⁵Dale Crane, from a speech at the “Nature Has No Borders” conference.

reorganized and strengthened its programs dealing with the world's national parks and related areas.³⁶

Maybe we can presume that the UN established this committee of international experts to aid the nations with managing their natural resources. Even if they are innocent of any conspiratorial intent, a couple of issues beg attention.

The first issue deals with coercion. It is rare that the United Nations will allow individual nations to opt out of their 'development' programs. The international park will be a coercive program, involving compliance with international land use policies.

The United States will have to abide by the ruling of a Canadian bureaucracy. John Cuthbert, Chief Forester, Ministry of Forests, claimed that areas within the international park will have to work within the processes developed within British Columbia's Protected Area Strategy.³⁷ Paul Pritchard, President of NPCA, made it clear that we are not talking about setting up any options or flexibility. Furthermore, our international park will set the precedent for the entire world:

Unlike existing international parks on the North American continent, this park will have legislative mandates setting forth specific ecosystem based management objectives and coordinated methods for achieving them. The idea of a park and "special management area" cooperatively managed by different agencies to support a common objective sets a precedent that will establish the pace for ecosystem protection worldwide.³⁸

The second issue deals with law. Every nation establishes their laws with unique traditional, cultural and religious principles. Some nations respect private property but many do not. Some nations value independent enterprise, some nations franchise all industry and others directly control or own the businesses.

The diversity of the international community holds such dichotomies of opinion. Why would a free nation, such as the United States, subject our laws to a fascist, or socialist authority? How is it possible to enter a strong man's house and carry off his possessions unless the strong man is tied up first?³⁹ If we fall for this tyrannical land grab, we will neuter our Constitution, along

³⁶Robert I. Standish, "National Parks Around the World," op. cit., *The New Book of Knowledge* (1991 ed.), vol. 13, p. 5657.

³⁷*Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter for the Cascades International Alliance, Vol. 1, Issue 2 (Summer 1994).

³⁸op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

³⁹Matthew 12:29.

with the rights and freedoms associated with it.

Furthermore, we will find ourselves living under an international agenda of socialistic population and resource allocation. The socialistenvironmentalist has no respect for the laws of the United States. They see our laws, the source of our freedom, as a threat to the 'ecosystem.'⁴⁰ So they will continue to assault us with crisis after crisis until we agree to submit to the slavery and tyranny that these other nations hold in common.

The biological integrity of the North Cascades is divided by a patchwork of jurisdiction, management priorities and laws so that the entire ecosystem is at risk.⁴¹

North Cascades International Park

The North Cascades International Park covers approximately twenty percent of the State of Washington and a small portion of British Columbia. Roughly eighty percent of the park is contained within Washington's borders, while Canada contributes twenty percent of the land. "The greater North Cascades ecosystem stretches from tide water [Puget Sound] on the west to the dry Okanogan River Valley [Hwy 97 and the Columbia River] on the east; from Washington's Snoqualmie Pass on the south to the Canadian Similkameen and Fraser Rivers along its northern extent."⁴²

The park embraces the entire business and population centers along the Interstate 5 highway corridor from Everett to Vancouver, along with many medium sized cities, small towns and communities. According to the Cascades International Alliance, there are more than five million people living within the population strip along Puget Sound and Georgia Strait.⁴³

Because this is a significant area the impact of this park upon human population will be devastating. At first, we will see more regulation of the rural areas. Then the few who remain after that will be driven out. What is at stake is our right to live where

40"ECOSYSTEM: A selfsustaining community of interrelated plants and animals living in a physical environment that supplies the food, water, and other raw materials needed to sustain life. Because all the members of an ecosystem are interdependent damage to one species or a change in some aspect of the physical environment can upset the balance of the entire system. The 'greater ecosystem' concept is based on an ecosystem of a large enough area to sustain all of its species and natural functions." op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

41op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

42op. cit., "*Nature Has No Borders*," brochure. [Brackets added].

43id.

we chose, own property and make use of it. If the American people understood this upfront, they would never allow it to happen. That is why the promoters must lull us into a false sense of security by making us believe that only federal lands are affected. They claim that private property will be safe from international intrusion.

Although no boundaries have been drawn, the proposal will not include privately owned lands. Only federal lands will be considered.⁴⁴

To arrive at the desired consensus to bring the park into broad acceptance, the promoters work like seasoned politicians, mitigating every concern. However, they cannot make real guarantees and it is likely that every promise will be broken through no fault of their own. Ensuing legislation and court precedent are out of the promoters' control. This aspect aside, your definition of private property is much different from theirs. We will talk about this later.

“Nature Has No Borders,” the Conference

The University of Washington hosted the conference, “Nature Has No Borders,”⁴⁵ from 25 to 27 March 1994. It was cosponsored by the National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA), University of Washington’s Canadian Studies Center at the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies and the United States National Park Service. The Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission, which is the fiduciary agency for the Environmental Endowment Fund, made the conference possible by a grant.

Due to widespread protests and oncampus picketing Dr. William Gerberding, President of the University of Washington, along with Senator Patty Murray⁴⁶ and Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt withdrew from addressing the convention.

The featured speakers at the conference were Steven Owen, Commissioner, (BC) Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE), who spoke at the Friday evening dinner. Rep. Bruce Vento,⁴⁷ Chairman of the (US) House Subcommittee on National

44op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

45Unless otherwise noted, all references to “the conference” from this point forward mean the “Nature Has No Borders” conference (25 Mar 1994) held at the University of Washington.

46Although Sen. Murray did not speak to the conference directly, her State Director, Dan Evans, presented a video taping of her remarks.

47DMN; Democratic Farmer Labor Party.

Parks, Forests and Public Lands, spoke at the Saturday evening dinner. “Both speakers heralded conference attendees for their vision and contributions to open dialogue in ecosystem protection and land use management.”⁴⁸ The Saturday lunch speaker was Hon. Clifford Lincoln, M.P. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment and Deputy Prime Minister. The title of his speech was *Protecting the Ecosystem: An International Challenge*.

There were several workshops presented. This listing was assembled from the conference program and a review of the conference published in the Cascades International Alliance’s newsletter, *Nature Has No Borders*.

The Case for Ecosystem Management.

- 1* Dr. James Karr, Director, Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Washington.
- 2* Dennis Demarchi, Habitat Classification Specialist, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks.
- 3* Dr. Kenneth Lertzman, Professor, School of Resource and Environmental Management, Simon Fraser University.
- 4* Andy McKinnon, Manager, Forest Ecology Research, Ministry of Forests.
- 5* Moderator: Dr. Tom Perry, Member Legislative Assembly for British Columbia.

SocioEconomic Costs and Benefits of Ecosystem Protection.

- 6* Valerie Buchanan, Director of Economic Development, Fraser/Cheam Regional District.⁴⁹
- 7* Dr. Gundars Rudzitis, Professor, Department of Geography, University of Idaho.⁵⁰
- 8* Moderator: Dr. Dave Fluharty, Research Associate Professor, School of Marine Affairs, University of Washington.

Sustaining the Cascades Ecosystem.

- 9* Evan Frost, Conservation biologist, Greater Ecosystem Alliance.⁵¹

48op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

49“. . .linked changes in the socioeconomic makeup to population growth.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

50“As more people move to these areas for noneconomic reasons, a stronger, more diverse economy will result.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

51“. . .detailing the importance of remaining wildlife habitat in the North Cascades and the effect of unrestrained development on the diverse species of the ecosystem. . . . presented a detailed plan for biodiversity protection” op. cit., *Nature Has No*

10* Dennis O’Gorman, Deputy commissioner, CORE.

11* Moderator: Dr. David Thorud, Dean, College of Forestry Resources, University of Washington.

The Changing Natural Resource Economy.

12* Dr. Jack Knetsch, Professor, School of Resource and Environmental Management, Simon Fraser University.⁵²

13* Dr. Thomas Power, Professor, Department of Economics, University of Montana.⁵³

14* Moderator: Dr. David Brower, Chairman, Earth Island Institute.

Tourism Industry in the Northwest.

15* Dr. John Hunt, Department of Resource, Recreation and Tourism, University of Idaho.

16* Dr. Peter Murphy, School of Business, University of Victoria.

17* Moderator: Bernard Gagosz, Consul General, Canadian Consulate General.

Cultural Resources of the Northern Cascades First Nations.

18* Doreen Maloney, Chairperson, Skagit Systems Cooperative.⁵⁴

19* Larry Commadore, Consular, Soowahlie Band Council, Sto Lo Nation.⁵⁵

20* Bob Pasco Chief, Nlaka’ pamux Nation.⁵⁶

21* Moderator: Dr. Rachel Nugent, Chair, Department of Economics, Pacific Lutheran University.

Ecological Management of Forest Lands.

22* John Cuthbert, Chief Forester, Ministry of Forests, who described British Columbia’s Protected Area Strategy (PAS).

Borders, the newsletter.

52“ . . . presented findings that discredited conventional economic analysis of land use. . . . The value of a landscape is much more than the material worth of extracted resources.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

53“Protecting environmental quality protects our economic vitality.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

54“ . . . supported ecosystem management standards that provide full protection of natural resources and access for Native peoples.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

55“ . . . gave an impassioned account of Native spiritual practices.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

56“ . . . emphasized the importance of protecting traditional spiritual sites.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

23* Zane Smith, Regional Forester, Pacific Southwest Region, US Forest Service (retired).⁵⁷

24* Moderator: Russ Hughes, Regional Staff Manager, Integrated Resources, Ministry of Forests, Vancouver Forest Region.

Management of International Park Lands.

25* Sandra Davis, Acting Regional Director, Canadian Heritage, Alberta Region.

26* Jack Neckels, Superintendent, Grand Teton National Park, National Park Service.

27* Moderator: William Chandler, Director, Conservation Programs, National Parks and Conservation Association.

A Protection Proposal for the Northern Cascades.

28* Jake Masselink, Assistant Deputy Minister Parks Division, BC Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks.⁵⁸

29* Paul Pritchard, President, NPCA.⁵⁹

30* John Reynolds, Deputy Director, National Park Service.⁶⁰

31* Moderator Bill Paleck, Superintendent, North Cascades National Park Service Complex.

Where To Now.

32* Irving Fox, Professor Emeritus, School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia.⁶¹

33* Emory Bundy, Director, Bullitt Foundation (King5 News affiliation, Seattle).⁶²

57“ . . .spoke on the need for ecologically sustainable forestry. ‘Let the output of land management be stewardship.’” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

58“ . . .called for the participation of all concerned parties government, First Nations, and the general public in planning ecosystem management of the North Cascades.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

59“He proposed three objectives: 1) designation of an international park, 2) creation of special management areas around the park. . . . and 3) aid to local communities in transition from extraction based economy to alternative sustainable economies.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

60He pleaded for cooperation to “rededicate ourselves to the interdependence of all of us and our interdependence in the finite reality of our lovely, delightful planet, our home.” ed. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

61“ . . .emphasized the importance of public involvement in the planning and implementation of public land use management policy. He warned against transnational corporate interests substituting for the interests of citizens and indigenous people in creation of public land use policy.” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

62“ . . .closed the conference stating that the wisest investment humans can make is ‘an investment in all the species that we know nothing about.’” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

34* Moderator: Cleve Pinnix, Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission.

Other notable speakers presented papers of economic and ecological research of the North Cascades supporting international land management on an ecosystem basis. George Frampton, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, brought Bruce Babbitt's support for the formation of an international park. He cited three areas where "ecosystembased land management policies are already working."⁶³ Dan Evans, Sen. Patty Murray's State Director, brought her comments by way of video. She clearly stated her support of the park;⁶⁴

I will be grateful for the chance to use my office constructively to build the kind of relationships necessary to move the international park concept forward.

Future Parks

On 04 October 1993, the Board of County Commissioners, Skagit County, Washington, voted and passed unanimously Resolution #15035. The resolution was titled "Support For An International Park Across the United StatesCanadian Border, In Washington and British Columbia." This is the first legislative arm of our government to officially recognize the park.

The promoters have proposed another park after the establishment of the North Cascades International Park. It will be the Columbia Mountains International Park. This park continues from the NCIP across the top third of Washington State and over portions of Idaho and Montana. Thus the whole upper Washington State region will fall into international jurisdiction, namely the United Nations. After these regions are adopted, the Olympic Mountains, Puget Lowlands, Central Cascades, and Columbia Basins Parks will swallow up the remaining portions of Washington State. These also, while wholly contained within our State, will be under United Nations supervision because of international environmental treaties.

⁶³I called his office several times, but was unable to talk with him. The people I did talk to were not able to cite these three areas, or produce a working paper on this subject.

⁶⁴The international park is antithetical to our national sovereignty and to the Constitution *which she swore to uphold*. Why is she so excited about the park?

Fast Players in the Game of Politics

One day⁶⁵ I was listening to the radio when I heard our Vice President, Al Gore, say that, “Our heritage is in our national parks.” This may be eloquent, but it is not patriotic. He simply does not understand the history of our nation. He does not realize why many people have forsaken their families and possessions to live here. Worse still, he fails to discern what our fiduciary obligation is to future generations.

The park promoters claim that the value of ‘our lands’ is in direct relationship to the efforts of the people to preserve them.⁶⁶ This, too, sounds charismatic, but it is not realistic. The land is not our heritage, it is merely an asset. We can only value this resource to the degree that it affords us wealth and a place to live. If we place the value of the land above our liberty, we will eliminate our jobs and our homes. What benefit then is a single tree to mankind if we live without freedom?

We cannot forget that our true national heritage is the blood that was shed for freedom by those who came before us. They were willing to die so that we might be free of governmental tyranny and bureaucracy. They pursued the right to voice their opinion without being hanged for treason or charged with a hate crime. Our forefathers fought for the right to believe in the One who gives us liberty. They believed that our Godgiven rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness were the fundamentals of life.

The ‘pursuit of happiness’ was never thought to be the endowment of political authority over the property rights of others. It was never the right to engage in irresponsible behavior without suffering the consequence of the action. The ‘pursuit of happiness’ was understood to be the Godgiven right to defend one’s self, family and property. Our Founding Fathers knew that it was innate within man to raise a family, worship God, engage in commerce and build an estate. They also knew that this was most possible with a limited government of citizen representation.

It was for these rights that our Founding Fathers, with a firm reliance upon God, pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.⁶⁷ This is an awesome heritage and it is the foundation of our nation. This heritage of freedom has

⁶⁵28 Jun. 1993.

⁶⁶ed. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

⁶⁷This is a recapitulation of the last sentence of the Declaration of Independence.

made us great.

We cannot find our renown in our land, nor amidst our natural resources nor in our parks. Many nations have wealth and resources that surpass ours. South Africa has diamonds, the Middle East has oil and Russia has platinum to name just a few. Regardless of their assets, no nation will ever become as great as America has been.⁶⁸ This is only because the other nations have never understood a heritage based upon the principles that God set forth in the Bible. “Your statutes are my heritage forever.”⁶⁹

We are on the road to forgetting what has made us great and our vice president is leading the way. We have to hold our governing authorities accountable to higher law. Otherwise, we will certainly lose our true heritage and the benefits, wealth and freedoms that come with it.

Newspeak Politics

A politician is able to mask ideas with words. They customarily claim to have broad based support when proposing unconventional reforms, whether they do or not. To win our endorsement, the politician will spin words with subtle nuances. We may believe that we are listening to a constitutional dissertation when we are hearing socialist newspeak. If we carefully examine the rhetoric advocating environmentalism, International Parks, Goals 2000 education reform, Crime Bills, GATT treaties, or any other statist agenda, after a while we will begin to understand the underlying meaning of the phrases.

Our lawmakers and bureaucrats are trained to be facilitators. At taxpayer expense, they attend an inordinate amount of seminars and workshops. Through years of training, they have learned to present the most negative proposals with a positive light. They know how to divide citizens into small groups and they have learned to diffuse angry outbursts with positive responses.⁷⁰

⁶⁸Of course I cannot foresee the future. Although the glory of our nation is waning fast, there is no other nation existing that is established upon God’s law. Without His law, there is no possibility for greatness. The Soviet Union’s influence may have been vast but they rejected God and they did not last long. They were oppressive and had their economy not been propped up by the US government they would never have lasted as long as they did. China is large and oppressive. Though they are immense, they are not great. They may continue to conquer smaller nations, but they will not be exalted and people will not flock to them. The United States has offered freedom, justice and opportunity, and oppressed people have stormed our borders to get inside.

⁶⁹Psalms 119:111 (NIV).

⁷⁰Positive responses are not to be confused with positive ideas. A positive response is limited in scope. It does not need to agree. It only needs to acknowledge the other

It is not wrong for a person to negotiate well and win favor. The common citizen, however, is not skilled in this art. When they are mad, they are mad. When they are upset, they are upset. They are not trained to negotiate with government officials, nor do they understand that they are wrestling with an experienced facilitator. So they mistake the agent's agility for sincerity and sometimes for truth. The unknowing civilian, lacking this alacrity, is often convinced they are wrong, or they are embarrassed by their own crass. They walk away vowing never to confront again. Worse yet, they are seduced and fall into step with the facilitator.

Knowing that the masses can be broad sided by such strategies, the politico is able to make the most immoral proposal to be publicly palatable.⁷¹ Congressman Bruce Vento, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, uses Biblical and ethical wordpictures to promote the international park.

These land policies and rules are a twoedged sword. It reminds me of the adage that we have the right to swing our arm but that right ends where another person's nose begins.⁷²

The old adage that our rights end where another person's begins is now used as a pretext for socialism. Their argument is that the earth is a common resource, rather than the domain of private property. So instead of protecting life, liberty and property, this cliché will be remade to imply that if we use our property to our own benefit we are violating someone else's ecological rights.

The hypocrisy of the environmentalist and their flagrant disregard for another's Godgiven rights is illustrated in the story of William Arthur, the Northwest Regional Director of the Sierra Club.⁷³ In December 1992, he cut and sold 20 logging trucks of timber from his property surrounded by the Colville National

person, or their comment. Any unity on the smallest point is an area to exploit; the positive change agent will usually act as if both parties are unified on the entire subject.

71A good example is government schools teaching our children that using condoms is 'safe sex.' Their excuse is that by withholding this instruction we put students in danger of getting AIDS. Sexed proponents attack abstinence and morality, claiming that this will endanger our children. Their presumption is that all children are going to have sex. This, too, is a mask. Most students will follow the instruction given them. If school administrators were really interested in reducing teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases, they would not be fighting the parents who want their children to be taught abstinence.

72op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

73AP story, "Environmentalist Draws Jeers For Logging His Land," *Columbia Basin Herald* (06 Dec. 93).

Forest. He removed all the marketable timber, which was approximately 85,000 board feet.

According to the newspaper account, Mr. Arthur used the money to improve his home. He admitted logging another portion 12 years earlier to put himself through graduate school. However, when he sat on the forestry panel with President Clinton, in Portland, Oregon, (April 1994) he proclaimed, "We cut like there's no tomorrow, and tomorrow caught up with us yesterday." He has made his profit and it is time for the rest of us to quit this senseless logging.

Neither the proponents nor the politicians of environmentalism have any desire to revert to an austere lifestyle. Before his election to the vicepresidency, Al Gore wrote a book about the evils of modern technology entitled *Earth In the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit*. The purpose of the book was to convince us common people to repent of our selfish lifestyles and save the earth.

In a review of the book, the *Wall Street Journal* recites his own, confessed hypocrisy. "Mr. Gore is unhappy with much of modern life. He feels guilty about 'my own hypocrisy' in using chlorofluorocarbons 'in my automobile air conditioner' while he's 'on the way to a speech about why they should be banned' for hurting the ozone layer."⁷⁴

An Associated Press news story was released in June 1993.⁷⁵ Vice President Al Gore had replaced the deck on his home just about the time that he was writing his book. He used 3000 board feet of vertical grain Douglas Fir. Vertical grain fir is a beautiful wood, it is expensive and it is old growth. Mr. Gore, the enthusiastic environmentalist, must certainly enjoy his new deck. So why would the second highest leader of this free country want to deprive us of the ability to do the same?

I have another question. Why do environmentalists publish and publish and publish? Chris Genovali, chair of the San Francisco chapter of the Sierra Club, complained that native⁷⁶ forests are "being liquidated by increasing industrial activity."⁷⁷ Then he went on to write that, "The major force behind this troubling

⁷⁴Review & Outlook section "Senator Malthus," *The Wall Street Journal*, (03 Aug. 1992).

⁷⁵AP story, "Old-growth Wood Used on VP's Porch," the author's copy appears to be dated 09 June 93.

⁷⁶When is a forest not native?

⁷⁷Chris Genovali, "Rescuing the Forests of the Northern Half of the Globe," *Northwest Conservation, News and Priorities* magazine, Greater Ecosystem Alliance (Summer 1994), p. 8.

development is the growing consumption of paper. . .” I found this quotation inside a twentyfour page quarterly environmental journal. Within that journal I found several advertisements for other environmental books and periodicals. They keep on writing. I can’t help but wonder if they would curb their books, magazines and direct mail fundraisers if that alone would save a few of these forests.

On the other hand, I feel no guilt for writing. Besides the therapeutic benefit that it provides, I know that my activities are providing jobs and feeding families. Loggers will cut the trees. Truckers will haul the logs to the mills and millwrights will make the paper. This paper will be shipped twice more and a printer will produce the finished product. Behind the scenes will be people making and repairing chainsaws. Others will raise cows to feed the loggers and provide leather for boots, chaps and tool belts. There will be people producing and shipping the leather products. Some people will be mining the hills to provide materials for the manufacture of the chainsaws, trucks, presses and equipment parts. Others will be working to produce the petroleum products necessary for manufacturing the equipment, fuel the saws and trucks, and provide ink for the printer. I do not want to forget the people who raise cattle and crops for clothing, nor do I want to forget the grocers and equipment warehousemen and their families, etc. There are myriad jobs created by writing this book.

Probably the most satisfying part of all this is knowing that the government shares my interest in perpetuating these jobs. For all the work I give these people, the bureaucracies require twice as much paperwork, legal and accounting, for every link on this industrial chain. This begins the process again. So please tell your friends to buy my booksÇ it keeps the economy going!

Many people have told me that when they contacted their congressional representative or their local paper about the international park, they were told that it is only a rumor. This can hardly be a rumor. Governor Lowry of Washington wrote a letter to the Northwest Regional Director of the National Parks and Conservation Association, praising him for his efforts to help create the park.⁷⁸

Using what we have just learned about positive verbal strategies, examine this excerpt to see if it may be clear that he understands that the people are against this project. Nonetheless, he

⁷⁸Letter from Gov. Mike Lowry to Dale Crane, NW Regional Director, NPCA (14 Jul. 1993).

encourages Mr. Crane and his environmental friends to persevere. They will eventually wear the people down.

I am aware that many difficulties exist and a great deal of work must be done to create the political climate necessary for the enactment of appropriate laws in both nations. I wish you well and hope the needed consensus can be achieved.⁷⁹

The international parks are no rumor to the environmental culture. Several environmental periodicals have written of the efforts, keeping their readers informed of the progress. The Cascades International Alliance, openly states on the front page of their newsletter that they are;

Working to establish an international park and special management area in the North Cascades Ecosystem.⁸⁰

Our nation has not yet lost its last statesman, but it seems that politics and government jobs tend to attract the worst people. There are many bureaucrats who could never win an election, yet they write more regulations than a lawmaker. Many of the statutes that they propose have little to do with the well being of the people. Their purpose is to increase their agency and power. For these people, it is easier to get a government job and become a feudal lord than to win the respect of the people through dedication, hard work and customer service.

This ethic is antithetical to the founding of our country. The government our forefathers instituted was designed to be limited, to serve not to rule. We fought a revolution to rid our land of ruling classes. Our Constitution goes so far as to even forbid titles of nobility.⁸¹ They established a representative civil government, ruled by the majority, with protection for the minority. Now, two hundred years later, representation has been revised to mean consensus.

To most people, consensus and majority are synonymous. Consensus, however, implies agreement but it is not a majority. It is a direct manipulation of the democratic process, using small committees and study groups to achieve the desired results. It is a wonderful tool to effect social change that places the will of the minority above the majority.

Consensus is not hamstrung by the usual protocols required

⁷⁹op. cit., Lowry.

⁸⁰op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

⁸¹*The Constitution of the United States*, art. 1, sec. 9.8.

for majorities and it is recognized without a vote. The will of the leader is reflected in the outcome of consensus. Dissenters do not have to be heard. If dissenters reveal themselves, they can usually be ignored. If they become obstinate, nobody outside the committee, meeting or hearing will know. If they organize, they can be painted as radicals, or trouble makers. There is no record for anyone to investigate to prove the extent of the opposition. There is no evidence of the majority will. There was consensus because it was declared.

A recent example of consensus, or in this case plurality, was the election of Bill Clinton, who, upon winning with only 43% of the popular vote, declared his victory to be a 'mandate.' This is another good example of masking negative outcomes with positive statements.

The White House Connection

The Constitution sets forth itself to be "the supreme Law of the Land," along with "the Laws of the United States" and "all Treaties made."⁸² When the courts and the politicians refer to this supremacy clause, they will often suggest the three parts to be equal. Sometimes the courts will give more weight to the one most detailed, of which the Constitution is the least. Sometimes more weight will be given to the most recent and again the Constitution fails. However, the Constitution is clear that it is predominant and the laws and the treaties "shall"⁸³ be made in Pursuance thereof." By giving the three parts equal stature, the Constitution is minimized and unconstitutional laws are able to be declared 'constitutional.' We will review this aspect later in the book.

Have you noticed that we have had a proliferation of treaties in recent years? It is not because we have suddenly decided to become more friendly with the rest of the world. Treaties have been found to be a useful tool for overcoming constitutional restrictions that limit the overweening role of national government. Through treaties, the President is able to write law that will accomplish what he believes Congress has failed to do. The Senate is willing to ratify treaties that make laws which bring about the social changes they desire but would otherwise be unpopular and would make reelection difficult.

For example, portions of the Rio Declaration, the Global

⁸²*The Constitution of the United States*, art. 6, sec. 2.

⁸³Historically, in legal vernacular, 'shall' means 'must,' if they meant 'recommended,' 'maybe' or 'optional' the drafters would have written 'should.'

Climate Change treaty and Agenda 21,⁸⁴ drafted and agreed upon during the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development,⁸⁵ call for America to reduce the number of cars on the road and eventually eliminate all air conditioning and outdoor barbecues. If our president or senators were to make outright statutes to this effect, the people would storm Washington DC.

The Rio Declaration⁸⁶ established the Sustainable Development Commission, under Principle 27. This worldwide commission has the authority to hold hearings, have public proceedings and receive evidence about the environmental behavior and policies of all nations.⁸⁷ This is the equivalent of an international land use planning department. Have our leaders forgotten that we spilled blood to get out from under the land use policies of the king of Britain? Why should we now submit to an international jurisdiction? At the very least, this is another wasteful bureaucracy.

To facilitate the United Nation's international agenda, President Clinton has created a national council of Sustainable Development. Five Cabinet members sit on this council as well as several leaders from environmental groups.⁸⁸ He established the White House Ecosystem Management Task Force as the liaison between federal agencies and this council. Then the President directed the State Department to set up the Interior Ecosystem Management Task Force and give priority to communications between the council and the UN.

The State Department initiated the drafting of a 50 page report for the UN Commission. This outlined the national Council's efforts to implement Agenda 21. That was in August 1993. According to the State Department, Agenda 21 is a nonbinding agreement. However, it was adopted in toto by all nations represented at the Rio convention. You can understand that there is considerable peer pressure to conform to these measures.

Not only does Agenda 21 address basic human needs such as where we live, our health, water allocation and waste, but it is

84Dixy Lee Ray & Lou Guzzo, *Environmental Overkill*, Regnery Gateway, (1993), all cites are from the paperback edition; HarperPerennial, (1994), p. 910. Agenda 21 is "an 800page agreement that lays out 115 specific programs to put into effect all the major issues discussed at Rio. The Agenda is designed to facilitate (or force) the transition of the economies of all nations to 'sustainable development.'

85The Earth Summit at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, June 1992.

86The Rio Declaration was ratified by the Senate and signed by President Bush.

87op. cit., Ray & Guzzo, p. 9.

88Steve Gorton, "Will People Give Way To Ecosystems?" *The Montanian* (29 Jun. 94).

an agreement of “a global partnership for sustainable development.”⁸⁹ It requires the United States to send 0.7 percent of its GNP to developing nations. It proposes to transform developed nations into austere societies.⁹⁰ It increases labor intensive construction technologies.⁹¹ That is, we will get rid of our tractors and equipment because they produce carbon dioxides. We will return to the shovel and scythe. Probably the most dangerous section of this treaty is the clause that ordains the young to rule the world.⁹²

Deputy Secretary of State, Tim Wirth,⁹³ took the Council’s report to the United Nations Commission in June 1994.⁹⁴ The State Department is working on UN projects and treaties which puts them at odds with, rather than defending, our Constitution. We have the best freedoms and the best Constitution in the world. Why are we implementing treaties that diminish this? Why are we not bringing the rest of the world into conformance with our values instead?

Tim Wirth was also the highest ranking US delegate to the United Nations Conference on Population, in Cairo, Egypt. He has previously served as a board member of the Boulder, Colorado chapter of Planned Parenthood.⁹⁵ His service is compatible with the Cairo conference because it focused on ways to control and reduce world and national populations. The aim of the international park is

89“Agenda 21: It’s Not Hidden,” *World Climate Review*, Vol. 3, No. 1, p. 8 (Fall 1994).

90Section 4.11: “The need for new concepts of wealth. . . through changed lifestyles.” op. cit., *World Climate Review*, p. 9. If we become an austere nation, how will we continue to fund the developing countries?

91Section 7.69: “Promote the use of labourintensive construction and maintenance technologies. . .” op. cit., *World Climate Review*, p. 9.

92Section 25.2: “It is imperative that youth from all parts of the world participate actively in all relevant levels of decisionmaking processes. . .” op. cit., *World Climate Review*, p. 9. Even before I published this book I was rebuked for jumping to conclusions. This person felt that this section only invited the youth to become involved, to know what is going on in the world. If you have the same impression, please read it again. Remember, political statements always mean something. 1) ‘youth. . . participate actively in. . . decisionmaking. . .’ does not mean that they are merely observing [also remember what we learned about consensus]; 2) ‘imperative that youth from all parts of the world’ means that the UN will force us to accept the views of third world youth, regardless of educational and social standing. Isaiah 3:4 warns us that when we leave the laws of God children will rule over us. We already have many officials that have the character of children. By incorporating real children into the decision making processes of world governments, we will be ruled by children, virtual and authentic.

93former Senator (D, CO).

94ed. cit., American Sheep Industry Association memorandum (01 Jun. 94), commenting on Bureau of Land Management’s *Internal Working Document*.

95Bob Ditner, “Life and Death in Cairo: A Reporter’s Notebook,” *Citizen* magazine, published by Focus on the Family, (21 Nov. 94), p. 11.

to limit the availability of land for human habitat. Mr. Wirth cannot hide behind his job. It is not surprising to see Malthusians and proponents of eugenics⁹⁶ in the forefront of the environmental movement.

With what you hear from the news media, you probably thought that Vice President Gore commissioned the National Performance Review to make government more efficient and responsive to the people. That too, is a mask. The ‘performance’ has to do with environmental responsiveness, not people. Writing for the *Washington State Farm Bureau News*, Peter Stenberg notes that;

The national goal of ecosystem management was initiated by Vice President Gore’s National Performance Review (NPR). . . . Gore commissioned a White House Ecosystem Management Task Force to coordinate the activities of this Interagency Management Coordination Group.⁹⁷

Mr. Stenberg is not merely giving the bully pulpit over to the property rights advocates. The government’s own Bureau of Land Management confirms his report;

The National Performance Review (NPR) is the beginning of a longterm commitment to making the changes needed to create a federal government that works better and costs less. . . . Ecosystem management is one of the collaborative crossagency initiatives spurred by the NPR. The report from the Vice President envisions a *proactive approach* to ensuring a sustainable economy and a sustainable environment through ecosystem management. . . . NPR reinvention initiatives are being implemented across government. [Emphasis added].⁹⁸

Under the color of governmental efficiency, our Vice President established the National Performance Review, which is

⁹⁶Malthusians and proponents of eugenics will be discussed later in this book. Malthusians believe that the population of the world is increasing faster than our ability to feed them. They believe that war, famine, disease, abortion, euthanasia and suicide are necessary activities to restrain the proliferation of the masses. The study of eugenics is concerned with improving, or purifying, the species, usually by limiting reproduction to the purest of the races. Not only are these philosophies dangerous by themselves, but they pose an ominous threat to society when they merge politically.

⁹⁷Peter Stenberg, “Ecosystem Management: The Latest Correct Environmental Thinking and a Battle Plan Against Private Property Rights,” *Washington State Farm Bureau News* (Aug. 94), page 11.

⁹⁸BLM, *Internal Working Document*, “Subject: National Performance Review Initiatives,” prepared for: BLM Summit 3/30/94.

just another bureaucracy. The main objective of this new commission is to manage our ecosystem. It is under the direction of an ecosystem management task force and an interagency management task force, which are *two more bureaucracies.* The NPR is as close to eliminating waste and making government more efficient, as Mr. Gore is to his Baptist faith.

The White House Ecosystem Management Task Force is chaired by Katie McGinty, Director of the White House Office of Environmental Policy. The task force consists of Assistant Secretaries from twelve departments and agencies, representatives for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.⁹⁹

The goal of ecosystem management is to restore and maintain the health, sustainability and biological diversity of ecosystems while supporting sustainable economies and communities. . . . The Task Force is working to establish overarching goals for all agencies, draft an Executive Order on Ecosystem Management to provide critical direction and guidance to federal agencies. . . . Among the case studies. . . selected for budget review and analysis are. . . the Pacific Northwest Forests.¹⁰⁰

When Paul Pritchard spoke to the conference, he reminded the attendees that this vision, for the international park, has been ongoing since the 1920s. With the recent change in the Washington political landscape, that is the 1992 elections, he expressed hope that a window of opportunity had opened. He has not been disappointed. Since the 1992 elections, the White House has been working actively to bring private property under the purview of national and international jurisdiction.

The difference now is that both the United States and British Columbia have more environmentally sensitive administrations. In the US, Secretary of Interior Babbitt [*sic*] has expressed strong interest. . . to manage public forests as ecological units. . .¹⁰¹

Bruce Babbitt, Water and Dams

Interior Secretary, Bruce Babbitt, recently declared that he “would love to be the first Secretary of the Interior to tear down a

⁹⁹op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, “Subject: White House Ecosystem Management Task Force and the Interior Ecosystem Management Task Force.”

¹⁰⁰id.

¹⁰¹op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

really large dam.”¹⁰² While serving as the President of the League of Conservation Voters, he addressed a lawyer’s conference advocating the importance of federalizing control of the waters of the western States. In his speech¹⁰³ he called for judicial activism to facilitate the federal confiscation of waters. He warned that conservative judges would hinder the process by relying on a constitutional construction of law.

There is a constant threat that a new conservative judiciary will frustrate this effort to find a more balanced pattern of water use by expanding the concept of constitutional taking beyond any reasonable measure. . . . Navigation is an important aspect of the public interest in water because it has such deep historical roots. These roots might prove to be a formidable defense in takings claims.¹⁰⁴

Furthermore, he stresses the importance of assuming federal regulatory powers, that is de facto government, and using creative techniques for writing unconstitutional law. He parades the very arguments that should be used against unfounded environmental regulations as major victories of legislative and judicial activism. He gloats about the successes of the environmental and legal special interests to get controversial statutes passed by an ignorant Congress.

These bundles of rights in water also need to be examined in the context of two of our most important environmental laws. The first is the Clean Water Act. . . . This is a very important *assumption of federal regulatory power* because it reaches everything that is wet (and some things that are arguable not so wet)[sic]. . . . The second federal law is the Endangered Species Act, the single most *inventive* and trailblazing environmental law of this century. I am certain that members of Congress who passed the Endangered Species Act did not fully understand the American West. [Emphasis added].¹⁰⁵

Water, or what is legally termed *navigable waters* is the key to consolidating the control of large land areas. Federal regulations

102Grant County Public Utility District, (Ephrata, WA), *Tear Down The Dams!?!?*, newsletter (26 Sep. 94).

103Bruce Babbitt, “The Public Interest In Western Water,” 23 *Envtl.L.* 93342 (1993).

104op. cit., Babbitt, p. 936.

105op. cit., Babbitt, p. 939.

now include all waters, even mud puddles¹⁰⁶ (wetlands). With federal control of water, the rights of States and individuals will be diminished and the potential for federal revenue will be unlimited. This centralization of authority, along with progressive legislation will not only lead to more power for the lawmaker, but will be good for the lawyer, as well.

Water quality standards and endangered species issues will come to a head in the California Bay Delta within the next five years. This will be a massive fight, which in my judgment, will make the spotted owl seem like a relatively gentlemanly discussion because of its complexity and the fact that it will cover the entire watershed of the Sierra and Central Valley. . . . There is going to be a lot of sitespecific federal legislation in the future dealing with water issues. If you have a problem on a local river, it is going to become a federal topic. . . . The water problems of the West are going to be solved, not by taking more water for private use, but by setting up markets to reallocate the water we are already using. These markets will allow those who need more water and who are willing to pay a higher price. . . . the public interest in water, which is a growth industry. It will keep all of you [speaking to lawyers and law students] wonderfully busy for your lifetimes.¹⁰⁷

In the introduction to the printed text of his speech, Mr. Babbitt erroneously claimed that the federal government had ‘diverted’ water rights to the States and must now get that resource back under its control. The reason he makes this remark is to lay a foundation for us to believe that it is the legitimate and proper role

¹⁰⁶There are many accounts that will confirm this allegation. Permit me to share this one. I was building four duplexes in Snohomish County for a client. Across the street was a ditch that was approximately oneandonehalf blocks long. The county, without privilege of easements or condemnation, had previously installed a pipe under the road to relieve this ditch onto my client’s property. During the worst rain, it would develop a puddle that was approximately 70 to 100 square feet. The neighbor across the street told all parties that he had never seen the puddle last more than a week and that was only during periods of heavy, continuous rains. There was an outflow pipe at the other end of the property that was always dry. In March 1990, the project was shut down for wetland mitigation. It was about two years before work was resumed. During the mitigation, it was admitted by the county agents on several occasions that we would be creating a wetland. In other words, there was no wetland, but the county felt that this was a perfect location for one. This account is not unique. The cost to myself was great. The impact on other contractors, businesses and jobs was severe. The cost to my client was devastating. The benefit to the environment and the county is nothing. The benefit to the attorneys was a windfall.

¹⁰⁷op. cit., Babbitt, p. 940, 942.

of national government to control the water adjacent to and beneath our soil.

In the rush to settle the West, the federal government diverted water rights to the states. However, emerging public rights such as the public trust doctrine and reserved water rights are bringing private rights back into a more balanced public/private approach. This shift in focus will result in a more environmentally sensible use of water resources.¹⁰⁸

The original intent of public trust,¹⁰⁹ as spelled out in article IV, of *The Ordinance of 1787*, was to provide unimpeded navigation throughout the western rivers. Under the Common Law, the right to water flows with the ownership of property. The only state interest would be the protection of navigation.¹¹⁰ At the time of the incorporation of the United States the original States each retained local control of their navigable waters. Local control of natural resources was accorded to the subsequent States through the Equal Footing Doctrine.¹¹¹

To this day, most courts still recognize the Overlying Right, which allows a property owner to take water from the ground. They also uphold the Common Enemy Doctrine, which allows a property owner to divert surface waters onto his neighbor. These are Common Law ideals. Historically, water is fundamental to the land. It is not a reasonable conclusion that the federal government 'diverted' control of these waters, as Mr. Babbitt claims.

The Equal Footing Doctrine, however, has been eroded through judicial and legislative tampering, as well as bureaucratic regulations. These strategies to diminish this doctrine have empowered the national government with public trust, giving the appearance of federal jurisdiction over waters. There is no constitutional authority, nonetheless, that is able to deprive the individual States of their right to control natural resources. This can

¹⁰⁸op. cit., Babbitt, p. 933.

¹⁰⁹Public Trust Doctrine: "Provides that submerged and submersible lands are preserved for public use in navigation, fishing and recreation and state, as trustee for the people, bears responsibility of preserving and protecting the right of the public to the use of the waters for those purposes. . ." *Black's Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., West Publishing (1990).

¹¹⁰*The Constitution of the United States*, art. 1, sec. 9.6 provides for unrestricted navigation, while the States' rights to their water is implied in art. 1, sec. 8.17.

¹¹¹Equal Footing Doctrine: "This doctrine provides that, like the original states which retained title to the beds of their navigable waters, all new states are entitled to the beds of navigable waters within their boundaries. . ." op. cit., *Black's Law Dictionary*.

only be accomplished through de facto judicial activism, which is what Mr. Babbitt espouses.

There is a tendency for the courts to accomplish their political goals by legislating through precedents. As late as 1908, the US Supreme Court ruled that individual States were protected from coercion to export their natural resources, namely river and lake waters.¹¹² By 1923, however, the Court had had turned 180 degrees and held that a State could be required to export their natural resources, namely natural gas, even before they satisfied local needs.¹¹³

The controversial Boldt decisions¹¹⁴ and other reserved water rulings have changed the face of fishing, industry and commerce in the northwestern States. Corps of Engineers' wetland regulations have altered the authority over water and have substantially deteriorated the rights of property owners.

Regarding the future of our dams, Mr. Babbitt explained that most dams were built with fifty year leases, which are now expiring. He gloats that many of the leases will not be renewed and the dams will have to be removed. The premise for removing the dams is to protect endangered fish and other environmental concerns. This is hypocritical because he allows for the dams to remain if they are retained by the Indians.

There are not going to be any more dams in the West unless there is the most excruciating evident case made, or unless they are built for a Native American tribe which has a special claim for water. Existing water projects all over the West are going to be reconfigured to give water back to the environment. . .¹¹⁵

112 *Hudson County Water Co v McCarter*, 209 US 349 (1908).

113 *Pennsylvania v West Virginia*, 262 US 553 (1923).

114 *United States v Washington*, 384 FSup. 312 (1974). The State of Washington contended that the Lummi Indian tribe was fishing in deeper waters than agreed to at the time of the signing of the treaty. Judge Boldt ignored the treaty and held that new areas were "usual and accustomed." His premise was that aboriginal Indians had, like any fisherman, moved to more productive waters. In other words, the Indians were allowed to go beyond the scope of the treaty to follow the fish. As they traveled, they carried their treaty rights to claim the fish, despite the fact that they were outside the treaty boundaries. This restricts or deprives all other fishermen of their ability to fish as long as the Indians have laid claim. This is a good example of establishing social policy through judicial precedent. Regardless of his intentions toward fairness, he upheld an action that could not stand the test of treaty nor Constitution. Whenever a judge succumbs to the temptation to enact 'fairness' in violation of law, the outcome is precedent that erodes everybody's rights, results in unfairness for one or more parties and creates disrespect for law and animosity toward those who have obtained rights unjustly.

115 op. cit., Babbitt, p. 941.

How do we “give water back to the environment?” The environment is not robbed of its water or resources, irrespective of the dam. This is another case of environmental hypocrisy. The purpose for removing dams has nothing to do with the pretext. It is a play for political power.

Gorbachev and the International Green Cross

With the demise of the ‘Evil Empire,’ or Soviet Union, many believed that the cold war was over and the world was heading toward a lasting peace. Communism may have appeared to be over because it was bankrupt, both economically and morally. Nonetheless, the world has never witnessed a voluntary relinquishment of such immense power and domination. The old maxim for consumer economics holds true for politics as well; “if it sounds too good to be true, it is.” The Russian giant may have fallen, but socialism and fascism are not dead.

Mikhail Gorbachev was not one day out of the Soviet Union when he began his new career, speaking throughout the United States. Recently, he was the guest of honor of the Environmental Media Association and keynote speaker at the Environmental Media Awards.¹¹⁶ His latest mission of peace has been the promotion of Global Green USA, which is part of International Green Cross (IGC). He formed the IGC to seek solutions to the world’s environmental problems.¹¹⁷ They are currently developing international environmental laws. They plan to offer a draft of these new global codes at the 50th anniversary celebration of the United Nations.¹¹⁸

It is ironic that the leader of the world’s most environmentally deprived nation, who was responsible for the Chernobyl disaster, now rises to become the world leader of the environmental movement. Joseph Farah noted that this man with the “Orwellian vision” is lauded by Hollywood and criticized by none. He also points out that these champions of the first amendment, are “enamored of this new environmental prophet.” However, only five years earlier, it was he who outlawed all independent media activity within his country. Is this a paradox, or a parody?

There is no new face for Gorbachev. He has not received

¹¹⁶Joseph Farah, “Gorbachev Stars as Captain Planet” *World* magazine (29 October, 1994), pp. 1819.; and, “Going From Red to Green,” *People* magazine (31 October, 1994), pp. 145146.

¹¹⁷op. cit., *People* magazine.

¹¹⁸op. cit., *World* magazine.

an environmental conscience. He is the same ruthless leader with megalomaniac dreams. It is only for pragmatic reasons that he is compelled to change his appearance. Farah reminds us what Mikhail Gorbachev wrote in his newspaper column, published in the *New York Times*, in 1992:

The idea of socialism lives on; and it is my feeling that the quest—the desire to experiment and to find a new form for putting the socialist idea into practice—is ongoing.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁹op. cit., *World* magazine.

What Is Sustainable Management?

To begin with, ‘sustainable management’ has nothing to do with ‘sustainable yield.’ Most people are familiar with the latter term. If not, it is not hard to deduce that ‘sustainable yield’ has something to do with managing the natural resources to ensure that there will be enough product for future demands. The promoters of the international parks and those who endorse restrictive environmental regulations use familiar terminology to advance their ideas but they mean quite the opposite.

During the conference, Paul Pritchard, President of the NPCA, talked about ways for the national government to take control of the land. His aim is not to maintain the resources to guarantee future yields. Rather it is to diminish our use of these resources, leading to an austere lifestyle. His references to ‘changing ideas’ and ‘evolving techniques’ are eloquent ways to say that we must use international pressure to circumvent our constitutional rights. In other words, a freemarket people cannot be trusted to impoverish themselves, so we must use world government to do this.

Our efforts to further protect the North Cascades ecosystem affords us an unheard of opportunity to work together as an international community. . . . Changing ideas about how to protect ecosystems provides evolving techniques and expanding perspectives for managing the human impact to the environment.¹²⁰

He explains that our country needs international land use management because, “The North Cascades are truly an international ecosystem. . .” He also claims that grizzly bear, wolf and lynx populations are “internationally significant.” He makes these claims without any supporting argument or documentation. Political economists and environmentalists, nonetheless, support this plan as a means for achieving a ‘sustainable economy.’ At the conference, several speakers backed him up with economic and ecological research.¹²¹ They contend that we cannot have a

¹²⁰op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

¹²¹“Throughout the conference, many notable speakers presented papers of their latest economic and ecological research of the North Cascades, supporting international land management on an ecosystem basis.” cit., “Conference Focuses on Goals for Common Future,” op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

sustainable economy without ecosystem management.¹²²

We need a practical social and economic transition to sustainable economies.¹²³

How do we have a 'sustainable economy' based upon a severely limited extraction of natural resources? My friend, Judy, has a saying that she is quite fond of repeating. "It takes a man, plus tools, plus a natural resource to equal a sound economy."

I have to question the credentials of any 'economist' that believes that an economy can survive on office jobs. Timber harvesting, mining, ranching, farming, fishing, processing, manufacturing and construction are the essence of any economy. It is foolishness to believe that we can remove the wealthproducing sector and prop up the system with services.

Most people understand the importance of natural resources for survival. After man was created, God gave him the responsibility to manage the earth. That responsibility follows to us. That is why it is innately human to desire the soil.¹²⁴ Conversely, the economy proposed at the conference is socialism. The 'transition' to accomplish this change is using government subsidies, grants and welfare from the taxpayers that still have jobs. That, in itself, is not sustainable for many reasons. Here are a few:

1. They will reduce or eliminate wealthproducing jobs. Not only does this sector provide us with housing, food, clothing, paper, etc., but they provide the engine that keeps money and wealth dynamic.
2. The national government will rob from the taxpayer to pay for the unemployment and retraining¹²⁵ of those who were formerly wealth producers. This will force an increase in taxes.
3. The wealthproducing sector provides the bulk of government revenues. Therefore, tax revenues will be

122"ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT: A sciencebased management approach that provides natural habitat for the benefit of all species and maintains the structural and functional integrity of an ecosystem while providing economic benefits at a level that the ecosystem can sustain" op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

123Rachel Nugent, Ph.D. "Sustaining the Economy of the North Cascades," op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

124Genesis 3:19, God told Adam that he would eat his food by the sweat of his brow. see also Genesis 2:15.

125According to the GEA, Congress allocated \$15.3 million in 1994, to create employment for displaced timber workers. op. cit., "GEA Stalks The Forest Service In The New Age Of Ecosystem Management," *Northwest Conservation, News and Priorities* magazine, Greater Ecosystem Alliance (Summer 1994), p. 18.

reduced by diminishing or eliminating this sector. This will force another increase in taxes.

4. As the wealthproducing sector of the economy decreases, the taxpayers' monetary base becomes more static. Not that this is bad in itself, which is another topic. However, as deficits continue to mount, interest becomes dynamic. Static money cannot compete with dynamic interest.
5. As the wealthproducing sector of the economy decreases, basic necessities will become luxuries and will no longer be available to the average wage earner and family.

The park promoters depend upon crises to persuade the people to surrender control of the forests and resources. The best strategy has been to play up the guilt and create villains. There is no other way to persuade a freedomloving people to accept international intervention of their economy and resources.

Who are the Villains?

Industry is the easiest to target. During the 1980s, the media bombarded us with stories of disastrous leveraged buyouts and junk bond sales. Stories of poor consumers being ripped off by unscrupulous businesses continually make headlines. By portraying these abuses as the norm, the media has intentionally painted all business with the color of greed.

Profit is no longer considered to be essential to establishing a solid business and guaranteeing future jobs. Private enterprise is portrayed as a threat to our economy and ecology. We are conditioned to believe the reports of destruction without question.

The North Cascades are subjected to the effects of mineral exploration and the threat of future mining. . . . These same types of cyanide heapleaching mines have already killed thousands of birds and fish in Nevada, Colorado and California.¹²⁶

Overlogging, mining, grazing, roads, agriculture and dams within the North Cascades all endanger what remains of the ecosystem. Just as the grizzly bear knows no borders, neither do threats to the ecosystem. Even with the protection afforded to the region through the establishment of the parks and forests, the ecosystem cannot escape the impacts of industrial development, urban

¹²⁶op. cit., "Nature Has No Borders," brochure.

encroachment, and air and water pollution in the surrounding areas.¹²⁷

Mining companies with private inholdings on public lands seek approval to remove millions of tons of rock. . . . have already killed thousands of birds and fish. . .¹²⁸

By establishing the premise that business is evil, the next step is to justify public extortion. In other words, we tax the life blood out of our entrepreneurs and employers. That's okay because we have the national government to look after us when these businesses go down and the jobs are gone.

Along this same line of reasoning Senator Patty Murray stresses that these are the people's parks. If we, the people, allow any business to operate within them, we deserve 'our fair share.' With no risk and no investment, our outrage alone, qualifies us for a return of the profits.

You. . . have a right to expect a fair return from businesses for the right to earn money in the parks. . . . I think this region is headed in a very positive direction in forest management.¹²⁹

Who gets this money? our fair share? It will not be the producers the businesses and employees. The money will go to the regulators and paper shufflers. In the name of environmental justice we will abandon a wealthproducing economy and favor of a system of wealth consumers.

"Classical economics must be reworked because it 'defines productivity narrowly and encourages us to equate gains in productivity with economic progress.'¹³⁰

Favoring Tourism over Production

For the sake of 'public lands' and 'public revenue,' Senator Murray and other politicians and bureaucrats have decided to regulate our loggers out of the 'destructive practice' of timber harvesting. They mitigate this crisis by giving lipservice to the loggers' plight. This is only done to transfer the blame from their destructive regulations to a so-called decrease in resource supply. They hope to appease them by promising to give them taxpayers' money. Their goal, nonetheless, is to bring these productive people

¹²⁷op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

¹²⁸op. cit., "Nature Has No Borders," brochure.

¹²⁹op. cit., Sen. Murray.

¹³⁰Al Gore, op. cit., "Senator Malthus," *The Wall Street Journal*.

into the national government dependency class.

As timber supply has decreased, people in the timber communities have been rightfully concerned about what economic opportunities will be available in the future. For many towns, some of the real opportunities will come through tourist and recreational use of the public resource. This means providing services for people who visit the forests and the mountains for the outdoor experience.¹³¹

Timber supplies, however, have not decreased. We have more forests in our land than we 'need.' Currently there are over 230 billion marketable trees in our nation. That is more than 1000 trees per person. Furthermore, about four million new trees are planted every day.¹³² Yet, we have curtailed domestic logging and we are importing most of the logs we need for housing, furniture, publishing and packaging.

Like a true politician, Sen. Murray makes the waves then tries to convince us that the government is the only one that can save the ship. She wants us to believe that this experiment will not damage our economy and that if we will just look to the national government, they will come through with the money and jobs.

If we believe her, we will forge another link in the chain of government dependence. This chain is hard to break. Russia ought to be a good lesson for us. Once people are accustomed to government dependency, it is difficult for them to assimilate freedom and take responsibility for their lives.

According to Sen. Murray, recreational jobs will be the hub of this new, 'sustainable economy.' Recreationbased industries will thrive.¹³³ Life will be better than ever before. Careers will be

¹³¹op. cit., Sen. Murray. She has difficulty delineating between diminished supply and overregulation.

¹³²op. cit., *Ray & Guzzo*, p. 109.

¹³³Just as this book is going to press, I had the privilege to talk with a couple of outfitters who apprised me of what is happening to their 'tourist industry.' One of these outfitters was recently denied their permit renewal in the Buckhorn Wilderness of the Olympic National Forest. The official reason was that they were not able to conform to the needs assessment of the Wilderness Act. In other words, they could not prove that they need to be there. According to the outfitter, they agree that the wilderness is subject to overuse, but the window for the outfitter is only 100 days per year. Other uses are not curtailed. It would seem to me that if the bureaucrats were really concerned with the overuse and abuse to the wilderness, they would widen the window for outfitters, who know the area and exercise responsible use, and reduce the window for other users. Another aspect that was brought up was the recent efforts to reduce the number of outfitters. In one year the permitted outfitters within the Olympic National Park jumped from eleven to thirtyfive. The government is trying to pare this down and will not be renewing many of these permits. Those who

fulfilling as we focus on pleasure rather than production. This theory is supported by the Cascades International Alliance, the National Parks and Conservation Association, Paul Pritchard and Governor Lowry;

The lifestyle and beauty of the Pacific Northwest draw people and businesses. As timber and mineral supplies dwindle, the communities whose economies are dependent on them turn to alternative and sustainable livelihoods. Every year millions of people retreat to the North Cascades for renewal and recreation. The businesses who supply services and equipment to them are growing. The North Cascades are among the most stunning mountains in the world. Climbers dream and plan for years to ascend [various peaks]. . . Mt. Baker Snoqualmie national Forest receives over 5 million visitors each year. Day hikers, backpackers, anglers, hunters, photographers, birders and climbers they all come to revive their spirits in this powerful and majestic land.¹³⁴

This North Cascades ecosystem which spans the USCanadian border is the life of the Pacific Northwest. People flock here to be inspired by the landscape. Economists consider the environment and wildlands to be a key to the Northwest's thriving economy.¹³⁵

The economy of the region thrives, in part because of the myriad of recreational opportunities. . .¹³⁶

Governor Lowry sees the North Cascades as the 'backyard' of the international VancouverSeattle metropolitan area.¹³⁷ The forests are the playground for the city dwellers. Geraldine Payton, writing for the *Columbiana* magazine, says that the demand for recreation has already exceeded the supply. She is not, however,

do renew will have to demonstrate why they need to be there and why they cannot do the same thing someplace else. Both of these examples bring out the hypocrisy or deceit of Senator Murray and the other promoters of the international park who promise that our disenfranchised loggers will find new careers in the tourist industry. The current policy is to dispossess the outfitters who are using the parks and forests now. Let's look at this rationally. We are trying to pare down the less than three dozen outfitters within the Olympic National Park, but we are promising that dispossessed loggers will find new careers as outfitters and tour guides. How many loggers do we have in this State, ten thousand? fifteen thousand? With the recent curtailing of logging on the Olympic Peninsula alone, how many loggers are dispossessed, one thousand? five thousand? The promoters' claims are less than honest. We are being mollified with positive sound-bites.

134op. cit., "Nature Has No Borders," brochure.

135op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

136op. cit., Gov. Lowry.

137ed. cit., Gov. Lowry.

arguing for 'supply side' economics.

Despite the seemingly endless vastness of the Cascades demand for primitive backcountry recreation already exceeds the available supply.¹³⁸

Since the days of the kings, it has been recreation that has delimited the blue blood from the blue collar. The promoters of the park are seducing us into this new economic structure using leisure as a carrot. Nonetheless, we, the common working taxpayer, will only *work* in these recreationbased industries. It is the elite who will enjoy the leisure.

Furthermore, the elite, the politician and the bureaucrat do not enjoy the masses making a livelihood off them. They do not mind dependency but they abhor independence. So they must prevent this new economic sector from becoming independently profitable. One way to do this is to repaint these retrained workers with the evil colors of 'corporation.' Then they can tax them and get their money back.¹³⁹

Professor Irving Fox laid the foundation for this strategy. He warned the conference delegates against allowing corporate interests to supersede those of citizens and indigenous people.¹⁴⁰ Sen. Murray outlined a plan to get the loggers back to work, then tax them for the opportunity.

As you know, Sen. Dale Bumpers of Arkansas has introduced legislation in the Senate to reform the process of granting contracts for visitor services in and around national parks [SB. 208, the National Parks Concessions Reform Act]. In this time of tight federal budgets and heavy use of our national parks, reforms are needed. We must be especially mindful of the need for strong stewardship. And you, the taxpayers, have a right to expect a fair return from businesses for the right to earn money in the parks.¹⁴¹

She is not very stewardlyminded when voting against balanced budgets. Nonetheless, she declares stewardship to be of paramount importance when there is a good potential for federal revenues. This 'stewardship' will tax the retrained workers right out of their new enterprise.

I just read some bad news in the *Seattle PostIntelligencer*

138Geraldine Payton, "A Proposal to Establish Cascades International Park," *Columbiana* magazine, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 19.

139This money is really not theirs. It is the tax money from the masses.

140op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

141op. cit., Sen. Murray.

newspaper.¹⁴² Despite the growing popularity of ecotourism, the Pacific Northwest is lagging behind in their market share of the tourist industry. According to the article, this lag is due to our State being “the most frugal in the union when it comes to promoting tourism.”

If we plan to concentrate our economy around tourism, we are going to have to give a high priority to marketing this industry. That means that we will have to increase taxes to pay for this overhead expense. This is another point that could be added to the list earlier this chapter, of reasons why this new economy cannot be sustainable.

Keynesian Economy

The promoters claim that establishing an international park will be a boon to the service industry. Dr. Thomas Powers assured the conference delegates that despite the decline in extractionbased employment, communities east of the Cascades have already experienced an increase in jobs within the service industry by 150 percent.¹⁴³ He is a professor of economics, but he failed to assess was why this has happened. Who provides wealth for this growing service sector? There has never been a simultaneous increase in the service sector with a corresponding decrease in the productive sector.

The simple fact is that Western Washington has driven businesses away through the Growth Management Act, wetlands ordinances, and extensive and costly permit and mitigation processes. It often takes as long as five years to obtain approvals for manufactory and warehouse expansions. The simple solution for these industries is to take their businesses to the Eastern Washington communities. The wealth producing employment base is moving eastward and this accounts for the rise of service sector jobs.

The eastern communities will process commercial permits in more reasonable time frames. They will do this without extensive Environmental Impact Statements and costly mitigations. They have good access to major highways, rail and air. Several colleges work cooperatively with the new industries, producing a sufficiently qualified labor pool. This labor pool is able to work for lower wages than the western side of the State, largely because of

¹⁴²Imbert Mathee, PI reporter, “Tourists From Abroad Stay Away From Seattle In Drones,” *Seattle PostIntelligencer*, (03 Jan 95).

¹⁴³op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

the reduced cost of housing on the eastern side.

Maybe these businesses did not move far enough. Had they moved out of the State, the State coffers would have suffered severely. Then, maybe, our public servants would have learned a good lesson. Rather than learn from this clear example of overregulation, the bureaucrats continue to make the people more dependent upon the national government instead of local businesses for their livelihood.

According to the bureaucrats and the media, industry and private enterprise is unable to provide the ‘aid’ that local communities need. It is not enough that businesses provide jobs; they must also take care of people. Since business cannot solve everyone’s problems the government must, “. . . [work] towards an economic strategy to aid local communities around the North Cascades. . .”¹⁴⁴

This is an eloquent way of rationalizing the overregulation of enterprise. It also serves to exaggerate once again the selfishness and greed of entrepreneurs and industry. This is drilled into us on every front so we do not question it anymore.

. . . decades of excessive logging and grazing in both Canada and the US have destroyed habitat necessary for bird, animal and fish species common to the North Cascades.¹⁴⁵

Is it possible that our overzealous, greedy, capitalistic entrepreneurs have overlogged and overgrazed our lands? Have we harvested more trees than we need for housing, publishing, shipping, medicines, food additives, etc? Have we grazed more cattle than we eat? Where have we dumped the excess?

A more important question is, why? Why would any entrepreneur or industry, especially a greedy one, produce more product than needed, when this would only reduce profit margins? Why would a greedy capitalist want to reduce his profit?

Most economists do not understand the dynamics necessary for a functioning, productive society. They have been indoctrinated with the socialistic theory that economies cannot survive without government intervention. So they go along with the absurd speculation that we will replace productive, wealthbuilding jobs with leisureoriented services.

In the real world, services without a raw material can not make an economy. If we are all ski instructors, who will make the

¹⁴⁴op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

¹⁴⁵op. cit., Payten.

skis? Who will mine and process the materials for the manufacture of the skis? Who will build the equipment to make, process and ship the skis? Who will feed the people who are making the equipment, making the skis, giving instruction and taking the lessons?

Look around yourself at work. Every job is dependent, directly or indirectly, upon harvesting natural resources. It requires wood to build a house and to make the paper. If your job is dependent upon a computer, do you know where the plastic case came from? Where did the sand for the microchip come from, or the ore for the copper wire? Maybe you drive. The automobile body was mined from iron, quartz or other ores. The steering wheel was processed from trees or oil. Your tires came from trees and ore, and was processed with heat from fossil fuels. Any occupation we have originates from a wealthproducing enterprise.

These new economists tell us that wealth is static, that it is derived by one person at the expense of another. If wealth was static, would not all our financial resources have dried up years ago? Instead, as human populations increase, wealth has made corresponding increases, especially in free countries where private enterprise is encouraged.

On the other hand, when civil government impedes the harvesting of wealthproducing resources; when they regulate the production and shipping; when they license and restrict the employment of the labor pool, the economy will quickly stagnate. Regulation cannot be justified on economic or productive merits. So they rationalize it by claiming that it is necessary to stabilize the economy.

Rachel Nugent,¹⁴⁶ Ph.D., a professor of economics at Pacific Lutheran University, expands this theory for the international park. Somehow, managing ecosystems will give us stable economies. We will, however, preserve the aesthetics of the environment at the cost of jobs.

An ecosystem approach to managing the North Cascades region is not concerned only with preserving the natural environment for the pleasure of tourists, or even future generations of residents. Instead, community economic enhancement and stability are the goals.

This eloquence attempts to persuade us to believe that 'stability' will be reached when we cease the 'destructive practices'

¹⁴⁶op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

of cultivating and harvesting the natural resources. Once again, their idea of sustainable management is not sustainable yield. Their interest is not in working to secure adequate resources for the future. It is to reduce our lifestyle so that we will be compatible with third world nations right now.

A nonproductive society is not stable; it is stagnant. Mankind is inherently dependent upon natural resources for survival and wealthbuilding. We are innately creative and productive; we emulate our Creator.¹⁴⁷ Our creative abilities are demonstrated through managing, harvesting and processing our environment. This is wealth and it is not stagnant.

Socialism and Selfesteem

There is very little difference between democracy and socialism. This is especially true when democracy is perceived to be the right to determine how to spend the 'collective wealth.' In our nation 58 percent of the people are living off this collective wealth, through grants, welfare, bureaucratic employment, etc. The few producers that are left are being tyrannized by the collectors.

Within this socialistic environment, wealth diminishes. In a socialist economy wealth is static. If there is no wealth producing industry, then truly one man's wealth is built upon the loss of another. It is not the one who collects the public handout who is taken to task. Instead, the producer is condemned for taking his wealth from the 'public assets.' We are brainwashed to believe that these assets belong to the collectors, who are not willing to produce for themselves.

Senator Murray capitalizes on our inborn laziness by focusing upon collecting the public revenues from those who work on our public lands. The modern economist, college professor, journalist, environmentalist and park promoter believes that we need a democraticallyÇ or governmentÇ regulated economy to circumvent this 'static.' Only then will we have hope and find fulfillment in our careers, which will be centered on services to the leisure class. The quality of life's experiences are preeminent to the quality of life itself, or productive careers.

The effort to find and agree on sustainable ways of managing, and in some cases preserving, natural resources in the region must be aimed at maintaining and improving the quality of life's

¹⁴⁷Genesis 1:26.

experiences for those who live in the North Cascades region.¹⁴⁸

People who work hard and are productive, will find time for leisure. However, when our economy focuses upon leisure, we will most certainly collapse. The promoters do not understand this and use ‘democracy’ and the self-esteem of the community to advance a socialistic society.

The sensible principles that apply to longterm maintenance and improvement of the natural environment of the North Cascades apply as well to the human social and economic environments. The most important first step is developing an approach and outlook that allows broad based community decisionmaking that gives outcomes consistent with the forces of economic, social, and environmental change. . .¹⁴⁹

By concentrating on the alleged industrial damage to the environment, the park promoters seek to paint private business as violators of public lands. Profits by private enterprises are portrayed as a threat to our resources. So the democratic solution is to use the rangelands for setting community goals instead of raising cattle. This theory assumes that we will all decide how everyone else will run their businesses and then we will all divide the checks. What happens when the producers don’t want to go to work anymore?

Rangeland Reform ‘94 is a call to take a broader view of how public resources are used and managed. It asks to restore the health of the land. . . . The purpose. . . is to carry out a rangeland management program that improves ecological conditions, while providing for sustainable development. . . . Manage rangelands in a manner that is compatible with principles of ecosystem management. . . . Consider the needs of local communities dependent on livestock grazing. . . . effective public participation in rangeland management.¹⁵⁰

As we mentioned before, Senator Murray has a theory that we “have a right to expect a fair return from businesses for the right to earn money in the parks.” This is given the flavor of being ‘democratic.’ The park promoters use this ‘democracy’ to pave the way for direct governmental control of our industries and all productive enterprises.

148op. cit., Nugent.

149id.

150op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, “Subject: Rangeland Reform ‘94.”

This 'public' ideal will expand to bring private industries on private lands under the control of bureaucratic restrictions. We see the precedent being set with wetland ordinances affecting manufacturing, farming and housing. These sensitive private lands are portrayed now as 'public' because they have a public interest. The promoters are using environmental democracy to promote a self-absorbed socialism.

Are more bureaucracies the answer to our social, environmental and economic problems? We need to understand that our Constitution does not call on the civil government to satisfy the needs of the people. That is the moral obligation of families, churches and communities. Empowered by this democratic ideal, government bureaucracies will grow in numbers and grow in power.

A recent example of bureaucratic growth is the newly established National Biological Survey (NBS). President Clinton called for the creation of this new bureaucracy on Earth Day, 1993. Within one year, the new NBS had 1850 employees, 4 Ecoregional offices, 13 Research Centers, over 60 Cooperative Research Units and 100 field stations.¹⁵¹

This new bureaucracy is supposed to "serve as the nonregulatory arm of the Interior Department."¹⁵² Its stated function, however, is to "provide leadership in gathering, analyzing and disseminating the biological information necessary to support the sound management of the nation's natural resources."¹⁵³ The BLM goes on to explain that this division of the Interior "will offer the essential tools for solving natural resource problems before they become a crisis."¹⁵⁴ The 'essential tool' is the power to regulate. Without regulation the bureaucracy has no power, no hammer, if you will. To claim that any bureaucracy is nonregulatory is an oxymoron.

When reporting on environmental disasters, the news media will try to paint a picture of greed or neglect by industry. They want us to believe that private enterprise does not have the desire, knowledge or ability to prevent these tragedies. So "the [NBS] will produce the map we need to avoid the economic and environmental 'train wrecks' we see scattered across the country."¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, "Subject: National Biological Survey."

¹⁵²id.

¹⁵³id.

¹⁵⁴id.

¹⁵⁵id.

We need to wake up. The national government will not save us; it will only regulate us. Have we forgotten that it was a socialistic government that was rigidly regulated which spawned the Chernobyl disaster?

Economist Nugent is not deterred by regulation nor stagnation in her promotion of democratic socialism. She sets forth the necessary principles for us to abandon our freedoms in the name of our communities' self-esteem. The "three guiding principles" that she sets forth for "community economic enhancement and stability" are:

1. Define achievable societal goals;
2. Accept and share the benefits and costs for change;
3. Consider the outcomes of decisions and processes and whether they are consistent with the community's goals.¹⁵⁶

'Achievable societal goals' refers to the amount of government regulation that the people are willing to endure. To 'accept and share the benefits and costs for change' means to be willing to lose our property, or the ability to use the property. We must also accept the higher taxes that will be necessary to make up for the lost revenues and subsequent higher demands for government services.

Lastly, an 'outcome' is a warm fuzzy for bureaucratic control of the economy. Community goals will be established by consensus, which is not a majority. Bureaucrats will draft regulations based upon their interpretation of these goals. Under this new socialistic 'free market' approach, we weave a larger entanglement of bureaucratic layers than ever before thought possible. Because enterprise is dangerous, consensus will protect us. Then we will all feel good about the additional restrictions upon our lives.

Nugent submits three avenues that "do not result from traditional, isolated economic decision making"¹⁵⁷ to accomplish her "three guiding principles."

- 1) Growing only as fast and in ways that the human population and natural resource availability and regeneration can support.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter. Numbering added.

¹⁵⁷"traditional, isolated economic decision making" is a politically correct term that is phrased such to get us to accept the premise that private entrepreneurs and industry are archaic concepts that no longer work.

¹⁵⁸op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

This is not a promotion of supply side economics. I don't think she believes that the marketplace has the ability to predict and adapt itself to increasing, or decreasing demands and resources. She proposes bureaucratic control with emphasis on data collection.

2) Keeping track of current conditions and progress. . . . adopting 'indicator' or 'quality of life' measurement systems to provide information and guide policy decisions, from land use to educational resource decisions.¹⁵⁹

Political indicators will control resource allocation. Government schools will be reduced from teaching to coddling; with emphasis on self-esteem, sexual confidence and saying 'no' to drugs. Students will be focused on feeling good about themselves. They will not notice their lack of skills for making a living outside the career path selected by the public-private partnership of government schools.

3) As life changes more quickly than before, and local, regional and global influences are more pressing, a system is needed to ensure maintenance for the community's priorities. . . . knowing how many jobs at what skill and income level are provided. . . natural resources are needed. . .¹⁶⁰

This proposed bureaucratic management of the economy will bring industry, jobs and resources under the control of the national government and large corporations. Environmental propaganda will be used to protect large monopolies. Communities will operate as a cohesive unit, one with the earth and organized by bureaucrats.

Small enterprises will be a thing of the past as we eliminate "isolated decision making." Nugent also claims that we "must be prepared and have a mechanism to reject those enterprises and activities that are inconsistent with long-term viability."¹⁶¹ In other words, we must remove the remnant of private enterprise, making all industry a franchise of the state.

Who will decide what is good for the earth? If man's entrepreneurial spirit is hostile to the environment, what is his bureaucratic spirit? Is the character of bureaucracy more charitable than the businessman? Absolutely not! This is out of the realm of possibility and will be demonstrated in the following chapters.

159id.

160id.

161op. cit., Nugent, *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

Bureaucracies produce regulations for managing the masses. They use the technologies of the masses to conform us to their crises rather than to promote our wellbeing.

Eventually the crises will consume life itself. Resource extraction is presumed to be harmful to the earth, but we cannot survive without it. So the environmentally responsible course of action will be to limit people, limit life. If we believe that the earth is more valuable than man, we will accept abortion, euthanasia and suicide as acceptable alternatives. These will be the tools for, “improving the quality of life’s experiences for those who live in the North Cascades region.”

“Nature Has No Borders”

One argument for promoting international jurisdiction over American soil is that the borders are placing the ‘public’ lands in peril.¹⁶² In other words, the contention is that national boundaries destroy ecosystems. At the conference, Mr. Pritchard called for an end to all borders because they are limited by “compartmentalization” and “nationalism.”¹⁶³

Is international protection a revolutionary idea? No! Rather it is the border that is revolutionary. We can start right now to build a revolutionary plan together. . .¹⁶⁴

Why does he claim that the ‘no-borders’ concept is not revolutionary, then invite us to join this revolutionary plan? Maybe he has confused the words ‘revolution’ and ‘revolting.’ He may find the border ‘revolting’ but it is not ‘revolutionary.’ Man has always had borders.

The earth has survived six thousand years of man. Civilizations have come and gone while the ‘ecosystem’ has remained intact in spite of war. The promoters’ own publication admits, “that the grizzly bear, gray wolf and lynx exist at all is evidence of the wilderness of the North Cascades.”¹⁶⁵ Conservationist Pritchard also admits that, “. . . today, in the greater North Cascades ecosystem still reside every known species that was here before European settlement.”¹⁶⁶ Nonetheless, the park promoters want the nations of the world to eliminate borders for the sake of animals, which are not actually in peril.

Pritchard is correct in his observation that animals do not recognize man’s borders.¹⁶⁷ However, he certainly must know that animals do have borders that they jealously and mortally protect. It is a revolutionary idea for us to change our economy and our politics to accommodate the everchanging borders of the various

162“These valuable public lands are in peril. The various parks and forests divide the region into a disjointed patchwork of laws, politics and management practices so that the integrity of the entire ecosystem is at risk.” op. cit. “*Nature Has No Borders*,” brochure.

163ed. cit., Paul Pritchard.

164op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

165Greater Ecosystem Alliance, *For Wildness and Diversity in the Pacific Northwest*, brochure.

166op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

167“. . . that species do not distinguish artificial national boundaries, but move within a range dictated by need, certainly not politics.” op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

species.

The basis of the noborders concept is to tie up large tracts of land. One strategy to accomplish this is codifying environmental statutes dealing with water and endangered animals. Bruce Babbitt confirmed that environmental regulations will have a farreaching role in restricting the right of property. He claimed that passage of the Clean Water Act was a good tactic because it permitted the federal government to assume powers that did not belong to them. He says that this will tie up everything that is wet, and some that is not. The Endangered Species Act is inventive law. These two acts will be used to tie up large regions of land and destroy industry and jobs.¹⁶⁸

Another strategy is to shift our priorities away from the needs of man and toward the needs of the earth. The tool to accomplish this is a young, unproven and deceptive 'science' called 'landscape ecology.'

Landscape ecology is a young science that looks at ecological patterns and processes across large areas.¹⁶⁹

This 'science' gives broad powers to bureaucracies in the name of ecology.

A number of federal agencies and nongovernment organizations are working through the Interagency Ecosystem Management Coordination Group to coordinate and conduct a broad ecological assessment of major ecoregions of the US. The total cost of the five year project is estimated at \$100 million.¹⁷⁰

This expensive assessment will tie up large areas of land. The 'landscape ecosystem' approach is used because it exposes almost limitless areas to bureaucratic and international control. This will be a more effective tool than the archaic strategy of habitat protection.

A good way to protect large, fully functioning ecosystems is to provide for species that run their length and breadth. . . the wild salmon, who require clean water from mountain to sea. . . the

168ed. cit., Babbitt, p. 939, 940.

169op. cit., *For Wildness and Diversity in the Pacific Northwest*, brochure.

170op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, "Subject: Interagency Ecoregionbased Ecological Assessment Agencies." Listed agencies that are cooperating in the funding: National Biological Survey, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Park Service, Department of Defense, National Association of State Foresters, EPA, Fish and Wildlife," etc.

solitary and selective lynx, who need a wide roadless range.¹⁷¹

GEA's landscape outlook broadens our horizons for protecting the wild areas of the Northwest.¹⁷²

Nationalizing Private Property

In the United States, the federal government's first attempt to conserve the region and its resources came in 1893 when the Pacific Forest Reserves were created. Disregard for regulations spawned the creation of the Washington Reserve which contained the Washington Forest Reserve, running from west of Mt. Baker to south of Lake Chelan and the Mt. Rainier Forest Reserve of more than a million hectares. Thus began nearly a century of national, regional and local activity and controversy of how to best protect the North Cascades.¹⁷³

The North Cascades International Park encompasses a significant portion of the State of Washington, as we learned in the first chapter. The business and population centers along the Interstate 5 corridor, from Everett to Vancouver, are included within this park. There are also hundreds of small cities, towns and communities.

Not satisfied with national parks and forests, the environmentalists aim to get control of all lands, including private property. The Growth Management Act of 1990¹⁷⁴ restricts rural residential development. This, along with tolled roads and other tactics will be used to drive the people out of the country areas and into the cities. Nonetheless, the promoters claim that private property will be safe from international intrusion.¹⁷⁵

The Cascades International Alliance, however, claims that, "These valuable public lands are in peril. . . so that the integrity of the entire ecosystem is at risk."¹⁷⁶ These 'public lands'¹⁷⁷ that they refer to is the entire region of the international park and the special

171op. cit., *For Wildness and Diversity in the Pacific Northwest*, brochure.

172id. GEA is the Greater Ecosystem Alliance.

173op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

174Washington State Legislature, *ESHB 2929* (1990).

175"Although no boundaries have been drawn, the proposal will not include privately owned lands. Only federal lands will be considered." op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

176op. cit., "Nature Has No Borders," brochure.

177"The North Cascades ecosystem transcends the US/Canadian border and so must the protection and management of these valuable public lands." op. cit., "Nature Has No Borders," brochure.

management area.¹⁷⁸ There is no distinction between private and public property.

On one hand the promoters assure us that private property will not be affected. On the other hand they claim that we need to protect the entire ecosystem. These two claims appear to contradict each other, but they do not. We, the common people, are confused by the traditional definitions of public and private lands, which are not the same as the bureaucratic definitions.

If an ecosystem does not recognize international borders, it will not likely recognize private borders either. When the laws are changed to grant status to the international park, private property will lose its status. This will be due to the prevailing 'public interest.' Therefore, it is the 'truth' that no private lands will be taken, because our property will no longer be private.

Along this line of reasoning the judicial system has begun to reduce the status of private property. A few years ago, a Federal District Court judge ruled that private ownership of land did not preclude the right of the public to access these lands for aesthetic or recreational purposes. Additionally, a very recent court ruling granted Indians the right to harvest shell fish on private beach lands. That 'right' is preeminent over the rights of the property owner because it allegedly involves Indian treaties.

Steve Gorton warned in his newspaper column, "The proposed ecosystem act [Ecosystem Protection Act] would protect any geographical area the federal government believes is in danger of being harmed by human activity, regardless who owns the land."¹⁷⁹

Peace at the NonBorder

International cooperation for shared landscapes is not unique between Canada and the United States. Even before the establishment of WatertonGlacier International Peace Park in 1932, park staff of the two national parks cooperated with each other in stocking fish and other activities. The purpose of joining the two parks was to establish 'an enduring monument of nature to the longexisting relationship of peace and goodwill between the

¹⁷⁸"SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA: lands excluded from park designation, but of equal importance to the ecosystem, managed to ensure the protection of areas that are vital for the preservation of biological diversity and the integrity of the ecosystem while allowing sustainable economic activity." op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

¹⁷⁹op. cit., Gorton

people of and governments of Canada and the United States.’¹⁸⁰

The idea of an international park and preserve created and operated as a cooperative venture between the United States and Canada is one I can and do support. Our two nations have much to gain from such a park by linking parks and other wild areas that exist on both sides of the border. What better way to tell the world of our two nations’ friendly heritage than to establish an acrossborder park that symbolizes and extends the cooperation that infuses our daily concourse now?¹⁸¹

Governor Lowry made a blanket claim that, “Our two nations have much to gain from such a park.” He never explained what gains he had in mind. Clearly, no nation has ever benefited by removing borders or allowing another country to help them run their forests and industry. We have nothing to gain by relinquishing our sovereignty over all our cities, towns, resources and industries.

Nevertheless, he is not alone in his claim. Many of the promoters have used the umbrella of ‘much to gain.’ If they ever mention what the benefits are, it is environmental justice, biodiversity protection and other such ideas that do not benefit humans.

The promoters of the park claim that national divisions, with separate and sovereign laws, are placing our animal habitats at risk.

These valuable public lands are in peril. The various parks and forests divide the region into a disjointed patchwork of laws, politics and management practices so that the integrity of the entire ecosystem is at risk.¹⁸²

The biological diversity of the North Cascades is divided by a patchwork of jurisdiction, management priorities and laws so that the entire ecosystem is at risk. Overlogging, mining, grazing, roads, agriculture and dams within the North Cascades all endanger what remains of the ecosystem.¹⁸³

To them, mutual cooperation for managing the animal habitat on both sides of the border is not enough.

Although the history of exploitation of the North Cascades ecosystem has been partially mitigated by efforts at protection on

180op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

181op. cit., Lowry.

182op. cit., “*Nature Has No Borders*,” brochure.

183op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

both sides of the border, species and ecological processes remain insufficiently protected to maintain the values that characterize the area. A unique strategy is called for. A new methodology that recognizes the common nature and culture of the North Cascades—one that transcends compartmentalization and nationalism.¹⁸⁴

The ‘unique strategy’ that Mr. Pritchard called for, is the voluntary surrender of our constitutional rights and property within these borders. After all, the United States negotiated the surrender of the homes and lands of Israelis living within the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.¹⁸⁵ Certainly we can negotiate a similar surrender for our own American citizens living within the international nonborders. We have yet, however, to see the Israelis leave their land, and we may yet discover that the freedom-loving people of the United States take their Constitution seriously.

Animal Rights and Roads

Arnold Roth used to draw single frame cartoons called “Poor Arnold’s Almanac.” These were oftentimes political commentaries. I clipped one¹⁸⁶ that defines the lunacy of the animal rights movement. It had a caption stating: “Animal Rights:” and a footing that read: “The Right To Climb Trees.” The drawing portrayed a rhinoceros shinning up the trunk, while a hippopotamus and an elephant were sitting on the ground holding two very bent over branches. This is a perfect picture of the absurdity of the animal rights movement.

Animal rights will be a major strategy used to tear down our borders, tear up our roads and coerce us to relinquish our property.¹⁸⁷ Large quantities of land will be surrendered to the animals and to ‘protective,’ international jurisdictions.

The greater North Cascades ecosystem comprises a region

¹⁸⁴id.

¹⁸⁵Although this land is claimed by the Palestinians, it is possessed by Israelis and their modern suburban homes.

¹⁸⁶Arnold Roth, Creators Syndicate, “Poor Arnold’s Almanac,” *The Herald*, (08 Nov. 1989).

¹⁸⁷“WILDLIFE INTO THE FUTURE: That the grizzly bear, gray wolf and lynx exist at all is evidence of the wilderness of the North Cascades. Lynx need remote, high elevation forests, while grizzly bears and gray wolves use virtually all habitats within the North Cascades ecosystem. Enough land must be safeguarded to support these wide ranging species. Recovery of the bear and wolf populations will require an ecosystemwide plan for restoring and protecting habitat.” op. cit., “*Nature Has No Borders*,” brochure.

thriving in geographical and biological diversity. Rivers originating in the North Cascades flow through Canada and the US irrespective of international borders. Salmon migrate from ocean to river often through two countries; grizzly bears, gray wolves and lynx traverse the 49th parallel without stopping at border crossings. The North Cascades is an international ecosystem; nature without borders.¹⁸⁸

A good way to protect large, fully functioning ecosystems is to provide for species that run their length and breadth: the free roaming grizzly, who travel vast distances and utilize nearly every habitat in the ecosystem; the wild salmon, who require clean water from mountain to sea; the solitary and selective lynx, who need a wide roadless range to find enough snowshoe hare, their main prey; and the remaining ancient forests, who stand scattered throughout the region, sheltering many endangered plant and animal communities.¹⁸⁹

Can you see that this argument can be used to tie up all lands? Promoters use catch words such as: 'length and breadth,' 'mountain to sea,' 'roadless range,' etc. I wonder if we shouldn't be working to protect smaller animals from the 'free roaming grizzly,' who utilizes and obliterates 'nearly every habitat?' What do we do when we have too many lynx and they threaten the survival of the snowshoe hare?

Furthermore, they try to make us connect all forests with ancestry or heritage. This is to make us feel that there is a sacredness of all trees and that their preservation is more important than the resources within the park. Thus, the park lands, public and private, will be surrendered for the 'benefit' of the entire ecosystem.

The foundation of a Cascades International Park & Reserve offers us, as Canadians and Americans, a rare opportunity. Never before have the boundaries of a park & reserve been based on the needs of an entire ecosystem. . . . The North Cascades ecosystem transcends the US/Canadian border and so must the protection and management of these valuable public lands. This can be achieved through a Cascades International Park & Reserve.¹⁹⁰

If these lands are public domain for both nations, the next

188op. cit., "Nature Has No Borders," brochure.

189op. cit., *For Wildness and Diversity in the Pacific Northwest*, brochure.

190op. cit., "Nature Has No Borders," brochure.

step is for this region, of vital international significance, to be 'public' for the rest of the world. I can think of a couple of rare occasions, in the history of mankind, where the situation was ripe for the wholesale seizure of a society's institutional and educational philosophy. In this century, Lenin and Hitler were available at just similar opportunities. Now we are at the third such window. This time it will be tyrants who masquerade as spokesmen for the animals.

GEA¹⁹¹ is. . . Taking the lead in monitoring the federal government's North Cascade Grizzly Bear Recovery process.¹⁹²

Of all animals, the Grizzly is a useful device for confiscating large areas of land. It is purported that every grizzly requires 70 square miles of habitat. The current North Cascades population is around twenty bears, but projections call for this to increase between 500 and 1000. So we import them into the North Cascades to give environmental substance for driving the people out.

Why haven't the grizzlies known that this was their natural habitat and come here on their own? These bears are dangerous and present a hazard to those who use the forest lands for hiking and camping.

This is not to say that humans won't have to make sacrifices. . . Recreationists will have to bear a part of the burden.¹⁹³

Gordon Chandler certainly bore his share of the burden. He is an experienced hiker who stumbled across a grizzly bear defending a huckleberry patch. He was mauled but fortunately survived. According to the newspaper account the incidents of attack have been low.¹⁹⁴ Bear in mind, however, that until recently this area had no grizzlies to speak of. Occasionally there was the stray, which does not a habitat or ecosystem make. Now that we are working to proliferate the area with grizzly bears, the occurrences of assaults upon people will accelerate in direct proportion.

As animals gain more rights, people have fewer rights to defend their property. California State representative Dana

191GEA is the Greater Ecosystem Alliance

192op. cit., *For Wildness and Diversity in the Pacific Northwest*, brochure.

193Matt Norton, "Futile Fear and Loathing of the Cascades' Grizzly," *Northwest Conservation, News and Priorities* magazine, Greater Ecosystem Alliance (Summer 1994), p. 6.

194J Todd Foster, "Hiker Mauled," *Spokane Review* (30 Aug. 94).

Rohrabacher described how bureaucrats impaired the efforts of homeowners to protect their property from the recent fire that swept the area. They were told that it was against the law to clear tall grasses and brush next to their homes. Environmentalists claim that tall grasses are necessary for the protection of endangered rodents.

In addition to this the Laguna Beach council thwarted efforts to construct a larger reservoir that would have provided much needed water for the firefighters. To compound matters, millions of gallons of water were spilled over the Prado Dam, amidst a severe drought, to protect some vireos (songbirds). However, the vireos were not even there. They were wintering in the Bajás.

Victims are looking for those responsible for the more than 200,000 acres and 1,145 homes turned to ashes by the fire in Southern California in October 1993. It wasn't an arsonist or Mother Nature. As the smoke cleared, burnedout homeowners and weary firefighters were pointing to a surprising culprit: environmental extremists.¹⁹⁵

Forest workers ran a full page ad¹⁹⁶ documenting the importance of selective logging to prevent and control fires. They contend that if the timber industry had been allowed to harvest the lumber, the fire that ravaged the Boise National Forest in the summer of 1994, may never have happened. At worst, it would never have grown out of control.

During this fire several firefighters were killed. Now the trees that we preserved by regulation are gone. With wise management, we could have put the trees to good use, creating more wealth and jobs. The families of the local loggers would be better off. The families of the dead firefighters would have been spared enormous grief.

The promoters of the park not only want the people to abandon their property within the nonborders, they want to tear up the roads as well. They assert that the survival of the lynx depends upon undisturbed habitat.¹⁹⁷ They contend that roads prevent the

195Rep. Dana Rohrabacher, "A Bird In The Brush," *American Spectator* (Mar 94), p. 86.

196Forest Workers of the Intermountain West, "One Of These Idaho Forests Was Selectively Logged In 1994. . . One Of Them Wasn't," *Spokane Review* (30 Aug. 94).

197ed. cit., Sean Cosgrove, "The Lynx> Symbol of a Wild Park" *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

lynx from finding food.¹⁹⁸ Logging roads “cause erosion and landslides and provide poachers access to wildlife.”¹⁹⁹

The highest priority for regionwide restoration should be to obliterate roads. . . . we believe the decommissioning of unneeded, neglected and highimpact roads is the most urgent and significant restoration need on public lands in the range of the Northern Spotted Owl.²⁰⁰

Do not think for a moment that they are only talking about abandoned logging roads. These grow over and meld into the environment. The ‘high impact roads’ which are in range of the Spotted Owl, are the very roads that lead to our suburban homes.

198“. . .lynx who need a wide roadless range to find enough snowshoe hare, their main prey. . .” op. cit., *For Wildness and Diversity in the Pacific Northwest*, brochure.

199op. cit., “*Nature Has No Borders*,” brochure.

200op. cit., “GEA Stalks The Forest Service In The New Age Of Ecosystem Management,” *Northwest Conservation, News and Priorities* magazine, Greater Ecosystem Alliance (Summer 1994), p. 18.

The Establishment Of Religion

The United States' taxpayers have spent over 4 trillion dollars on the war on poverty. We lost the war to the welfare state and perennial deficits. We now have a 4.5 trillion dollar debt, amounting to almost \$20,000 liability for every man, woman and child in America. Poverty has increased to the same extent that bureaucracies and regulations have. Now we are proposing to spend as much, or more, on the preservation of the environment.

Dixy Lee Ray and Lou Guzzo pointed out, in their book *Environmental Overkill*, that we have already spent 9.7 million dollars on protection for the spotted owl alone. "The Department of Interior has estimated that it will take 50 years and \$114 million *just to list* the current candidates for protection, and billions more in recovery costs."²⁰¹ Our regulators protect even such minuscule, yet prolific species, as the Dung Beetle.

The Selling of Paganism²⁰²

Emory Bundy²⁰³ closed the conference stating that the wisest investment we can make is "an investment in all the species that we know nothing about."²⁰⁴ His argument for preserving our natural resources is made on the pretext that we do not know the damage we may be doing to unknown species, even microscopic insects. Therefore, we allow our forests to waste away in our efforts to protect everything and harm nothing.

They scrutinize every activity in the hope of understanding every minuscule, secondary impact of our actions, individually and collectively, upon the entire ecosystem. P.J. O'Rourke put it succinctly. He described the international environmentalists as people who are afflicted by reverse astrology. Instead of believing that every aspect of their lives are affected by heavenly bodies, they believe that heavenly bodies are affected by every aspect of their lives.²⁰⁵ Here is a good example from the EPA.

EcosystemsÇ the complex of living and nonliving components

201op. cit., *Ray & Guzzo*, p. 90. emphasis in text.

202The word 'pagan' in this book is not used in derogation. It is descriptive of a belief, or worldview that is contrary to the JudeoChristian principles upon which this country was founded. This includes, but is not limited to, 'Native Indian Culture.'

203Director of the Bullitt Foundation, an affiliation of King5 News (Seattle, NBC).

204op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

205P.J. O'Rourke, *Environmental Phonies*, cit., "Visions of Liberty, Tape #13," Laissez Faire Books (1993).

that function together as a unit in a given area such as wetland communities, estuaries and prairiesÇ form the core organizational structures of the natural world. Ecosystems have a degree of inherent stability which helps them resist some disruption. Significant manmade stresses, however. . . can alter ecosystems, affecting their ability to sustain life, including human life. The quality of life for humans is thus linked inextricably to the sustainability of ecosystems.²⁰⁶

Steve Gorton wrote in the *Montanian* that, “

The ecosystem concept is based on the belief that every natural thing in the world is related, and everything is of equal value.”²⁰⁷ Not only do the worldviews espoused at the conference place animals at par with man, but man is viewed as dependent upon animals and the environment, rather than upon the Creator. It is interesting that those who place animals equal with man do not hold these animals to the same rigid standards of accountability.

Their philosophy is similar to the Hindu Indian that are dying of starvation while allowing their cows to roam free and eat of the finest of the land. During the epidemic that swept India in 1994, it was reported that many of these people were hosting rats and feeding them. “Many of the rats leap onto a platform where food has been placed under a yellow umbrella. . . .while priests chant hymns.”²⁰⁸

The Bible warns that when we reject the laws of God, the animals will have dominion over us and the land will spit us out.²⁰⁹ If we reject God’s mandate to take possession of the earth and fill it,²¹⁰ our slavery will come from our own regulations as we give animals equal dominion. We can rationalize these environmental arguments with compassionate logic, or give it the color of science. Nonetheless, we are going the way of the Hindu, to our harm.

Geraldine Payton, writing for the *Columbiana Magazine*,²¹¹ encourages the progress of modern scientific research to establish pagan values.

Ecologists agree that setting aside habitat is a key element in

206US Environmental Protection Agency: *National Performance Review: Ecosystem Protection* (August 6, 1993) p. 4. For the park promoters’ definition of ‘Ecosystem’ see the footnote on page 12.

207op. cit., Steve Gorton.

208Dilip Ganguly, AP, “Hindu Practices Feed Plague, Officials Say,” *The Spokane Review* (30 Sep. 94).

209Leviticus 18:24-28, 20:22, Isaiah 56:9-12, Jeremiah 5:16.

210Genesis 1:28, 9:1, Isaiah 45:18.

211op. cit., Payton.

strategies to recover species that have become rare or endangered by human activities. Nature has no boundaries, someone has observed. But limits to human use must be proscribed if society is to preserve the greatness of the natural landscape it dwells within. Establishment of an International Park will protect a significant Northwest ecosystem and act as a blueprint for future international protection of vital transborder ecosystems.

The view that we have an ‘interrelatedness’ with the earth lays the foundation for creating a crisis. When we accept this as truth, it then becomes possible to convince us that our earth is in danger and our own survival is threatened. The scientist or the news media have only to dig up another dilemma to get the people excitedly rushing to the national government to repair the problem.

Recognition of this interrelatedness should be the first step toward reinventing our government and societal approach to ensure the protection of ecosystems and natural resources.²¹²

The park promoters are not ashamed to encourage religious values as long as they are pagan. Governor Lowry stated that one of the important reasons for establishing the international park was because, “Native Americans seek the seclusion of wild places for traditional practices.”²¹³ Economist Nugent wrote about the plight of the “indigenous people struggling to maintain their social structures in the face of continuing conflict with newer populations.”²¹⁴ The economists and environmentalists promoting the park claim that expanding the human population into the rural areas is encroaching upon the Indian’s right to traditional religious practices.

To link mankind’s life to the ecosystem is paganism, pure and simple. It is not science. If we accept these claims to oneness with the earth, we will open the door for the interdiction of our freedoms.

Religious Freedom for Pagans Only

We need to start searching for a way to express a new moral vision or spirituality, or what I would call a gospel for the earth that can be attached to all of the existing religious traditions. I

212op. cit., EPA, p. 4.

213op. cit., Lowry.

214op. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

think that our religious traditions need to be redirected to a new covenant. The covenant has to be with nature. Wisdom is the English word for 'Sophia.' Sophia is a feminine holy spirit in the Bible that's some kind of complementary accessory to God. Sophia is all about intuition, all about fecundity, all about gardens, all about nature, and weaves in and out as a figure that is much neglected. But obviously Sophia is a biblical concession to the goddess religions that preceded the Old Testament.²¹⁵

The conference was a smorgasbord of New Age newspeak. John Reynolds called upon the delegates to "rededicate ourselves to the interdependence of all of us and our interdependence in the finite reality of our lovely, delightful planet, our home." Jake Masselink wants everyone, "government, First Nations [Indians] and the general public" to help plan the ecosystem management of the North Cascades.²¹⁶ Paul Pritchard called for consensus with Indian Nation activists and he attacked American industry for destroying their heritage and violating their religion.

The concerns of the native people on both sides of the border can only be voiced by their representatives and we strongly support and seek their participation. . . . Logging roads and dams make many places unsuitable for traditional Indian ceremonies.²¹⁷

Several more at the conference spoke on behalf of the Indian Nations. According to the Cascades International Alliance,²¹⁸ Doreen Maloney called for "standards that provide full protection of natural resources and access for Native peoples." In other words, no resource extraction and no one but Indians are allowed in the woods. Larry Commadore "gave an impassioned account of Native spiritual practices." Bob Pasco, "emphasized the importance of protecting traditional spiritual sites."

Native traditions are deeply steeped in reverence for nature. Hundreds of sacred sites are still in use in the North Cascades. However, logging, roads and dams make many sites unusable for traditional ceremonies. For the native peoples, the North Cascades ecosystem embodies their right to religious freedom.²¹⁹

The logging will end and the roads and dams will be removed, in the name of religious freedom. We already reviewed

215Tom Hayden, California Assemblyman and exSDS leader.

216ed. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter. Less weight will probably go to the general public, especially if they disagree. That is where the 'consensus' tool comes in.

217op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

218ed. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

219op. cit., "*Nature Has No Borders*," brochure.

Bruce Babbitt's claim that we must destroy the dams. The pretext is to save the environment, and to promote religious freedom. He concedes, nonetheless, that Indians will be allowed to own and build dams.

There are not going to be any more large dams in the West unless there is the most excruciating evident case made, or unless they are built for a Native American tribe which has a special claim for water.²²⁰

Mr. Babbitt makes it clear that it is not really the fish that is causing our concern over large dams. It is the politics of power. The whiteman²²¹ is the wrong victim group to control dams. Mr. Babbitt, however, neglects to draw attention to the Indians that are preventing the fish from reaching the dams by spreading nets across the river inlets. It is the nets, not the dams, that are preventing the salmon and other endangered fish from spawning.²²²

Resolving Indian Conflicts With UN Troops

The Tulalip Tribes, of Marysville, Washington, have recently asserted their 'rights,' not only for control of their treaty lands, but to control all privately held lands within their reservation.²²³ Once an Indian Nation, like anyone else, has ceded a portion of their lands for just compensation, they have relinquished all control to that land that is not set forth by title, deed or covenant. If the government capitulates on this issue it will set a disastrous precedent. Those families who paid a fair consideration

²²⁰op. cit., Babbitt, p. 941.

²²¹The 'whiteman' is an easy political target. However, America, is more than the 'whiteman' per se and the public works affect all residents and citizens. The collective 'American persona' is white, black, brown, etc. Therefore, any attack by one group upon the injustice of the American system, flies in the face of all the people of this land and jeopardizes their freedoms and prosperity as well.

²²²Additionally, the Japanese are fishing the ocean with nets that are miles long, scooping up thousands of fish, multiple schools, at a time. There are also problems with Alaska and Canadian fishing practices, which Robert N. Crittenden details in his book, *Salmon At Risk*, Crittenden Biometical (1994). Not nearly as many fish reach the Indian nets as there should. By the time the fish reach the dams, there are even fewer. However, if any fish at all meet their doom at the dam, the environmentalists want all the dams pulled down. This is absolute with no compromise. They won't even allow for nuclear or coal powered plants to replace them. If we allow this, we will find electricity too expensive for the average family to afford, if it is even available. On the other hand, my point is twofold: the hypocrisy of the Indian culture and the dichotomy of politics when it comes to the Indians. The Indians purport to be one with the earth, yet they will scoop up the remaining fish and blame it on the 'whiteman.' Furthermore, an Indian dam won't hurt fish, while 'whiteman' dams do. This is obviously a pitch for control.

²²³"Tulalips To Make Land Use Changes," *Marysville Globe* (27 Oct 94).

for their property within reservation lands will be forced to retrocede their land use rights. This could eventually evolve into a cession of the purchaser's interest in the property.

This is an important issue because:

35* Land is the essentially element of all prior treaties with the Indians.

36* The control of land is the crux of the international parks concept.

Land has been the central element of the transgenerational conflict between the United States and the Indian Nations.²²⁴ As our nation grew from a loose knit consortium of colonies to a bonafide constitutional republic, more and more people filled our borders and compelled the protracted expansion of our boundaries.

As borders expand, history attests that the usual consequence is war. Our land, however, is unique; we made treaties. This policy of treaty making was due largely to the bilateral position of trust between our nation and the Indian Nations. Furthermore, our people were grateful to the many Indians who had fought along with us in the Revolutionary War. Their sacrifice was not to be taken lightly.

However, as time went on, treaties brought with them about as much trouble as they resolved. Modern revised history and conventional political wisdom wants to paint the 'whiteman' as the villain and the Indian as the victim. It does neither party, nor history any justice to accentuate the bad side of one party and the good of the other. The truth of the matter is that both sides have been victimized and both have been wrong.

We can point to atrocities such as the forced removal policy that our nation held in the early middle nineteenth century. This policy culminated in the 'Trail of Tears,' where four thousand Cherokee Indians perished on their forced march west. On the other hand, some Indians made systematic, unprovoked raids upon unprotected settlements. Other Nations made forceful attempts to take back the lands that they had sold for just compensation.

Despite these incidents, both sides usually conducted themselves trustworthily. Therefore, to focus on the outrage will only serve useful ends for the party looking to gain a disproportionate advantage. Even if the exaggerated cruelties were of the magnitude purported, these 'criminals' and their 'victims' are

²²⁴This review of the relationship between the United States and the Indian Nations is general in nature. Because this book is too short to deal with this subject comprehensively, some notations may not apply to specific individuals or nations.

all dead. It is just as ludicrous for the Indian to try to take this land back as it is for the 'whiteman' to assume absolute guilt. We can spend man's remaining future on perpetual 'war trials' and accomplish nothing.

There is no nation and no race of people who are innocent of oppressing, extorting or enslaving others.²²⁵ Regardless the claims of the modern revisionist historians, the United States like no other nation, has the unique quality of:

37* Allowing their failures to be printed in the history books, even to the point of exaggeration as it is today.

38* The people of this land have a low tolerance for prolonged inhumanity. We spilled our blood to end the enslavement of the Black²²⁶ people. Americans demanded an end to military campaigns against the Indians after the massacre of Wounded Knee.²²⁷

39* We are the only nation to enact monetary and legal penalties against ourselves to compensate other races and peoples for past injustices. Meanwhile, we seek no revenge upon those who have oppressed and abused our forefathers.

The sovereignty of the Indian Nations has never been questioned by our lawmakers. It was recognized from the start that the Indian nations had the capacity for selfgovernment and the ability to wage war. These are two inherent qualities necessary for the successful culmination of any treaty agreement. However, even though they are acknowledged to be sovereign, the Nations are legally dependent and nativeborn Indians are citizens of the United States. In fact, their status affords them all the rights of citizenship in addition to the special rights accorded in their respective treaties.

After the Civil War, it became apparent to both sides that the westward movement of the Indian people was not going to solve the problems of our expanding borders. After the Appropriations Act of 03 March 1871, which ended the policy of treaty making,

225For thousands of years the Indian Nations practiced slavery, cannibalism and human sacrifice. After the advent of the 'whiteman,' the Indians continued in the slave trades; trading both Indian and Black peoples. ed. cit., *The New Book of Knowledge* (1991 ed.), vol. 9, p. 178. *The Encyclopedia Americana* (1904/1906 ed.), vol. VIII.

226Not all slaves were Black and not all slave owners were white. White slavery has existed since before the days of the lords and barons. It was prevalent in early America and continues underground to this day. African nations instituted slavery centuries before European traders brought Black slaves to America and Europe. Slavery in Africa continued until the 1930s. In America, there were Blacks and Indians who were slave owners.

227ed. cit., *The New Book of Knowledge* (1991 ed.), vol. 9, p. 182.

the 'independent nation' status was revoked.

Prior to this time, the government began to focus their efforts on encouraging the Indian Nations to meld into American society or become self-sufficient. Lands were reserved for Indian Countries but it was hoped that this duality would fade and all would become one people. Article 4 of the Treaty with the Choctaws²²⁸ stated that the boundaries of the treaty would not be altered "until the period at which said nation shall become so civilized and enlightened as to be made citizens of the United States."²²⁹

This reference to citizenship did not refer to statute, as was done fifty years later, but it referred to the assimilation of the people into mainstream society. It was also the goal of many tribes to abandon their nomadic and 'savage' lifestyles and become pastoral and civilized people.²³⁰ Most Indian people did integrate into society, even to the extent that they intermarried and adopted the American Judeo-Christian culture.

With the rapid expanse of the welfare state subsequent to the New Deal years, our nation is dividing into myriad victim groups. Each one is vying for a bigger share of the entitlement pie. Indian activists are caught up in this movement also. To perpetuate the myth of Indian sovereignty and their 'independent nation' status has been a cruel hoax. It has not been continued out of fairness, but for political expediency. We have convinced many of the Indian people that they are owed, still, for the land and hardship.

We have robbed them of individual responsibility. They believe they have the right to collect checks and entitlements and fight for the sacredness of these sacraments. This is the greatest threat to the Indian culture. It is the very political organizations that claim to be working toward Indian ends that will inevitably bring the Indian Nations to their destruction.

In 1869 the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, expressed his concern that we terminate this "cruel farce" perpetuated by treaty making and establish fair and just laws in dealing with the Indian people.

. . . A treaty involves the idea of a compact between two or more sovereign powers, each possessing sufficient authority and force

228 Treaty with the Choctaws, 18 Oct 1820, 7 Stat 210.

229 F. Cohen, *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*, (1982 ed.), The Michie Company, p.86.

230 This argument was recognized by the Supreme Court as a prominent element of an 1888 agreement in the precedent setting case of *Winters v United States*, 207 US 564, 576 (1908). ed. cit., F. Cohen, p. 579.

to compel a compliance with the obligations incurred. The Indian tribes of the United States are not sovereign nations, capable of making treaties, as none of them have an organized government of such inherent strength as would secure a faithful obedience of its people in observance of compacts of this character. They are held to be the wards of the government, and the only title the law concedes to them to the lands they occupy or claim is a mere possessory one. But, because treaties have been made with them, generally for the extinguishment of their supposed absolute title to land inhabited by them, or over which they roam, they have become falsely impressed with the notion of national independence. It is time that this idea should be dispelled, and the government cease the cruel farce of thus dealing with its helpless and ignorant wards. Many good men, looking at this matter only from a Christian point of view, will perhaps say that the poor Indian has been greatly wronged and ill treated; that this whole country was once his, of which he has been despoiled, and that he has been driven from place to place until he has hardly left to him a spot where to lay his head. This indeed may be philanthropic and humane, but the stern letter of the law admits of no such conclusion, and great injury has been done by the government in deluding this people into the belief of their being independent sovereignties, while they were at the same time recognized only as its dependents and wards. As civilization advances and their possessions of land are required for settlement, such legislation should be granted to them as a wise, liberal, and just government ought to extend to subjects holding their dependent relation. . .²³¹

Congress did not listen to him then and the situation has not improved. One hundred eight years later, in 1977, Congress appointed a commission to investigate the state of Indian affairs. “*The Final Report*”²³² recommended that future policy determinations be based on the following objectives:²³³

- 40* a reaffirmation and strengthening of the doctrine of tribal sovereignty and the trust relationship,
- 41* increased financial commitment to the economic development of tribes and improvement of the standard of living of offreservation Indians;
- 42* consolidation of Indian programs in a new Indian department or agency;
- 43* greater encouragement of tribal participation in planning and budgetary processes; and

²³¹Commissioner of Indian Affairs Annual Report., HR Exec Doc No. 1, 41st Congress, 2d Sess 448 (1869). op. cit., F. Cohen, p. 106.

²³²*Final Report* to Congress, May 1977. The commission was composed of three Senators, three Representatives and five Native Americans.

²³³op. cit., F. Cohen, p. 205, (bullets added).

44* federal recognition of terminated and other nonfederally recognized tribes, including extension of federal services to them.”

The only dissent to the report came from the vice chairman of the commission, Lloyd Meeds, who said that it was “onesided advocacy in favor of American Indian tribes.” He recommended increased state jurisdiction over Indian lands, especially where nonIndian interests were involved. The central issues have not changed much through the years.²³⁴

Congress has continued to increase their spending on Indian programs. Indian Nations participate in the food stamp and the food commodities programs. They receive AFDC, SSI, Medicaid, child welfare services, federal social services benefits as well. Additionally, Congress has established special Indian programs such as the Indian Health Services, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA),²³⁵ Housing Improvement programs and several economic development programs, including the Indian Financing Act which provides capital and pays the interest for Indian selfdetermination projects.²³⁶

Despite the substantial sums of taxpayer moneys that have been invested in Indian selfdetermination programs, these programs are seldom successful. “In 1974 the Comptroller General found that of twentyfive major projects representing a sevenyear investment of twentythree million dollars, fifteen projects had ceased operations and another nine were in difficulty.”²³⁷ That means that only one project out of twentyfive was successful.

It does not matter if the money is given to a specific race, color or economic class of people. Entitlements and government sponsored economic programs do not teach people to be responsible and accountable. Furthermore, it divides people into groups and breeds resentment between the collectors and the producers.

There is another reason that these programs have failed for the Indian. It is the same reason that their dual citizenship and the whole ‘nationwithinanation’ concept does not work. The United States is a constitutional republic with a freeenterprise economic

²³⁴ed. cit., F. Cohen, p. 2056.

²³⁵this agency is not exclusively Indian, but it does retain an “Indian Desk.” op. cit., F. Cohen, p. 701.

²³⁶op. cit., F. Cohen, p. 201.

²³⁷op. cit., F. Cohen, p. 723.

base. Conversely, the Indian Nations are a socialist republic with a welfare based economy.

We have funded; they have failed. Race has nothing to do with it. They are socialists living within a freemarket economy. The reservation Indian has no individual rights to property and they pass no inheritance to their children. All property resides in the tribe. Rather than developing their own free markets, as their forefathers did before them, they have resorted to collecting the gleanings from our tables. Only those Indians who have ventured out of Indian Country have tasted the freeenterprise system.

Of course, the United Nations would be eager to emphasize the plight of the American Indian to bring the rest of the nation into conformance with their international socialistic idealsÇ promoted as ‘democracy.’ Dissatisfied with the failed attempts by the United States to bring selfsufficiency to the Indian Nations, the Indians are now taking their complaints to the UN.

It would be major news if dozens of national leaders testified that the United StatesÇ apparent watchdog of world democracy and human rightsÇ had dishonored United Nations humanrights and genocideprevention conventions. Yet that’s what happened. . . at the Daybreak Star Indian Cultural Center. . . Speaker after speaker from NativeAmerican nations in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest gave searing testimony about a 400year trail of broken treatiesÇ and lack of treaties. . . traditional lifestyles wiped out, stories boiled over, bringing hot tears or icy nods from onlookers.²³⁸

This event was cosponsored by the International Indian Treaty Council. It was a UN commissioned workshop. The United Nations is gathering data on how indigenous²³⁹ people view their treatment by other governments. A worldwide report will be made to the United Nations in July 1995. In the *Seattle Times* news report, Carole Beers quotes some of the Indian representatives:

Some tribes want official recognition. . . but I think they should be recognized internationally. The only thing that will change this is peer pressure. (Gary Harrison, Athabascan).

²³⁸Carole Beers, staff reporter, “Indian Nations Detail Mistreatment For UN Report,” *Seattle Times* (21 Sep. 94).

²³⁹I was born here. So, too, were my mother and father and their parents. Am I not indigenous? How long can small tribes lay claim to vast lands that are obviously overrun by other predominate nations and people?

We've been depowered as caretakers of the earth. . . We don't have one holiday of our own. . . Everything put here for us has been turned into a commodity. . . We have a moral authority that goes beyond legal authority. (Marlene Belcourt Silversong, CreeBlackfoot).

We should be aggressive. . . in demanding that America stand up and recognize where democracy came from (Indian peoples). . . Every time we fight for air, water, birds or salmon, we're made to look like poachers in the night. (Jewell James, Lummi).

We will not dance to the tune of the BIA for federal recognition. . . We were here first and it is our land! We are going to have a few more key cases. (Rudy James, Tlingit).²⁴⁰

Rudy James will sue to get the feds off the backs of his people. That is a worthy effort. Maybe Americans involved with the States' rights movement and other conservative efforts will find unity with the Indian in their struggle to stop the national government from micromanaging our lives.

Jewell James laments that Indians are made to look like poachers when fighting to get food (this is not in the best interest of the animals, Jewell). The Indians and environmentalists, however, use this same attack upon Americans whose livelihoods depend on gathering food for the grocer. It is not an issue of survival. The real issue is the control of the food chain. There is tremendous wealth and political power to be made for the producer, by being paid to produce the food that they are also subsidized to buy.

Do not think for a moment that the UN will be interested in justice. Politicians, national and international, are notorious for using victim groups to help promote their cause. In the end, they abandon them when the politicians' goals have been met. Just as certainly as previous Indian treaty rights have been subordinated to international treaties,²⁴¹ the UN will preempt Indian economic and cultural rights within the wave of proposed international environmental regulations.

It is time for the American people, Indian and nonIndian, to come to the table clean and negotiate workable standards for all people, free of entitlements and victim groups. Calling upon international peer pressure to coerce the United States to accept the Indian Nations as caretakers of the earth will eventually lead to UN

²⁴⁰op. cit., Beers.

²⁴¹In 1930 portions of an 1855 Indian treaty had been abrogated by a treaty with Canada which affected control of Salmon runs. op. cit., F. Cohen, p. 468, footnote 6.

troops in our streets.

People Are Natural Resources

The North Cascades ecosystem is truly visionary. It's also bold and a little ambitious. I know you are only in the early stages of planning and organizing. There are hundreds of obstacles to be overcome. It will not happen quickly. But like all good ideas, this one comes from the people.²⁴²

If the North Cascades International Park is such a good idea, if it truly 'comes from the people,' why are the proponents preparing to wear down the opposition? It is not likely that the idea for the park nor the explosion of environmental regulations originated from the working classes who make their living mining, ranching, farming, harvesting trees, etc. It is more likely that it originated from those who make their 'living' off the public trough and are upset to witness the despoiling of their favorite pristine recreational areas. Most people will not be excited about this plan when they realize that it will place them a couple notches lower on the food chain.

The sensible principles that apply to longterm maintenance and improvement of the natural environment of the North Cascades apply as well to the human social and economic environments.²⁴³

Outcome Based Environmentalism

Professor Nugent's plan to place human social and economic environments in subordination to the natural environment utilizes the outcome based approach.

The most important first step is developing an approach and outlook that allows broad based community decisionmaking that gives outcomes consistent with the forces of economic, social, and environmental change.²⁴⁴

In every sphere of modern society we are conditioned for outcomes, not results. Results are the outflow of diligence and effort, or the lack thereof. It is measurable. Outcomes are the

242op. cit., Sen. Murray. Compare her statement with Governor Lowry's letter to Dale Crane on p. 25. "I am aware that many difficulties exist and a great deal of work must be done to create the political climate necessary for the enactment of appropriate laws in both nations. I wish you well and hope the needed consensus can be achieved."

243op. cit., Nugent.

244op. cit., Nugent.

outflow of consensus. Nobody is ahead; nobody is behind. With outcomes, we measure how we feel, not what we produce.

A few years ago, I read a newspaper account of international comparisons of student testing. Of the developed nations in the world, the students of the United States scored dead last academically. However, there was one special question at the end of the test. All students were asked how they felt about their performance on the test. To this question the American students scored the highest.

Our government schools teach our children the importance of feeling good about what they do—whether they do anything or nothing. It is not important to do well. Already our careers are being measured by how we feel about them. Our usefulness to our employer, our service to our family and community are no longer priorities.

Modern economists, motivated by political and environmental concerns, reject the traditional view of family, morality and work. The view that ‘life’s experiences’ are more important than livelihood comes right out of the Woodstock mindset.²⁴⁵ Our sole purpose is to feel good, love freely and get high. Professor Nugent claimed that “the effort to find and agree on sustainable ways of managing. . . natural resources. . . must be aimed at maintaining and improving the quality of life’s experiences.”²⁴⁶

Any job is as good as another. They see no difficulty with replacing productive, wealthproducing employment with paper shuffling busywork. Their concept of productivity is the power lunch and has nothing to do with logging, farming, building, manufacturing, etc. They spend hours upon hours in meetings and seminars working to build consensus and training the rank and file to walk in the same dark light.

The Ecosystem Protection Paper was prepared by members of the NPR Ecosystem Protection Team with input from other EPA staff. This paper resulted from review of previous documents on

²⁴⁵Isaiah 3:12 warns us that when we parade our sin like Sodom, e.g. Woodstock, our guides will lead us astray and women will rule over us. God made man and women to be uniquely different, equal in worth, but distinct in role and responsibility. Where women tend to be governed by emotions, or feelings, man is governed by discipline and productivity. In rejecting God’s laws we have substituted discipline and productivity for feelings. Our guides, the psychologists and counselors, lead us off the path and women do by default rule over us. Feelings have triumphed over substance.

²⁴⁶op. cit., Nugent.

ecosystem protection, several day long seminars. . .²⁴⁷

We will have a lifetime of seminars to prop up our artificial self-esteem. Self-esteem has become our god.

Most economists spend their time sitting at desks, looking at statistics and crunching numbers or building political networks. They are oblivious to the tangible principles of economic and social reality. They obtain grants and build political power bases by reproving industry for being the destroyer of the ecology. Measuring their success by the size of their desk, they determine that their occupational style is most preferred. So they work to transform people whose occupations are 'destructive to the environment' believing that they will save the earth while providing these people with good paying jobs.

Ecosystem protection is often seen as a goal which is in conflict with other societal and economic values and interests. There is increasing recognition, however, that economic stability is in fact interrelated with healthy, functioning ecosystems. Many sectors of our society are directly and indirectly affected by past and present ecosystem degradation. The Florida Everglades and the Chesapeake Bay are both examples showing how the cumulative effects of human activity can destroy the inherent capacity of natural systems to sustain themselves, leading to significant economic dislocation. The unabated destruction of these natural systems, which sustain us today and our children tomorrow, must be halted. A national effort is needed to promote balanced and sustainable uses of our natural resources.²⁴⁸

When I was in school, we were taught that Lake Erie was destroyed beyond repair. It would take at least two hundred years to clean. In the late 1960s, it was the most ecologically abused lake in America. It received heavy industrial waste from local manufacturing, human debris from local sewers and it received the Detroit River, which brought debris and waste from several large industrial cities. Everything flowed in and little flowed out. It was so bad that it became known as 'Dead Lake.'

It is now reported to be one of the cleanest lakes in the world. "It is no accident that the cleanest lakes are now in the wealthy freemarket West, while the worst pollution is in Beijing or Russia's Aral Sea."²⁴⁹ An austere or repressed economy would

²⁴⁷op. cit., EPA, p.2.

²⁴⁸id.

²⁴⁹op. cit., "Senator Malthus," *The Wall Street Journal*

never have had the economic ability to extinguish the dumping and help clean up the lake.

When Mount St. Helens erupted, it was predicted that it would take hundreds of years for the land to recover. Not only have the lands recovered these short 15 years, but;

The stage was set for a grand demonstration. On similar but separate parcels of land, side by side, one could observe and compare natural recovery with managed and assisted recovery. Within a year, or two, the return of life, both plant and animal, was remarkable, and the differences between the natural and the managed areas are dramatic. Both are recovering, but the public lands, left undisturbed, lag far behind. Nature proved far more resilient than most people expected. Within a year, bracken, ferns, thistle, fireweed, and pearly everlasting dotted the landscape. On the private land. . . experimental plantings. . . were made. . . . Now a dozen years later, these plantings have grown to a lush forest, with most trees between 25 and 30 feet tall.²⁵⁰

The earth has proven to be hardy. Though we may harm it, we cannot destroy itÇ that is reserved for God. As a matter of fact, both of these examples clearly demonstrate how mankind is able to facilitate the renewal process of the earth by exercising stewardship and responsible caretaking. Have the environmentalists and park promoters ever considered that if they used their money and effort to aid industry and agriculture that we could have the best of both worlds? If we worked for expanding enterprise with an eye for good ecology, rather than working for government control and regulation, we could have productive jobs, abundant resources and a clean environment.

Centralization and Micromanagement

First, a broad national vision for change is needed. The federal government must focus this vision. . . eliminate gaps and inconsistencies in existing laws and pass new laws such as establishing a “Green Bank Program,” and other programs. Second, EPA should be a catalyst to the national vision for change by establishing and disseminating a set of organizing principles for ecosystem protection.²⁵¹

²⁵⁰op. cit., Ray and Guzzo, pp. 106107.

²⁵¹op. cit., EPA, p. 3.

Economist Nugent claimed that, “economic enhancement and stability follow from an ecosystem approach, and do not result from traditional, isolated economic decision making.” This means that we take decision making out of the hands of the entrepreneur and place that responsibility in the hands of an allknowing bureaucracy. Eventually, this will lead to government franchise of all jobs and resources and an end to the American dream. We will move away from an environment controlled by man to a society where people are subordinate to their ecosystem, or the bureaucrats thereof.

In chapter three, we reviewed her three step²⁵² approach to bringing the economy under government control. These are the plans that many of our government bureaucrats have for our lives. This is what government schools are teaching our children who will grow up to run businesses or more government bureaucracies.

Her first step could lead to forced abortions or sterilizations if it is determined that the population is growing too fast for projected limits on resource extraction. Somebody will have to keep track of ‘quality of life’ measurements for step number two. That person, committee or government bureaucracy will determine land use policy and educational outcomes and curriculum based upon their view of the needs of the environment. Who will this be, a political bureaucracy looking for power, or a family man, who believes in enterprise and jobs for his community?

The third step will require extensive data banks. This will be for keeping track of resources, markets and jobs, and every child, student and employee. The socialists will train our children for the job that they determine them to be most qualified. There will be no choices. This is the modern doomsday book.

The EPA has proposed to accumulate regulatory powers through the executive branch and into a centralized bureaucracy.

252“1) growing only as fast and in ways that the human population and natural resource availability and regeneration can support. 2) keeping track of current conditions and progress. . . adopting ‘indicator’ or ‘quality of life’ measurement systems to provide information and guide policy decisions, from land use to educational resource decisions. 3) As life changes more quickly than before, and local, regional and global influences are more pressing, a system is needed to ensure maintenance for the community’s priorities. . . . knowing how many jobs at what skill and income level are provided. . . . natural resources are needed. . . . the community must be prepared and have a mechanism to reject those enterprises and activities that are inconsistent with longterm viability.” op. cit., Nugent.

They further propose to arm this administration with the power to anticipate the requirements of the ecosystem and the power to regulate without congressional approval.

The Executive Branch should: 1) develop a national ecosystem management policy which is implemented jointly by the appropriate federal agencies pursuant to an executive order. . . . EPA should be a catalyst to the national vision for change by establishing and disseminating a set of organizing principles for ecosystem protection that can be used by Federal, state and local governments, citizens and other organizations. EPA should also implement structural changes through an ecosystem protection policy issued by the Administrator which establishes ecosystem task forces, and ecosystem plans, and institutionalizes ecosystem management principles.²⁵³

For example, the task force would recommend federal legislation providing agencies with the authority to anticipate and prevent biodiversity loss.²⁵⁴

Under this bureaucracy, humans are viewed as a resource to be managed. To protect the ecosystem, people must live in the big cities, leaving the wilds untouched. Yet they must also be productive enough to pay taxes so that we can achieve 'sustainable economies.' People are a resource to enhance the environment and centralize the civil government.

We have begun this process in the State of Washington with the passage of the Growth Management Act of 1990²⁵⁵ and the 1991 amendments.²⁵⁶ The outcome of these bills will eventually lead to the abolition of all rural development while mandating higher densities within the cities and the 'urban growth areas.'

We have High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on our urban freeways, which essentially restrict 25 to 33 percent of their capacity. This only serves to accentuate, rather than relieve, rush hour congestion. These HOV lanes have proved to be a failure. Yet, our bureaucrats will not admit defeat. Instead, they are

²⁵³op. cit., EPA, p. 3.

²⁵⁴op. cit., EPA, p. 10. There is a word play here to mask the bureaucracy's intent to assume legislative authority. On the one hand they will "recommend legislation," but on the other hand they will have the "authority to anticipate and prevent." It is common for bureaucratic agencies to twist a law to grant them more powers than the legislative body intended. Other times, they will just legislate. If they are not challenged, they have successfully assumed additional powers.

²⁵⁵Washington State Legislature, *ESHB 2929* (1990).

²⁵⁶Washington State Legislature, *RSHB 1025* (1991).

proposing to sell transponders to commuters and charge single occupant vehicles (SOV) for the privilege to use these lanes.

Even amidst the failure of years of carpooling promotions and empty Metro buses, they forge ahead with plans for high speed light rails systems, which will prove to be expensive. If it is profitable, why don't we allow private enterprise to build it and run it? There is more power, nonetheless, to be gained by robbing the people who will never ride it for the benefit of those who will build it and run it.

Furthermore, our bureaucrats have delayed the improvements to several hazardous rural highways. Two of the most dangerous highways in the State of Washington, highways 18 and 522, have been at the top of the priority list for improving. Somehow, the legislature found ways to spend the money on something else. In the 1992 session, they transferred transportation funds to the general budget,²⁵⁷ in violation of our State Constitution.²⁵⁸ The following year, due to public outrage, they put most, but not all, of the money back.²⁵⁹ After these funds were returned, somehow, these dangerous highways were dropped to the bottom of the list.

By creating an appearance of crises, they tried to coerce the people into accepting tolled roads as a logical, expedient remedy. If this precedent is established, this will only aid in the deceleration of rural business and employment, moving the people back to the cities. It is not coincidental that this was proposed subsequent to the Growth Management Act.

Washington State is not alone; almost every State is fighting similar battles. The civil government is no longer our servant. Our State and federal bureaucracies are using people as a resource to manage for political ends.

The US should develop human population policies that are consistent with sustainable economies and ecosystems.²⁶⁰

Ensure field organizations are responsive to the interdisciplinary ecosystem management concept. . . including sound Human

²⁵⁷*SB5972* (1992). This bill transferred \$120,000,000 from the transportation budget to the operating fund.

²⁵⁸"All fees collected by the State of Washington as license fees for motor vehicles and all excise taxes. . . motor vehicle fuel. . . other state revenue intended. . . shall be. . . placed in a special fund to be used exclusively for highway purposes." *Washington State Constitution*, art. 2, sec. 40.

²⁵⁹*HB2287* (1993).

²⁶⁰op. cit., EPA, p. 9.

Resource Management principles. . .²⁶¹

All ecosystem management activities should consider human beings as a biological resource.²⁶²

This philosophy will elevate environmental concerns above human consequence. People will be merely another factor in the environment. Consideration of the human cost of regulations will be subordinated to the needs of the entire ecosystem.

Although existing environmental statutes. . . are based primarily on human health impacts. . . . Regulatory standards thus often fail to consider crossmedia impacts that can impair ecosystem viability. . .²⁶³

EPA must make ecosystem protection a primary goal of the Agency, on a par with human health, as recommended by the EPA Science Advisory Board.²⁶⁴

Data collection on environmental and social resources and needs will be centralized. The National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) has been developed for just that purpose. This data collection agency was established by Vice President Al Gore as part of his National Performance Review and is in concert with his proactive approach to ecosystem management. The NSDI will oversee the “coordination of Federal geographic data activities in conjunction with State and local governments and the private sector; put in place data standards that will foster data sharing. . . encourage coordinated data collection.”²⁶⁵

The EPA intends to direct local planning agencies to regionalize, or consolidate their powers and functions.²⁶⁶ Money will flow toward the cooperative local governments, but ultimately local authority will be usurped. Their goal is to have the power to assess entire regions with fines, creating more government income and government jobs. They will use mitigations, along with the complete removal of private industry and jobs, to returning these areas to their natural state. When local jobs are gone, local

²⁶¹op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, “Subject: Field Organization Strategy.”

²⁶²op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, “Subject: Human Dimensions of Ecosystem Management.”

²⁶³op. cit., EPA, p. 5.

²⁶⁴op. cit., EPA, p. 11.

²⁶⁵op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, “Subject: National Performance Review Initiatives.”

²⁶⁶“EPA should direct grants to state and local governments to form regional planning units around ecosystem protection.” op. cit., EPA, p. 19.

governments will be powerless.

Ironically, it is this local government barrier that is preventing them from accomplishing this destructive centralization of power right now. The EPA report lists several obstacles. Two are worth noting. Under the paragraph “Including Ecological Considerations in Enforcement Actions,”²⁶⁷ barrier number three is the “primacy of state enforcement.” Under the paragraph, “Increasing the Use of Anticipatory Planning,”²⁶⁸ barrier number four states; “EPA has little influence over state and local policies.”

Nonetheless, they have figured out a way to circumvent local jurisdictions so that they will be able to accomplish the wholesale closure of regional industrial areas. They will break it down into small pieces, then bring all the pieces together. Whether this is accomplished concurrently or consecutively, the effect will be the wholesale destruction of private enterprise within the targeted regions.

The Office of Enforcement should cluster enforcement actions on a geographical/ecosystem basis to address the cumulative impact of multiple facilities on ecosystems. These multimedia enforcement initiatives would focus on specific ecosystems (e.g., San Francisco Bay Delta). Ecosystem status and trends on a landscape basis should be used. . . . to direct compliance inspections and enforcement activity at those facilities adversely impacting vulnerable and/or endangered ecosystems. In addition, opportunities for the restoration, enhancement, and protection of local ecosystems should be mandatorily assessed in every enforcement action undertaken by the EPA, and where appropriate, should be incorporated into all settlements negotiated by Agency enforcement officials.²⁶⁹

Managing the Population Crisis

Who will give us the picture of what pristine looks like? Is it more beautiful or livable than that portion of the earth that is responsibly managed by man? Environmentalists claim that people are wearing down the planet.

These are two misguided notions. The Second Law of Thermodynamics proves that everything deteriorates, or gets worse. The ‘natural’ state of the planet is degradation. There must have been a reason that God put man upon the earth and told him to

²⁶⁷op. cit., EPA, pp. 1415.

²⁶⁸op. cit., EPA, pp. 1516.

²⁶⁹op. cit., EPA, pp. 1415.

subdue it and to populate it.²⁷⁰ This principle was rejected at Babel and it is now rejected by the environmentalists and the park promoters.

When analyzing the landscape within an ecosystem management framework it is essential to include. . . . The impact of human occupation. . .²⁷¹

Changing ideas about how to protect ecosystems provides evolving techniques and expanding perspectives for managing the human impact to the environment.²⁷²

As the United Nations Conference on Population convened in Cairo, the manifest theme was the uncontrolled proliferation of the masses. Vice President Al Gore supported the Malthusian viewpoint with an oped column written for the Los Angeles Times Syndicate.²⁷³ In his column, he blamed population growth for the degradation of the natural resources.

The Malthusians try to convince us that ‘overcrowding’ is an evil thing. ‘Experts’ claim that overcrowding breeds poverty. If this is true, why are the sparse states of Central America much poorer than the urbanized nations of Western Europe? On the other hand, poverty is an institution in the United States. The poverty class has increased tenfold, while our population has only increased by 30 percent, in the last thirty years. That is the civilization we get when we pay people to become poor. Government regulation breeds poverty. There is no substance to any theories relating population and poverty.

Some experts claim that we do not have the ability to feed all the people. Our science, however, has so progressed that for the first time in the recorded history of the world, our ability to produce food has *exceeded* the proliferation of the people. Since 1960, our agricultural technology has doubled the output of food production, with fewer farms. The only remaining barrier to feeding the world is war and the intrusion of governments.²⁷⁴

I suspect that virtually all of our current policy thinking about agriculture is very near in time of being totally irrelevant. Major crops such as corn and wheat could see thousandfold increases in

270Genesis 1:28.

271op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, “Subject: Human Dimensions of Ecosystem Management.”

272op. cit., Paul Pritchard

273Albert Gore Jr., “Population is a Major Global Crisis,” *Seattle PostIntelligencer* (04 Sep. 94), *New Perspectives Quarterly*, LA Times Syndicate.

274ed. cit., Ray & Guzzo, chapter 6.

yield through genetic manipulation.²⁷⁵

Despite the addition of 1.8 billion people in the last 30 years, the number of wellfed people has increased, say the report “Food and Nutrition: Creating a Wellfed World.” . . . “Right now, there’s enough food to feed everyone, if in fact it could get to the people who need it,” Lupien said. [John R. Lupien, director of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization.]²⁷⁶

Fear is the tool that is used to ‘educate’ and coerce the masses to accommodate eugenic principles . The information that is used, however, is wrongÇ it is propaganda.²⁷⁷ The earth is far from overcrowded. In fact, the entire population of the world can be placed within the State of Texas with less than twothirds the density of New York City.²⁷⁸

Throughout the centuries, man has tried to answer the ‘problem’ of overpopulation. The ancient Greek and Roman philosophers lamented the wave of the masses and predicted ominous catastrophes for civilization if left unchecked. Of all the ageold philosophers, Christ alone did not ascribe to that opinion. He said that He came to give life and He would give it to the full.²⁷⁹ Furthermore, He rebuked those who would hinder the little children, the small masses, from coming to Him.²⁸⁰

There is an underlying hostility of the elite toward the common man that drives this movement of eugenicsÇ abortion, euthanasia and suicide. In an interview with Ted Turner, media magnate, in *Audubon* magazine, he claimed that, “Right now, there are just too many people on the planet.” He plans for the population to be cut back from the 5 billion we currently have, to no more than “250 million to 350 million.” Furthermore, he claimed that “we are a bunch of pigs. . . and losers.” He said that he believes we should return to spears, loin cloths and human sacrifices. “The indigenous people were the ones who were right!”²⁸¹

Turner has joined the cultural elite. When he calls us pigs, I wish that he would just speak for himself. He has no intention of

275Terry Sharrer, Smithsonian Institute, Curator of Agriculture, quoted op. cit., *Biotechnology In A Global Economy*, US Government Printing Office (Oct 1991).

276David Briscoe, AP, “Food Producers Keep Pace With Population Rise,” *Chicago SunTimes*, (21 Sep. 92).

277Propaganda: *pro pagan* (duh!).

278The population of New York city is 7.323 million people and they live within an area of 304 square miles. The population density of that city is 24,089 people per square mile. The land area of Texas is 267,339 square miles. Placing 5 billion people within that area will render the population density at 18,703 people per square mile.

279John 10:10.

280Matthew 18:6, 19:14

281ed. cit., Ray & Guzzo, p. 80.

giving up his billions of dollars and vast power to become a primitive. He wants us, nonetheless, to believe that we should. Why is it that the moguls with money and power are trying to convince us that our small prosperity is theft? Why do they want us to believe that the environment will disintegrate if we do not surrender our Godgiven rights?

The real reason for this war on the people, this rhetoric of overpopulation, 'save the earth,' etc., is not a fear of ecological collapse. It is a fear of intrusion, the intrusion of the masses upon the privileged. Geraldine Payton, wrote that, "The demand for backcountry recreation already exceeds the supply."²⁸² The Cascades International Alliance claims that, "The burgeoning population and ensuing development increase the demand for resources and recreation on an already beleaguered ecosystem."²⁸³ The purpose of the national parks movement was to preserve recreational areas for the elite away from the people.

In his book, *The Intellectuals and the Masses*,²⁸⁴ John Carey reviews the disgust that most of the literary scholars and writers have felt toward the common people. Most of these intellectuals feared overcrowding and considered the proliferation of the masses to be an intrusion upon their lives.

The crowd has taken possession of places which were created by civilization for the best people.²⁸⁵

[Speculative builders were the ones who buy] all the pretty woods and fields, grub up the grass and trees, and put streets there and lamp posts and ugly yellow brick houses. . . . Everything is getting uglier and uglier.²⁸⁶

The elite became more jealous of the masses after the institution of universal education. The common people were beginning to prosper themselves, move out of the cities and checkerboard the country side with little box houses. Previously, the poor and the middle classes were relegated into the crowded cities. Now we enjoy the same luxuries as the wealthy. This was and is their fear.

The masses were finally taking their place within the domain of the wealthy. This is what motivated many of the 'great' writers and intellects of this century to rally support for the

²⁸²op. cit., Payten.

²⁸³op. cit., "Nature Has No Borders," brochure.

²⁸⁴John Carey, *The Intellectuals and the Masses, Pride and Prejudice Among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880-1939*, St. Martins Press, A Thomas Dunne Book (1992).

²⁸⁵José Ortega y Gasset, op. cit., abridged by Carey, p. 3.

²⁸⁶Edith Nesbit, quoted op. cit., Carey, p. 49.

Eugenics movement and its leading patron, Adolph Hitler. Even before that time, the intellectuals had infiltrated Malthusian philosophy into the natural sciences. The theory of evolution began as a treatise on the supremacy of the Caucasian race. Do you know that the original title to Charles Darwin's famous work was, *The Origin of the Species by Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life?*

Darwin put together the principles necessary for his theory of natural selection after reading the *Essay on the Principle of Population* by Thomas Malthus.²⁸⁷ Malthus wrote this work in 1798 claiming that the population will always grow until restrained by war, famine or plague. Using the principles set forth by Malthus and Darwin, Francis Galton founded the study of eugenics to improve genetic endowment. Shortly thereafter, Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, began to use eugenics for the advancement of the Caucasian races. Adolf Hitler put their theories into practice and began eliminating the masses.

Despite their success in social and scientific circles, their most famous spokesman, Adolf Hitler, managed by his excessive zeal and candor to make such arguments intellectually unfashionable, for a time. Not even Hitler's murderous excesses and final disgrace, however, could stifle the opinions or activities of those who believe that there are simply too many people walking the earth.²⁸⁸

It is this resentment of the intruding masses that has caused the elite to hold the people in such disdain. H.G. Wells called the "extravagant swarm of new births, the essential disaster of the nineteenth century."²⁸⁹ Nietzsche claimed that, "Many too many are born." He said that a "declaration of war on the masses by higher men is needed."²⁹⁰ Flaubert wrote that, "I believe that the mob, the mass, the herd will always be despicable."²⁹¹

George Orwell, eventually deploring the masses as well as his own existence, wrote, "My poems are dead because I'm dead. You're dead. We're all dead. Dead people in a dead world. . ."²⁹²

²⁸⁷The father of the Malthusian philosophy.

²⁸⁸Otto Scott, "America's War Against the Children," *Chalcedon Report* magazine (Jan. 95), p. 3.

²⁸⁹op. cit., Carey, p. 3.

²⁹⁰op. cit., Carey, p. 4.

²⁹¹op. cit., Carey, p. 5.

²⁹²op. cit., Carey, p. 10. George Orwell, *Keep the Aspidistra Flying*.

There is a Biblical principle that all who hate wisdom love death.²⁹³

Is it any wonder that our culture is fascinated with death? We have forsaken the wisdom that founded this nation. We have bought the elitists' theories. Now, like them we fear intrusion and inconvenience. That explains why fewer than two thirds of our babies survive the womb.

It has been said, "The one principle of hell is, 'I am my own.'"²⁹⁴

²⁹³Proverbs 8:36. Furthermore, Proverbs 1:7 tells us that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.

²⁹⁴Cal Thomas, "The Sixties Are Dead: Long Live the Nineties," *Imprimis*, vol. 24, no. 1, (Jan 95) p. 4, quoting the novelist George MacDonald.

This Is For Our Children

Politicians understand the importance of involving the well being of our children when painting a picture of the glories and wonders of their new regulations. So children are always brought into the formula of government regulation and salvation. To sell us on the international park, the promoters mask their intent with words. They want to make us think that we are preserving opportunity for our children, when, in fact, we are removing their ability to provide for themselves and their families.

We recognize that the economic, environmental, and social needs of the nation must be met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.²⁹⁵

This vast mountain wilderness, in its entirety, needs to be protected for us and our children.²⁹⁶

In turn, the government schools are establishing a global worldview in the classrooms. Our children are taught that noborders and world peace are more important than selfish enterprises, such as getting a job and feeding a family. If we continue to teach our children to abandon their Judeo-Christian heritage, their lives and economy will become pagan and third world.

1,400 US public schools have accepted the “children’s global flag” which is flying beside the national and state flags in government school classrooms. Schools which fly the flag have signed an agreement to teach the children the moral code of ethics which includes world government and a pagan form of worship which teaches that “Mother Gaia²⁹⁷ (or mother earth) is the fountainhead (or source) of life.” The children must pledge to “preserve this amazing planet as the fountain of life.” This program is designed to teach children an internationalist mentality, and that they are children of a universal pagan deity.²⁹⁸

Why are we restructuring education? I have heard that it is because we want to develop worldclass students. Most of the

²⁹⁵op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, “Subject: National Performance Review Initiatives.”

²⁹⁶op. cit., Lowry.

²⁹⁷‘Gaia’ refers to the earth. The actual spelling for the ancient Greek goddess of the earth is ‘Gaea.’

²⁹⁸*Evangelical Methodist* (Jun. 1994), reprinted in *Network*, Grapevine Publications, vol. 3, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 95), p. 1.

world's students, however, are third world. We have always had firstclass schools with firstclass results, declining only in these last thirty years. We have been tinkering with education and it is getting worse. Why don't we just go back to what we lost three decades ago? What is wrong with school prayer, absolute values, basic curriculum and discipline?

Some reformers contend that by forming publicprivate partnerships, industry and schools together will produce a labor pool that will excel in the global economic climate. However, I have heard others just tell it flat out for what it is; that industry leaders perceive labor unions to be out of control. Education is the tool they will use to reach the future employees before the labor unions get to them. In this way they hope to obtain an efficient, yet controllable labor pool. Schools will produce workers trained to perform necessary functions, but not sophisticated enough to be entrepreneurial or marketably competitive.

It does fit that the current emphasis on selfesteem, sexual confidence and saying 'no' to drugs would aid this scheme to 'dumbdown' the students. The goal of the student will be to feel good about themselves, rather than to get ahead, or to be their best. Economist Nugent, in her third approach to "economic enhancement and stability," calls for a managed approach to jobs and job training. She repudiates competition and calls for an end to private enterprise.²⁹⁹ For the sake of saving our planet, we will remove all hope of economic prosperity and independence for our children.

Outcome Based Educators

Recently, Goals 2000 and the restructuring of education have drawn a lot of fire from conservative parents. An Associated Press story discussed the concerns that many parents have about the new History standards. One of their problems is that, "They belittle Western Civilization in the name of multiculturalism."³⁰⁰

The same day, Scripps Howard News Service carried a story on the newly recommended geography standards. According to the story, Roger Downs, a teacher from Pennsylvania State University, claims that, "we are not trying to produce a generation of minigeographers. The goal is to get someone who's

²⁹⁹ed. cit., *Nature Has No Borders*, the newsletter.

³⁰⁰Cassandra Burrell, AP, "History Teaching guidelines Draw Conservative Fire," *Times Recorder* (22 Nov. 94).

geographically informed.”³⁰¹

While on a recent plane trip to Cincinnati, I had the opportunity to talk to an educator who was heading for the annual convention of the National Council for Geographic Education. I asked her about the function and goals of the conference. She explained that this has been an annual convention for over eighty years, but that in recent years they have been concentrating on developing curriculum to accommodate the Goals 2000 program.

When I asked her why she would politicize geography,³⁰² she responded that “geography is much more than just maps and cities.” She explained that it was much better for children to be able to look at a map and understand the conflicts that could arise between the countries. If they could learn how to solve the conflicts, it would be more beneficial than learning the names and locations of the countries.

“But why should we abandon the basics?”

“The basics don’t teach kids how to think,” she responded.

I countered that it was hard to understand how the student could think constructively without a foundation in the basic principles of the subject. Then I asked her if she believed that knowledge was changing so rapidly as to render instruction in the basics obsolete. She heartily agreed and affirmed that by the time the student could learn the basics, the national borders would be different.

I had heard this same line from our local school superintendent and the vice super. So I asked her if she would be able to help me with a problem that my district’s administrators were unable to handle. She was interested in the challenge.

“They tell us that knowledge is doubling every seven to ten years,” I postulated.

She agreed with this assertion.

“If change is increasing exponentially, why did they say that knowledge was increasing at this very same rate when I was in school, twenty to thirty years ago?”

She pondered for a moment and then acknowledged that she had heard the same theory for quite some time. “If one stopped to think about it, it doesn’t make much sense that the ratio would remain the same for so long,” she acknowledged.

So I explained to her that I believed that bureaucrats were

301 Kenneth Eskey, Scripps Howard News Service, “Panel Recommends Geography Teaching Standards,” *Times Recorder* (22 Nov. 94).

302 That is exactly what I asked. She did not act surprised at the question nor did she ask me to explain.

trying to deceive us so that we would submit to a wholesale restructuring of our educational system. The crisis would cause us to accept their social experimentation with our children. She looked defensive.

Then I continued, "Maybe you could help me understand something else." Her eyes lit up with the prospect of a second chance.

"History, with the exception of recent developments, has not changed exponentially, has it?" I asked.

"No, it has not," she agreed.

"Take Geography. Excepting a few boundary revisions due to wars and natural disasters, has it changed faster than you are able to teach it?" I appealed. She affirmed that it really had not changed that fast.

"Then take Math. Aside from new math, which doesn't provide any real world usefulness (she shook her head in agreement), has it changed dramatically? Can we no longer keep up with the changing multiplication tables, addition, subtraction or division?" I submitted. She was smiling.

"Aside from graffiti and rap music, has our language changed?" I continued my argument. Now she was laughing.

"Maybe Science."

"Yes," she agreed. "Science has changed considerably."

"Science is probably the only field that we can maintain the possibility that our knowledge has doubled every seven to ten years," I suggested. Once again, she nodded her earnest agreement.

"But," I continued, "has it really changed exponentially, to the degree that we can no longer keep up with the basics? Have the chemical or periodic tables changed radically?" She agreed that they had not changed much, aside from an element or two in the last fifty years.

"Maybe the electronic sciences is where this radical change is taking place," I mused. Her eyes lit up with hope.

"But isn't the most complex microprocessor just a series of transistors?"

I summed up my argument by affirming my belief that a strong foundation in the basics is necessary for the development of true critical thinkers. It is important for students to grasp the basics if we hope for them to comprehend these great 'changes' that are taking place in our world. Then I consoled her that my local school authorities had also been unable to settle my questions regarding these issues.

“Well,” she defended, “it is good that you are communicating with your school administrators.”

Not admitting defeat, her concession was true to form with bureaucrats: They may not be able to answer your questions, or defend their position, but they will always be positive. This is the outcome of years of seminars and conventions.

Backyard Environmentalists

For the parents of project oriented children, the National Wildlife Federation has a program, which is promoted in our government schools. They want our children to register our backyards as habitat. For your payment of a fifteen dollar registration fee, they will process your ‘sensitive area’ into their national database. This will be used by environmentally concerned government officials and non-government organizations (NGOs) who will restrict or confiscate your property for the protection of these new plants and animals that you have attracted.

For example, you may be looking for a constructive, educational project to help your young child understand the environment. So together you raise wild flowers and attract squirrels, frogs or butterflies. You might have created a mini wetland area using depressions, peat moss, etc. Then your child becomes of teen age. They enjoy having friends over and you are considering putting in a swimming pool. So, you hire a pool installer and apply for the permit, only to find out that your backyard is now a protected area and cannot be disturbed. You will never get your back yard back.

Here are a few of the instructions that the NWF supplies your children:

No matter where you begin your efforts to improve wildlife habitatÇ your home, school or businessÇ you’ll be able to see a positive response quickly. Providing food, water, cover and places where wildlife can raise their young will become an even more exciting process as you learn more about the plants and animals with which you share your part of the planet. As you improve your yard, please consider joining the tens of thousands of others. . . who have become certified in our. . . program.³⁰³

When your application is received, it will be reviewed by naturalists. . . . When your yard is certified, you will receive a

³⁰³Craig Tufts, Naturalist and Manager, *Backyard Wildlife Habitat Program*, letter to “Dear Friends,” National Wildlife Federation.

handsome, personalized certificate from the National Wildlife Federation. . . . your yard will be assigned a unique number, and it will be entered into our computerbased National Register of Backyard Wildlife Habitats.³⁰⁴

A form is given to describe plantings, feeders, watering and visitors, cover, places to hide, places to raise young animals, etc. . . .

Please include a rough sketch or landscape diagram of your yard. . . . Remember to submit the \$15 Program Enrollment. . . . The health of our environment depends on how we treat it. . . . try to put the landscaping suggestions below into practice. . . . eliminate most turf grasses. . . . grow native plants. . . . If you don't have property or want to work on another. . . . consider adopting a school, a business, a zoo, botanical garden, homeowner's common ground, natural area or nursing home. If you're involved with a habitat in a nontraditional setting, let us hear about it.³⁰⁵

It is time for parents to become actively involved in the instruction of their children. If you do not have time to find out what the government educators are teaching your children, you may find yourself spending your time and assets trying to reclaim your progeny and your property.

Spending Our Children's Inheritance

According to the Washington State Constitution,³⁰⁶ the bulk of the money for school construction comes from the sale of timber on State lands. How do we finance these capital improvements if we do not cut any trees? Even before the international parks are established, the Department of Natural Resources believes that they are able to supersede State statute. With no coercion from the legislature, this bureaucracy has decided that it is in the best interest of the State to produce less yield. They blame this upon the 'changing regulatory requirements,' but they make the regulations.

³⁰⁴*Your Special Place in the Backyard Wildlife Habitat Program*, National Wildlife Federation.

³⁰⁵*Backyard Wildlife Habitat Program, Application for Certification*, National Wildlife Federation.

³⁰⁶*Washington State Constitution*, art. 9, sec. 3. "There is hereby established the common school construction fund to be used exclusively for the purpose of financing the construction of facilities for the common schools. The sources of said fund shall be: (1) Those proceeds derived from the sale or appropriation of timber. . . ."

State statute only requires the department to harvest timber at a 'sustainable yield,' which is a more flexible formula. . . . The department historically has adopted the more rigorous. . . and does not plan to change this policy. . . . timber sales and harvesting activities must respond to changing regulatory and environmental requirements.³⁰⁷

The simple fact is that we now have less money to build new schools. The revenue will have to be gained another way, which means that taxes will have to be raised. This could be another listing to the reasons why environmentalism cannot sustain an economy in chapter three.

What have we done for our children? Earlier in this chapter, I mentioned that as parents, we would be willing to endure regulations and taxes for the sake of our young. When it comes to the larger picture, however, we forget all about their futures. We go along with taxes, regulations and bad court decisions as long as we do not directly feel any pain because someone else will pay for it. We are ignoring the impact upon our children's generation and forgetting that they will live under these taxes, regulations, bad laws and debt.

What I am getting at is that we are unselfish with our children, but inconsiderate toward other taxpayers. Wake up; our children are the 'other taxpayers.'

Over and over, we have heard the phrase, 'the children are our future.' I would like to correct that right now. We are the children's future!! Ç and we are spending it. We are squandering their potential on our gratification. We have duped ourselves to believe that the children are our future to justify wanton spending. The spending has accomplished nothing and it is destroying their future. We can chose to give them hope and prosperity, but we have given them debt and death. Then we have the audacity to mollify them with empty slogans such as, 'just say "no" to drugs.'

There is a passage in the Bible that says, "A good man leaves an inheritance for his children's children."³⁰⁸ We have forgotten that principle and have opted for the philosophy of the bumper sticker that says, "We are spending our children's inheritance." Individually and collectively, it is nothing to be proud of. If we truly love our children, we will foreclose the blank check that we have given our government. We will also handle our resources responsibly so that we can take back the raising of our

³⁰⁷Washington State Department of Natural Resources, *Final EIS For The Forest Resource Plan*, (July 1992), p. 26, 31.

³⁰⁸Proverbs 13:22 (NIV).

children ourselves.

Scientists Will Be Sociologists

If the entrepreneurs and arbitrageurs were the heroes of the '80s, we hope scientists and engineers will be the stars of the '90s.³⁰⁹

We are constantly bombarded with stories that our carelessness, greed and excess have led to irreparable damage of our “lovely, delightful planet, our home.”³¹⁰ The media tries to persuade us that industry and entrepreneurs create disaster. It is only the politically correct environmental scientist who has the knowledge and wisdom to restore balance to our planet.

The National Biological Survey will produce the map we need to avoid the economic and environmental ‘train wrecks’ we see scattered across the country. NBS will provide the scientific knowledge America needs to balance the compatible goals of ecosystem protection and economic progress.³¹¹

A stronger link between science and policy is stressed. . . . The concept of ecosystem sustainability involves many areas of policy, for example, economics and land use planning.³¹²

So scientists will become the policy makers for all environmental considerations, including land use and economics. That is, they will decide where we live and which jobs are relevant to sustaining a balanced environment and economy.

The scientist will determine what a ‘natural state’ is, if there ever was such a state. It does not matter that a natural state may be worse³¹³ than a responsibly managed environment. The scientist will go about measuring the human impact to the environment, using Indian cultures and pagan traditions that have been handed down by word of mouth. They will decide how to get back to the natural, or how to establish our interconnection with Mother Earth.

309Mary Ann Liebert, *Genetic Engineering News*, magazine (Jan 1990), quoted in *Biotechnology in a Global Economy*, US Government Printing Office (Oct 1991).

310description borrowed from John Reynolds, Deputy Director, National Park Service.

311op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, “Subject: National Biological Survey.”

312op. cit., EPA, p. 5.

313The earth is under the Second Law of Thermodynamics which proves that all things degenerate. Nothing improves without tending. Environments where man does not tend will be overcome with rot. Periodically God cleanses these regions with fire.

When analyzing the landscape within an ecosystem management framework it is essential to include two considerations: 1. The landscape in an historical context. . . . how long the current landscape has been as it is now, as well as what forces caused it to be shaped to its present form. . . . 2. The impact of human occupation. . . . Not only can the social science broadly considered provide a human dimension to biological analysis, but they can answer critical questions about the impact on present human communities of decisions about land use. This includes issues of environmental justice, impacts on specific cultural values, such as Native American values. . . . the whole point about studying the human past is to learn from it what past cultures have to teach us about our interface with the environment.³¹⁴

A Young Science

To establish the parks the promoters will detour our scientific thinking away from the needs of man and focus upon the needs of the earth. Their scientists have been documenting this new approach to ecology for the last *two years*. They claim to have developed a *comprehensive approach*, called 'landscape ecology,' that will solve the environmental crisis. Their aim is nothing short of political activism.

Landscape ecology is a young science that looks at ecological patterns and processes across large areas.³¹⁵

GEA³¹⁶ is:

- 45* Presenting a comprehensive ecological assessment of the regionÇ developed during two years of data collection, synthesis, and scientific analysis.
- 46* Articulating an ambitious proposal, based on this assessment, for protecting the region's biodiversity.
- 47* Helping local conservation groups translate the proposal into effective grassroots campaigns.³¹⁷

Here is an overview of the landscape approach to ecological studies. Remember, this has been put together using two years' research.

314op. cit., BLM, *Internal Working Document*, "Subject: Human Dimensions of Ecosystem Management."

315op. cit., *For Wildness and Diversity in the Pacific Northwest*, brochure.

316GEA is the Greater Ecosystem Alliance.

317op. cit., *For Wildness and Diversity in the Pacific Northwest*, brochure.

A landscape approach examines how a watershed, or an area as large as the Greater North Cascades Ecosystem, changes over space and time, from high and low elevation, season to season, treetop to groundwater. It embraces the relationships between all elements and processes that make up an area: the natural mosaic of habitats, from low elevation forests to alpine meadows, and the largescale ecological processes that continually create these patterns, such as the flow of water and the course of wind and fire. As such, it provides a comprehensive basis for ecosystem conservation.³¹⁸

Can an army of scientists develop comprehensive policies that truly takes in all of these considerations within a lifetime? Yet we are supposed to believe that the scientists have been able to develop a comprehensive study, based upon this model, in this short amount of time.

They have zeal but lack knowledge. They have rushed in their enthusiasm.³¹⁹ Their cause for excitement is what Paul Pritchard describes as, “an opportunity to enact a new paradigm for ourselves and the land we live in. . . . Both the United States and British Columbia have more environmentally sensitive administrations.”³²⁰ The generation that told us to ‘turn off, tune in and drop out,’ is now in control. They are our scientists and politicians. We are, as conservationist Pritchard said, “at the dawn of a new era.”³²¹

Stretching the Truth

The promoters are careful with words, trying to persuade us to voluntarily accept their environmental tyranny. The environmental scientists mask the truth with doublespeak. That is why they use catch phrases such as ‘broadly considered,’ or ‘stretching.’

That is, if we stretch a bit. If we draw together patches of wilderness, across the jurisdictional and political boundaries that have divided them; if we extend protection to controversial species. . . if we embrace a new ethic that frames human needs within the needs of the land, and a new science that casts an eye to conservation rather than exploitation. If we take a few bold steps. . .³²²

318id.

319Proverbs 19:2

320op. cit., Paul Pritchard.

321id.

322op. cit., *For Wildness and Diversity in the Pacific Northwest*, brochure.

This 'stretching' is not merely gathering large sections of land or expanding our horizons. It is the act of bringing into the conversation the controversial species. In other words, these are species that do not need protection. By attributing to them a simple 'indicator' status, they are able to shut down entire industries and communities.

It is a new ethic that places man in a subordinate position on the food chain. It is a new science, not based upon fact, but based upon the politics of environmentalism. Their 'few bold steps' are not steps of faith, they are grasps for power. This science embodies the 'truths' of their political philosophy, justifying more money and more regulations, and it justifies their religion, the worship of Mother Earth.

It doesn't matter what is true; it only matters what people believe is true.³²³

Evolution or Conservation?

Evolutionary theory purports that all species evolved through natural selection, or survival of the fittest. Thomas Galton's theory of eugenics helped Darwin fill in the gaps of natural selection. Galton's premise was that the dominance of the good traits will purify existing species or establish new ones. The idea behind evolution is that every species evolves to a higher form.

Throughout the ages, however, there is one common denominator of all 'life forms.' That commonality is death. The Second Law of Thermodynamics proves that all things degenerate until they die. Evolution cannot conquer death.

We glorify the natural animal and marvel at their oneness to the earth. We worship the wolf and we wear their teeshirts. Some claim the wolf is trying to communicate the importance of saving the planet. If we would just listen they would tell us how to do it.³²⁴

Wolves and grizzly bears, however, are two of the most destructive animals. Wolves run in packs and will kill for sport,

323op. cit., Ray & Guzzo, p. 172. Quoting Paul Watson, cofounder of Greenpeace.
324I have often wondered, if the wolf is trying to tell man how to save the earth, wouldn't the other animals be trying to do the same thing? We have two dogs, three cats, eight chickens and a half dozen sheep. Not one of these animals has blockaded my truck to prevent me from driving off, spewing out carbons and chlorofluorocarbons, polluting the earth. None of them have shown me how to recycle. In fact, my dogs rob from the compost. They bring trash from the highway and chew it up on my front lawn. Then they litter all over the yard. My dogs are satisfied to have me scratch their ears and rub their bellies. My cats want me to massage their necks. My chickens want me to leave them alone and my sheep love a bucket of grain.

leaving the carcass to rot. The grizzly bear devastates trees and underbrush in its way, often destroying the habitat of other less powerful creatures. The grizzly, also, will kill for sport or anger. These two, of all animals, are fittest to survive. Is it not antithetical to evolutionary principles to award environmental protection to these creatures?

If the theory of natural selection is true, then wouldn't we be inhibiting the arrival of hundreds of thousands of new species by preventing the extinction of the least fit to survive? Doesn't it seem strange that we worry about extinction when we have a plentiful supply of amoebas to start the process all over again?

The theory of environmentalism is antithetical to the theory of evolution. We cannot on the one hand claim that there is a process of natural selection; that the species evolve to higher forms and that the fittest of these survive. Then, on the other hand, claim that we must protect these 'endangered' species. If evolution is fact, then it follows that 'endangered' species were designed to be that way. This means that we are interfering with the natural processes, maybe Mother Nature herself, to protect what has been relegated to extinction.

An Unholy Union

After the fall of man, God told Adam that by the sweat of his brow, he would eat his food.³²⁵ As late as the early 1800s, farming required 73.6 percent of the labor force. By 1980, it had dropped to 2.7 percent.³²⁶

Now that food production is not an integral part of life for most people, they are no longer connected to the soil. The popular mode to refresh this physical connection is through recreation. Many of these people find their pleasures in aesthetics, rather than industry. They are convinced that any alteration debases the natural resources. It horrifies the recreationists to see what the producers have done to this pristine earth.

The media bombards us with daily accounts of greed, excess and destruction. They try to persuade us that this planet is being destroyed beyond repair. This 'information' we receive from them is a Malthusian worldview. The media wants us to believe that we have too many people on the earth.

In their book, *Environmental Overkill*, the authors give an example of this philosophy as professed by Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University.

1. We must institute the Communist Chinese system of compulsory abortion;
2. We must return to the state of endless drudge, because the labor saving devices consume fossil fuels, poisoning the earth;³²⁷
3. Business air travel must be replaced by closed circuit television;
4. Automotive based family vacations must cease;
5. The rich and intelligent must not propagate, poverty is beautiful;
6. Responsible parents will have only 1.5 children.³²⁸

Christians can be especially susceptible to this worldview when the arguments are painted with the color of compassion and protection. This is because twentieth century Christians are less prone to read the Bible. So spiritual discernment comes from

³²⁵Genesis 3:19.

³²⁶ed. cit., Ray & Guzzo, p. 69.

³²⁷This is also found in Agenda 21, sec. 7.69.

³²⁸ed. cit., Ray & Guzzo, pp. 7778.

feeling and reasoning rather than from the Word of God. Compounding this problem, many church pastors, acting as builders, strive for physical growth rather than spiritual. So they paint Jesus as the Christ of love and compassion, disregarding personal obedience, to attract the masses.

This explains why liberal Christians will fight for government sponsored social programs.³²⁹ They have forgotten Christ's command to personally look after the poor.³³⁰ We are to make voluntary allotments to help the poor, the widow and the orphan.³³¹ He never told us to rob from the unwilling to give to the ungrateful.

The personal dynamic of willing people, churches and communities helping the needy, incorporates the necessary element of responsibility. With personal accountability few would be able to abuse charity. Those who are capable would have to work if they want to eat.³³² Charity is the role of the church and personal obedience.

When it comes to the environment there are Christians who are sensitive about the destruction of God's creation. They enter the environmental movement hoping to resolve problems that they believe are caused by greed and excess. Unwittingly, they align themselves with the Malthusians. This is an unholy alliance. Environmentalism is couched in religious language to sway the church masses to buy into pagan religions and socialist politics.

329See the instruction in Jeremiah 7:411. We cannot confuse government provision with God's. We cannot say that we trust God if we look to the civil government, or false gods, for help. Furthermore, government compassion is theft. Individual compassion is obedience to God.

330Proverbs 19:17, 31:89, Luke 11:3941, 12:3234, 14:1214. These are just a few examples.

331Deuteronomy 14:2829, 24:1921, Isaiah 1:17, Jeremiah 22:3.

332Proverbs 10:4, 26:15, Ecclesiastes 2:24, 8:15, 2Thessalonians 3:10.

Christian Environmentalism

Years ago I belonged to what was claimed to be a Christian environmental group. Their newsletters, however, were little different from the secular groups. So I contacted the organizer and he told me that he was a member of the Audubon Society. He claimed to be an environmentalist in the Audubon tradition, but he was looking to lend a Christian perspective to it. He felt that Christians should be leading in the work of saving the earth. We should do it for the 'right' reasons and Christ should get the glory. At this point, I decided to search the Scriptures instead of taking another Christian's word about my environmental responsibility.

Now several 'Christian' groups are jumping onto the environmental bandwagon. Many organizations which used to evangelize and care for the needy are now specializing in environmental problems. They are promoting pagan and secular groups that are working actively for the confiscation of private property, elimination of mining, timber harvesting and ranching and the establishing of international parks.

Recently, I received a complimentary newsletter from one of these 'Christian' environmental groups. The headline was: "Target Earth, Mission Groups Join Forces For 1995."³³³ The subheading under the newsletter title describes the publication to be, "Information on caring for creation from a Biblical Orientation."

The article had nothing to do with evangelism.³³⁴ In fact, no Scripture was to be found anywhere in the publication. As I read the newsletter, it became clear that they were bent upon saving the earth, not the souls of people. They tried to justify, or even disguise, their pagan philosophy by using liberal doses of key words, such as, 'God' and 'Christian.'

This group recently hosted a youth leadership camp. "Much attention was given to the linkages between ecological questions, world health, hunger issues, population growth, sustainable

³³³*Christian Environmental News*, Christian Environmental Association, Vol. 1, No. 10 (Sep. 94).

³³⁴I realize that this book, also, is not evangelistic. However, every cause, or issue, that the Christian becomes involved in must pass Scriptural muster. The principles must be Biblically accurate and the purpose, if not evangelism, must be discipleship—training the remnant (Isaiah 8:13-16, Jeremiah 23:14, Amos 5:14-15, Matthew 28:19, Acts 14:21-22, 15:16-18, 18:23). My criticism of this group stems from the fact that, although they are targeted toward Christians, they have omitted Scripture. Furthermore, they are espousing a philosophy that cannot be Biblically defended and they are deceiving young Christians, elevating environmental issues above issues of the heart. In fact, this is done at the expense of the heart, just as Paul warned in Acts 20:30.

lifestyles, economic policy, and international development. Each invitee had a demonstrated interest in and capacity for multiissue thinking, and the retreat's proceedings regularly underlined *the importance of this integrated approach to the complexities of modern living.*"³³⁵

Why do we think that life is so much more complex than 2000 years ago? Is it more complicated or is this argument a ploy to make the simple construction of Biblical law to be irrelevant?

"If the senior leaders of the North American Church were assembled here, what would you say to them?" This was a question posed at the youth leadership camp. It is an important question for the future leaders of the Christian church. So, should this question be answered according to our feelings, or is there a Scriptural basis for this? I think Jesus Christ answered that question. One day He called the future Christian church leaders together. He showed them the crowds that were harassed and tired.³³⁶ He told them that these people are sheep without a shepherd. He said that the fields are white and ready for harvest, pray that God will send out more workers to harvest.³³⁷

Christ was not talking about the environment. He was referring to souls. Never did Christ or a prophet warn the people that they were overlogging, overranching, overfarming, destroying wetlands, etc. Wherever the Scriptures talk about pollution or defiling the land, it is clear that pollution originates within the heart.

If we could clean up the planet, but failed to reach the heart of man, the planet is most certainly lost. Yes, there is one place where God tells us to 'think globally,' when Christ commanded us to disciple all nations.³³⁸ God's interest is to redeem a lost humanity, not a lost planet. He has no love for the land. He destroyed it once with a flood.³³⁹ He will destroy it again with fire.³⁴⁰

We can try to make environmentalism sound Godly, but God and the world cannot be joined! God does not call us to pray for the physical earth nor to work for its restoration. Trying to find

335Mark Cerbone, "Ring In The Future," op. cit., *Christian Environmental News*, p. 6. Emphasis added.

336Probably from trying to make a living while enduring bureaucratic regulations and paying confiscatory taxes.

337Matthew 9:35, Luke 9:2, John 4:35.

338Matthew 28:18-20.

339Genesis, chapters 6-11.

340Isaiah 24:1-3, 2Peter 3:10-12.

oneness³⁴¹ with the earth is to set ourselves apart for Gaea, or the devil.³⁴² No one can serve two masters.³⁴³ We can choose to be one with the earth, which leads to death, or we can choose to be one in Christ, which leads to life.³⁴⁴ It is impossible for Christians to ‘rescue the earth without worshipping nature.’

I should mention at his point that I do pick up litter, sort my trash and recycle. This is done out of a civic obligation as opposed to an intimate love for, or worship of, the earth. It is not done out of a fear that the earth will be doomed if I don’t do my part. However, I wonder if decay may not be better for the earth than reuse, in some cases.³⁴⁵ In any event, stewardship is important, but the souls of our family, community, business friends, etc. is a much more serious matter.

If our involvement in the environmental movement is to rid the world of greed and excess, we need to consider a few ideas:

- 48* Selfishness and greed are unhealthy and excessive but they are not limited to people of free markets and individualism. In fact, these traits can be quite accentuated in a democratic tyranny where the community decides how big to make the pot and how to spend it.
- 49* Training our children to be Christian socialists will not solve the evils of the world. This will only contribute to society’s paganism, in violation of Matthew 28:18-20.
- 50* We are responsible to fight innate evil by living Godly lives, not imposing physical restrictions on the people we perceive to be selfish or greedy.
- 51* God calls us to be productive.³⁴⁶ Environmentalism is restrictive and counterproductive, both materially and spiritually. We do not need a nation of bureaucrats, analyzing and regulating our every action. It is wrong for us to impute our ideals upon others at the expense of their Godgiven rights, jobs and money.

341The only ‘oneness’ with the earth that we have is the probability of death. We came from the dust and to the dust we will return (Genesis 3:19).

342Matthew 16:25-26, 2Corinthians 6:14-17.

343Matthew 6:24, Luke 16:13.

344Deuteronomy 30:19-20, Matthew 10:39, John 3:36.

345I am opposed to our use of landfills, where we save the evidence for the next four centuries wrapped in pipe and plastic. That is not ‘decay.’ Air is more renewable than land and our filtering systems are so far advanced that pollution from incineration plants would be minuscule. The scientists, bureaucrats and environmentalists know this, but there is considerable less profit, less taxing power and fewer crises from burning trash.

346Genesis 1:28, 9:1-7, Deuteronomy 8:18, 26:12, John 15:15.

52* While work environments should not become dump sites for trash and toxins, we cannot expect them to remain spotless, nor pristine.³⁴⁷ You cannot expect to keep the barn unsullied with animals in it. The same goes for equipment, if you want to keep them spotless you can't keep them working, etc.

53* None of this is meant to mean that we can ignore negligent polluters either. We are supposed to be responsible stewards, but this calls for reasonableness. We have a Common Law responsibility to protect our neighbor from our pollution. For violators we have Common Law remedies. We do not need to empower admiralty bureaucracies to intrude into our lives and property to enforce this.

It is clear in the Word of God that the law we live by affects the environment around us. If we live according to God's law, He will protect the land. When a society abandons the principles of God, the earth around them will spit them out of the land and be filled with pollution.³⁴⁸ How long will we ignore God's warning to heed Biblical laws and live accountable lives before Him?

Biblical Answers to Environmental Problems

We have no reason to apologize for making our livelihoods off the resources of this great land that God has given us. God has gifted man with the ability to produce from the resources that He provided.³⁴⁹ Our creativity is a reflection of the One who created us. We honor Him by being stewardly and productive.

After God created Adam, He instructed him to name the animals.³⁵⁰ God named all the stars,³⁵¹ so He could have named the animals Himself. He chose instead to delegate this authority to man. He placed the animals under the dominion of man. Naming the animals is the first act of environmental management mentioned in the Bible. The act implies authority and dominion, because the one who names is superior to the one who is named. Naming the animals also infers understanding and responsibility, because Adam would have to know the animals in order to name them. The act

347Proverbs 14:4.

348Leviticus 18:28.

349Genesis 1:28.

350Genesis 2:19-20.

351Psalms 147:4.

endows that animal to his care.

The first occupations that the Bible mentions are ranching and farming.³⁵² He gifted TubalCain, while Adam was still alive, with advanced metallurgical abilities.³⁵³ He gave us plants and animals for food.³⁵⁴ God gave us iron and copper³⁵⁵ and blessed us with the ability to manufacture hardware and tools.³⁵⁶ He gave us the hills and the forests to clear and make a place to live.³⁵⁷ He gave us the trees to build homes.³⁵⁸ He instructed Solomon to use the finest stone, cedar, pine, bronze and gold for His temple.³⁵⁹ The Bible is profuse with Scripture that affirms that natural resources are a blessing from God. It is our obligation to be productive and creative with these blessings. This is not the source of our pollution.

The Bible tells us clearly why we have pollution. Numbers 35:33 warns us that bloodshed and our unwillingness to punish murderers pollutes the land. Selfish living, idolatry and bloodshed are pollution according to Ezekiel 36:17-18. Jeremiah 2:68 describes pollution as forsaking God and His laws. Rejecting God, cursing, lying, murder, stealing and adultery is accounted as pollution in Hosea 4:16. Immorality, idolatry and materialism are added to the list in Jeremiah 3:9 and Jeremiah 16:18. Leviticus Chapter 18 establishes clearly that sexual sins and abortion are the primary cause of pollution in the land. In verse 28, God warns that if the people engage in these detestable practices, the land will vomit them out of it. Jeremiah 3:13 warns against divorce, promiscuous living and compromising our values for money and career. All these things completely defile the land.

Using the admonition of Jeremiah 16:18, that God would punish double for the sin of idolatry, how much more will He punish our land, when the land is our idol? We cannot accept oneness with the earth. If we do, God will smite our efforts to clean up the earth with confusion and frustration just as He did at Babel. With noble intent, we will oppress each other, stealing from some, bankrupting others, tearing families, industries and communities apart.

Hosea tells us, "My people are destroyed for lack of

352Genesis 4:2.

353Genesis 4:22.

354Genesis 1:29, 9:3.

355Deuteronomy 8:9.

356Deuteronomy 33:25.

357Joshua 17:15-17.

3581Kings 6:14.

3591Kings chapters 6-7.

knowledge.”³⁶⁰ He tells us further that we have rejected knowledge because we have rejected God’s law. Because of this, the land mourns and the animals, birds and fish are dying. Deuteronomy 28:22-24 warns that if we do not obey God our sky will be bronze and our soil like iron. That is, we will have pollution in the sky and the soil will not be fertile. Jeremiah³⁶¹ affirms the warnings of Hosea and talks about the disgrace that besets a nation that rejects God. They will lose their homes to foreigners. Water will be for a price and wood will be expensive. They are not able to rest from those who pursue them. Slaves or bureaucrats³⁶² will rule over them and their livelihoods may cost their lives.

Hosea³⁶³ also tells us that because we reject God our priests will encourage the people to sin. This is true in our time. All across our land, many of our church pulpits advocate irresponsibility, adultery, pornography and homosexuality. He warns us that we will be sexually promiscuous, yet we will not increase. His words are true. Abortion has snuffed the lives of a third of our children. We have sex, but we do not reproduce. Furthermore, he warns that we will consult wooden idols. We no longer worship the true God who has made this land to be free and blessed. We are filled with every religion and we attack our founding faith as ‘unconstitutional.’³⁶⁴ Lastly, he warns that our rulers will love shameful ways.³⁶⁵

Hosea has described our nation to a tee. Yet we refuse to acknowledge God’s law. We refuse to acknowledge that it was our forefathers’ fear of the only God that made our nation great. We

³⁶⁰Hosea 4:6 (NIV).

³⁶¹Lamentations 5:19.

³⁶²“Those who pursue us are at our heels; we are weary and find no rest. . . Slaves rule over us, and there is none to free us from their hands.” (Lamentations 5:5,8 NIV). Jeremiah does not make it certain that these are government bureaucrats. However, anyone who has been in business can understand how this could be reasonably construed by the clauses ‘those who pursue us are at our heels’ and ‘there is none to free us from their hands.’ This is especially true of anyone who has experienced the frustrations of enduring an environmental mitigation. Many do not escape with their assets intact. The clause that begins with ‘slaves rule over us’ could very well apply to bureaucrats. Even though they have de facto authority and there ‘is none to free us,’ they, of all citizens, have the most clouded status. They have less authority over their own lives than the average W4 or 1099 citizen. They are precluded from political involvement and have fewer redresses against the government, because the government is their employer. Worse than this, they are trapped in their dogma. They cannot be free thinkers. Any thoughts of individual responsibility to God or governmental accountability to God threatens their lifeblood. Their careers depend upon more and more individual accountability to and dependence upon government. Our bureaucrats are slaves.

³⁶³Hosea 4:7-14.

³⁶⁴Jeremiah 2:11.

³⁶⁵Hosea 4:18.

tolerate every religion, but we reject the Truth. When the fear of God is gone from our land, tyranny will arise and no faith will be protected except the universal faith of the earth.

“What about the poor animals who are not able to care for themselves?” you might ask. “Shouldn’t we do something to protect them?” It does not seem fair that they should suffer because man is violating God’s law. Well, the Bible is clear on that as well. Job chapter 39 describes God’s care over the animals. God asks, “Do you know when the mountain goats give birth? Who let the wild donkey go free? Do you give the horse his strength? Does the hawk take flight by your wisdom? He even describes the foolishness of the ostrich who lays her eggs on the ground, unprotected. We don’t need to protect them.

God watches over the animals. He is responsible for their survival. We do not even know how many animals or species there are.³⁶⁶ God knows them all, just as He knows when a sparrow falls to the ground³⁶⁷ and He knows the number of hairs on your head.³⁶⁸

When we leave God’s law, the animals will die.³⁶⁹ Remember the story³⁷⁰ of the Peter, James and John, who had been fishing all night and caught no fish. Jesus came along and told these experienced fishermen to cast their net to the other side of the boat. They caught so many fish they had to call to the other boats for help. We do not know if species are dying or if they are hidden from our view.

There is only one cure for our environmental crises. Christians must return to the law of the Lord.³⁷¹ God promises that if we accept the Word of God, our natural resources will flourish, we will have abundant forests³⁷² and the land will not vomit us out

³⁶⁶Laurie Goering, Chicago Tribune, “Biologist Tracks Amazon’s Bigfoot,” *Seattle Times*, (10 Jan 95). This story gives an account of sightings of what was thought to be an extinct sloth. Whether it is the extinct sloth or not, there are many cases such as this, confirming that we have no idea the extent of the species upon the planet.

³⁶⁷Matthew 10:29.

³⁶⁸Matthew 10:30.

³⁶⁹Hosea 4:3.

³⁷⁰Luke 5:19.

³⁷¹2Chronicles 7:1314.

³⁷²Isaiah 55:612 (NIV): “Seek the Lord while He may be found; call on Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way and the evil man his thoughts. Let him turn to the Lord, and He will have mercy on him, and to our God, for He will freely pardon. 'For My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My ways,' declares the Lord. 'As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways and My thoughts than your thoughts. As the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and do not return to it without watering the earth and making it bud and flourish, so that it yields seed for the sower and bread for the eater, so is My

of it.³⁷³ When we abide by His law He will provide in bountiful measure.³⁷⁴

Word that goes out from My mouth: It will not return to Me empty, but will accomplish what I desire and achieve the purpose for which I sent it. You will go out in joy and be led forth in peace; the mountains and hills will burst into song before you, and all the trees of the field will clap their hands.”

³⁷³Leviticus 20:22.

³⁷⁴Proverbs 10:3, John 15:7.

Extorting Our Constitution

There is a constant threat that a new conservative judiciary will frustrate this effort to find a more balanced pattern of water use by expanding the concept of constitutional taking beyond any reasonable measure.³⁷⁵

Judicial activists discredit a strict constitutional construction of the law, because it limits their abilities to mold society. It limits their ability to exercise power through regulating and confiscation. They disregard the limitations outlined in the Constitution, which were designed to protect our Godgiven rights.

Do you read the Constitution often enough to remember what is in it? My friend, it is for this reason that our Constitution has been deluded and diminished. We have not held our politicians and judges accountable to the structural foundation of our nation. Our lawmakers write statutes that supersede the Constitution and these stand as de facto law because they remain unchallenged.³⁷⁶

Similarly, our judges have made so many rulings that defy the Constitution. They assign 'constitutionality' based upon precedent, rather than holding their decisions and precedent accountable to the Constitution. By allowing precedent to stray outside the constraints of the Constitution, an activist judiciary is able to write law and circumvent the legislative branch of government.

Many judges believe that above their responsibility to decide cases according to law, they have a higher calling to mold society. From the early beginnings of our Constitution, our nation has struggled with judicial activism. In recent years this activism has accelerated, especially since World War II when the Warren Court. Our removed prayer, the Ten Commandments and Bible reading from school. They have stripped the rights of parents, given us the curse of abortion, and established special rights for criminals and homosexuals. They have expanded the first amendment to include pornography; restricted the second amendment, which is the citizen's right to selfdefense and a lawful society, and by

³⁷⁵op. cit., Babbitt, p. 936.

³⁷⁶*Maynard v Hill*, 125 US 190, 204 (1887). "A long acquiescence in repeated Acts of the legislature on particular matters, is evidence that those matters have been generally considered by the people as properly within legislative control."

Constitution cannot be infringed.³⁷⁷ They have ignored the ninth³⁷⁸ and tenth amendment³⁷⁹ rights of the people and the States.

Interior Secretary, Bruce Babbitt, understands the importance of an activist court to make the laws that the legislature may not have the will to make. He equates this to ‘finding a balance.’ He warns against a return to a conservative court, as it would set back years of judicial legislation.³⁸⁰

There is a growing tendency to refer to our Constitution as a ‘living document.’ Politicians and media applaud the ability of this alive document to meet the needs of an evolving social structure. The inference is superficially positive, but the insidious implications are that the traditions and principles upon which our Constitution was founded are dead.

Placing Law Above the Constitution

The environmentalists, NIMBYs³⁸¹ and others have been waging a war against private property for almost a generation in the Pacific Northwest. Then, at the general election of 1990, Initiative 547 was placed on the ballot. The question of the measure was whether environmental restrictions and fees should be imputed by local planning jurisdictions.³⁸² The people resoundingly rejected that proposal by a wide majority. However, our legislature had already begun to codify statute that has now become known as the Growth Management Act (GMA).³⁸³ The GMA embodies most of the ideals that were rejected in the initiative. The following year, they passed

³⁷⁷*The Constitution of the United States*, amendment II: “. . .the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.”

³⁷⁸*The Constitution of the United States*, amendment IX: “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

³⁷⁹*The Constitution of the United States*, amendment X: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

³⁸⁰See the opening quote of this chapter.

³⁸¹NIMBY is acrostic for “Not In My Back Yard.”

³⁸²*Initiative 547*. Ballot Title: “Shall state growth and environmental protection goals be implemented by measures including local comprehensive land use planning and development fees?” Ballot Summary: “This initiative requires cities and counties to adopt comprehensive land use plans conforming to the state’s growth and environmental goals. Those plans are subject to approval by a state panel appointed by the governor. Local governments are to adopt development regulations and can impose fees and taxes on development activities. Restrictions are imposed upon the conversion of forest lands.” Ballot Title and Summary were prepared by the Attorney General’s Office.

³⁸³Washington State Legislature, *ESHB 2929* (1990). Most of this law is found in the new section of RCW, Title 36.70A.

the 1991 amendments³⁸⁴ as an emergency measure,³⁸⁵ to circumvent the ability of the voters to repeal it.

Following the directives of the 1991 amendments,³⁸⁶ the Snohomish County Council adopted the Countywide Planning Policy (CPP).³⁸⁷ There were several citizens who believed that the measures adopted were beyond the scope dictated by the State and that the ordinance should be revised.

The Snohomish County Charter, in similar fashion to the State Constitution, provides for initiative and referendum rights reserved for the people.³⁸⁸ The Charter provides for a similar ‘emergency’ clause³⁸⁹ as in the State Constitution, overriding the ability of the people to file a referendum against an emergency ordinance.

The CPP did not include an emergency clause. So the citizens rightly believed that they had the constitutional and legal right to file a referendum. If this referendum was placed on the ballot and passed, it would require the County Council to reconsider and reform the CPP. It would not abolish it.³⁹⁰ Nothing in the referendum could be construed to force the County Council to violate any portion of State statute. After all, this was a referendum, which refers. It is not an initiative, which makes law.

The filing of the referendum challenging the Countywide Planning Policies of the Snohomish County Council by 35 of its citizens triggered a lawsuit against these people by their elected officials. This is the third such lawsuit in the Puget Sound area in the last few years. Pierce and Whatcom county officials have sued their citizens as well. In every case, the government officials chose to sue the people, rather than bring their case against the referendum or the ad hoc³⁹¹ organization.

384Washington State Legislature, *RSHB 1026* (1991). Most of these revisions are found in the RCW, Title 36.70A.

385*Washington State Constitution*, art. 2, sec. 2(b): “Referendum. . . may be ordered on any act, bill, law, or any part thereof passed by the legislature, except such laws as may be necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety, support of the state government and its existing public institutions. . .” This exception is commonly known as the “*emergency clause*.”

386RCW 36.70A.040, 36.70A.210.

387*Snohomish County Ordinance 93004* (04 Feb. 93).

388*Snohomish County Home Rule Charter*, art. 5.

389*Snohomish County Home Rule Charter*, art. 2, § 120, art. 5, § 70.

390Referendum 931. The Official Ballot Title: “Shall Snohomish County Ordinance 93004 adopting a Countywide Planning Policy for Snohomish County pursuant to the State Growth Management Act (RCW Chapter 36.70A) for the purpose of establishing a countywide framework for development of county and city comprehensive land use and development plans be ratified and approved?”

391Ad hoc: a committee or group assembled for a special purpose.

Arguing for the constitutionality of the Growth Management Act, the County put forth that there is a, “presumption of the statutes to be constitutional beyond a reasonable doubt.” Throughout the legal proceedings, the prosecution concentrated their arguments on procedural aspects in an effort to keep the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) above the Constitution.

This can be illustrated with some examples from a letter from Elaine Rose, Assistant Attorney General, to Representative Hans Dunshee.³⁹² A couple more examples are from statements made at the courtroom proceedings on Tuesday, 20 July 1993, with Judge William Howard presiding.

54* Elaine Rose pointed out that the attorney general’s role in the suit was to defend the constitutionality of State statute. That is, that the statute is procedurally constitutional and did not need to be defended substantively.

55* She also explained that the right of referendum may be “preempted if it is inconsistent with State law.” In essence, she has made the argument that the RCWs can override, and is thus superior to the Constitution.

56* Tommy Prud’homme, Assistant Attorney General, and Thomas H. Robertson, Deputy County Prosecutor, cited precedent from several cases affirming the ability of the Legislature to grant legislative authority to lower subdivisions of the State government. They argued that the legislature had given Snohomish County authority over the cities within the county borders to determine population allocation. There might be precedent that upholds this argument procedurally, but substantively, the Constitution grants mutual autonomy to the cities and counties.³⁹³ The supremacy clause³⁹⁴ provides for local sovereignty as well.

57* Prud’homme went on to argue that this “Legislative authority granted to the counties, precludes the free exercise [of referendum rights].” Once again, procedural arguments prevailed over substance. This overrides article 1, section 4, which guarantees that, “The right of petition. . . shall never be abridged.” Restricting local autonomy

³⁹²District. (Not reelected in 1994).

³⁹³*Washington State Constitution*, art. 11, sec. 10.

³⁹⁴*Washington State Constitution*, art. 11, sec. 11: “Any county, city, town or township may make and enforce within its limits all such local police, sanitary and other regulations as are not in conflict with general laws.” This is commonly known as the “supremacy clause.”

inhibits the will and the voice of the people, centralizing power. This also preempts article 1, section 1, which states that, “Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

Judge William Howard allowed the collection of signatures for the referendum³⁹⁵ but later ruled against allowing a referendum vote. This was done on the premise that a local petition would be adverse to an act addressing statewide concerns. Now the people are in a box. They cannot file a local referendum against the county ordinance, because it addresses a statewide concern.³⁹⁶ Yet the people are unable to use a statewide referendum or initiative to overturn, or refer, a county measure.

The citizens immediately appealed to the Supreme Court. The high court made the decision to keep Referendum 931 off the November ballot and set a later date for hearing the substantive issues. Before the Court, the Snohomish County Prosecutor and the Attorney General once again argued for procedure. They claimed that, upon establishing the Growth Management Act, the Legislature was intent on bypassing the referendum process at the local level.

The appellants (citizens) argued for the substantive merits of the constitutionality of this case. In their affirmative defenses³⁹⁷ they claimed that:

1. The State legislature did not intend to circumvent the local referendum process. If they had they would have enacted a special provision intercepting local government activity, including local referendum and initiative provisions;

³⁹⁵Referendum 931 was truly a grassroots effort. Individual citizens collected almost twice the required signatures in two-thirds the normally allotted time.

³⁹⁶The court was reluctant to allow the county citizens to refer a local ordinance because it allegedly dealt with a State statute. However, in *State ex rel. Mullen v Howell*, 107 Wash 167 (1919), the State Supreme Court held that the people of Washington State could refer a State statute even though it dealt with an amendment to the United States Constitution. That court upheld the constitutional right of referendum for the same reasons that our citizens had filed a referendum against the County ordinance. “It surrenders *pro tanto* the sovereignty of the state [in this case ≥ county], gives to the Federal [State] government a right to enact laws and to enforce them through the Federal [State] courts, and it will deny the citizens the protection of some of those guarantees that we have written out of the travail of time into our own Bill of Rights. . .”

³⁹⁷Affirmative defense: “In pleading, matter asserted by defendant which, assuming the complaint to be true, constitutes a defense to it. A response to a plaintiff’s claim which attacks the plaintiff’s *legal* right to bring an action, as opposed to attacking the truth of the claim.” *op. cit.*, *Black’s Law Dictionary*.

2. If the intent did exist, it was an ineffective intent. A statute that violates the Constitution cannot be relied upon.³⁹⁸ Therefore, the Legislature cannot remove the local rights established by the Home Rule Charter, even if determined to be in the State's best interest; and
3. The 1991 amendments to the Growth Management Act deprive local jurisdictions of their Home Rule Charters.

The first constitutional problem, is the issue of our constitutional right of initiative and referendum. Can the Legislature or any local body of government make a law that the people cannot address or protest? Article 1, section 4 of the State Constitution says that, "The right of petition. . . shall never be abridged." article 2, section 2(b) tells us that referendum is "the second power reserved by the people" (initiative being the first).

On 19 Aug. 1993, the appellate court, division two, reached a decision on a parallel matter, *Save Our State Park v Hordyk*.³⁹⁹ At issue was a county auditor's decision not to register an initiative based on the substance of the text submitted. Ruling in favor of SOSPark, Justice Alexander reminded us why the initiative and referendum processes were amended into the State Constitution.

In 1912, the citizens of this State amended our Constitution to give the people the right to initiate laws. . . . They passed the amendment 'because they had become impressed with a profound conviction that the Legislature had ceased to be responsive to the popular will.'⁴⁰⁰

The struggle for power between the statist and the individualists has been an ongoing conflict as far back as 1912, 1776, 1620 and 1215. 1993 is no different. The people will claim their Godgiven rights, only to be usurped by the ruling elite.

If growth management is a legitimate 'emergency,' then could not our Legislature, after becoming intoxicated with emergency powers, systematically strip the private citizen of virtually every right through such 'emergencies' as education, health care,⁴⁰¹ drunk driving, child abuse, illiteracy, unemployment, crime, etc? Under the pretexts of compassion and the welfare of the

³⁹⁸*Marbury v Madison*, 5 US 137 (1803).

³⁹⁹*Save Our State Park v Hordyk*, 71 WnApp 84 (1993).

⁴⁰⁰*State ex rel. Mullen*, 107 Wash. at 172 (1919), quoted op. cit., *Save Our State Park v Hordyk*, 71 WnApp 84, 89, Alexander, J.

⁴⁰¹The Washington State Legislature did pass a comprehensive health care bill in the 1993 session (*E2SSB 5304*).

people is there anything to prevent the State and local governments from completely denying every individual right, if left unchecked by the people?

Judge Alexander's opinion in *SOS Park* contained a footnote citing dictum from *Kennedy v Reeves*.⁴⁰²

. . .we feel that we must say frankly and in all seriousness that the custom of attaching emergency clauses to all sorts of bills, many of which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as actually emergent. . . has become so general as to make it appear, in light of recent experience, that a number of [formerly established presumptions indulged in favor of legislative declarations of emergencies] can no longer be deemed controlling. [Ellipses and notations as quoted.]

The second constitutional problem we need to consider is whether or not the Legislature has the authority to delegate legislative powers to the counties, preempting the authority of the cities. Constitutionally, this is a usurpation of the supremacy clause. This clause grants legislative authority to local jurisdictions as long as they are not in conflict with 'general laws.'

In researching relevant court cases to understand this clause, I found that many of the holdings of the Supreme and Appellate Courts reflected or referred to the holding set forth in *Lenci v Seattle*.⁴⁰³ *Lenci* affirmed that municipalities possess, ". . . a direct delegation of police power as ample within its limits as that possessed by the Legislature itself." In other words, the view held by the courts is that there is no provision in the Constitution granting the Legislature authority to circumvent a city's sovereignty by delegating legislative authority to a county.

However, a case was brought before the Central Puget Sound Growth Hearings Board by the cities of Edmonds and Lynnwood.⁴⁰⁴ The cities petitioned the Board regarding several sections of the Countywide Planning Policy,⁴⁰⁵ which were considered to be altering the land use powers of the cities. Arguing over section UG2⁴⁰⁶ of the CPP, it was discussed that both the city

402 *State ex rel. Kennedy v Reeves*, 22 Wn2d 677, 68384 (1945).

403 *Lenci v Seattle*, 63 Wn2d 664,667 (1964).

404 *City of Edmonds and City of Lynnwood v Snohomish County*, Central Puget Sound Growth Planning Hearings Board, Case No. 9330005. **NOTE:** This board has the same judicial powers and authority as a court of law. It is a modern Star Chamber. The judges are commissioners who are appointed to uphold policy, not Constitution.

405 *Snohomish County Ordinance 93004* (04 Feb. 93).

of Lynnwood⁴⁰⁷ and Snohomish County agree that, “. . . a city’s comprehensive plan is a part of the ‘land use powers of the cities.’”

However, the County contends that this power is altered by the GMA and that the city’s constitutional claim is overarched because the GMA is a ‘general law.’⁴⁰⁸ The justification being that the sovereignty granted to local jurisdictions through the supremacy clause was sustained as long as this sovereignty did not “conflict with general laws.” In other words, where the city may once have had jurisdiction, that power is null because the legislature wrote a new ‘general law.’ With this kind of logic, or precedent, the legislature is able to amend the Constitution with mere statutes, circumventing the amending and ratification process.

This circular approach to the relationship between ‘general laws’ and the Constitution was reflected in the Board’s decision.⁴⁰⁹ The Board held that the Growth Management Act did not alter land use policy because of the statutes in RCW 36.70A. What they did *not* say is that the GMA and RCW 36.70A are one in the same. Furthermore, when RCW 36.70A was codified, it nulled specific constitutional and legal authority that had been previously retained by the cities, without the benefit of a constitutional amendment.

So a new ‘general law’ overarched a prior ‘general law’ and dramatically changed the constitutional authority of the cities. This was not the intent of the writers of the State Constitution. At

406 *Legal Issue No. 4a*: “Does the county have the authority to allocate population and employment to the cities rather than just to the urban growth areas?” p.27.

407 *op. cit.*, *Edmonds/Lynnwood v Snohomish County*, On page 19, it states that the City of “Lynnwood argued that its sovereignty would be seriously undermined if the County has the authority to allocate population and employment.” It cited “a municipality’s constitutional authority, derived from Article 11 §11. . .” and “. . . a variety of other statutes reserve certain powers to the cities and that because the GMA is silent on these matters, it ‘. . . cannot be construed to set forth the intent of the Legislature to alter land use. . . or other powers of the cities.’”

408 *op. cit.*, *Edmonds/Lynnwood v Snohomish County*, p. 20.

409 *op. cit.*, *Edmonds/Lynnwood v Snohomish County*, p. 31: “. . . that the County does have the authority to allocate population and employment to the cities rather than just to urban growth centers. . . . This authority does not alter the land use powers of the cities because, under Chapter 36.70A RCW, such land use powers refer not to the policy documents but rather to development regulations. . .” It is interesting that the Board determined that the land use powers had not been altered, even though *both plaintiff and defendant argued that it had*. Lynnwood had argued that this alteration of their land use powers was unconstitutional. Snohomish County had argued that this new general law had overarched Lynnwood’s constitutional authority. The Board ignored both substantive claims and based their ruling along procedural, or technical lines. I believe that they used this case to set precedent for the GMA and it would not have mattered what issues Lynnwood or Snohomish County had set before them. If precedent was ever established that the GMA is a violation of the supremacy clause, the whole foundation upon which it is built would collapse.

the time of the writing, there was no ‘Revised Code of Washington.’ There was only the *Ordinance of 1787*, the *Enabling Act* and the territorial laws which were all related to the Common Law.⁴¹⁰ These are the ‘general laws’ referred to in article 11 section 11. RCWs are not ‘general laws.’ They are the compilation of statutes passed by the legislature. It was never intended that subsequent RCWs could, or would, usurp constitutional authority. There would have been no need to provide for constitutional amendments if they had intended for the constitution to be amended by code or statute.

The basis of ‘general laws’ is widening while our constitutional foundation is eroding. It is time for us to heed the warning of the writers that is imbedded within our State Constitution.

A frequent recurrence to the fundamental principles is essential to the security of individual right and the perpetuity of free government.⁴¹¹

The third constitutional problem is a contractual one. Throughout RCW 36.70A are sanctions toward the counties that fail to conform to the GMA within the prescribed time frames.⁴¹² Most of the penalties relate to tax revenues that will be withheld. Is a contract binding if one is forced to sign with a loaded gun to the head?⁴¹³

Furthermore, the integrity of the Home Rule Charter is defiled. The premise upon which the GMA was established was controlled growth. The actual structure of the statute, however, was built upon centralization of power. This is illustrated in the decision of the Board. Their conclusion was that the land use powers of the city had not been altered according to the new statutes. However, it was obvious that the cities’ power to establish a comprehensive plan, as delineated under the old code, was now nonexistent.

410*The Ordinance of 1787*, art. II: “The inhabitants of the said territory shall always be entitled to the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus, and of trial by jury; of a proportionate representation of the people in the legislature, and of judicial proceedings according to the course of common law.” *The Enabling Act*, 25 US Stat c. 180, p. 676, approved 22 Feb. 1889. “The constitution shall be republican in form. . . and not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence.”

411*State of Washington Constitution*, art. 1, sec. 32.

412RCW 36.70A Subsections: .210(2)(c) & (d); .210(5); .345; .340(2) & (3); .800(2)(e)

413RCW 62A.1-207: “A party who with explicit reservation of rights performs or promises performance or assents to performance in a manner demanded or offered by the other party does not thereby prejudice the rights reserved. . .”

Local municipalities have been stripped of their ability to establish local policy. Additionally, the counties are now strictly regulated in the goals and objectives of the policies they must outline for their jurisdiction. They are deprived of autonomy and are held accountable to State bureaucrats. If the State is allowed to violate the sanctity of the Home Rule, the character of the Chartered County is abandoned, or nulled. The supremacy clause is dead.

Judicial Precedent Over Constitution

Getting back to Snohomish County's argument that there is a "presumption of the statutes to be constitutional beyond a reasonable doubt." An early US Supreme Court case, *Marbury v Madison*,⁴¹⁴ held that, "All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void." Recent cases no longer hold to this view. Division one of the Washington State Appellate Court this last July (1994), reaffirmed the long standing precedent that "a statute is presumed constitutional. . ." ⁴¹⁵ Furthermore, it went on to say that, "If possible, a court will construe a statute so as to render it constitutional." In August, our State Supreme Court upheld a parallel precedent that any challenge to a statute must prove it unconstitutional beyond a reasonable doubt.⁴¹⁶

How does a private citizen go about proving the unconstitutionality of a law when it is the 'duty' of the court to construe it "so as to render it constitutional?"

This evolution did not happen all at once. It was built case upon case, precedent upon precedent. Our courts rule on suits by determining how the current matter applies, not to the Constitution, nor to our laws, but to the rulings of prior cases. Our courts have grown so accustomed to ruling according to precedent that they have forgotten our Constitution. Where once our laws were subject to be interpreted in agreement within constitutional limitations, the Constitution is now subject to interpretation by precedent.

We must hold our courts accountable to the Constitution. We need to convince our legislators and Congress to instruct the courts that they must hold all precedent accountable to the canons of the Constitution. This is the only way to put an end to 'constitutionality' by precedent. If we do not return the courts to their proper role of deciding cases in the light of the law they will

⁴¹⁴*Marbury v Madison*, 5 US 137 (1803).

⁴¹⁵*State v Spencer*, 75 Wn App 118, 121 (1994).

⁴¹⁶*State v HernandezMercado*, 124 Wn 2d 368, 380 (1994).

continue to legislate until they have absolute power.

Solutions Within the States' Rights Movement

Our best protection against bigger government in Washington is better government in the States.⁴¹⁷

The landslide reelection of President Franklin Roosevelt in 1936 was a serious setback to the Supreme Court. Coupled with the looming threat that his court packing scheme⁴¹⁸ might pass Congress, the Supreme Court began to double back on their antiNew Deal decisions. Since that time, the Court has done little to restrict the taxing and spending powers of the federal government.

Upon reinauguration Franklin Roosevelt said, "I see onethird of a nation illhoused, illclad, illnourished."⁴¹⁹ Thus he set the agenda for legislation by crisis that continues to this day. However, it became soon apparent that this nation did not have the financial resources to promote every individual and family out of poverty and into the middle class.

Rather than reassess the economy from the perspective of individual responsibility, the lawmakers have chosen to place that obligation more and more upon the States. This kills two birds with one stone, if you will. The congressmen are still empowered to champion the causes of the underprivileged during the election cycle, but are not held accountable for producing the funds necessary to accomplish their goals. Their designs are accomplished by mandating to the lower government bodies and by trampling entrepreneurial freedoms.

417Dwight D. Eisenhower, Speech to the NGC, Cleveland, OH, 08 Jun. 1964, quoted in *Policy Review*, no. 66 (Fall 93), p. 419

418President Roosevelt was frustrated with the antiNew Deal Supreme Court which had been striking down his major programs and the essential elements of the New Deal. So he proposed to Congress to add one new justice for every judge over the age of seventy. This was couched as an attempt to facilitate caseload as the justices were getting old but could not be retired involuntarily without cause according to the Constitution. This would have immediately added six new justices to the bench. The scheme was obvious to most observers as a power grab and a few members of Congress accused him of dictatorial intent. Franklin Roosevelt's attempt failed, but it was successful in putting the 'fear of god (government)' into the justices. This mindset of civil government being a sacred institution has carried forward to the current bench. This explains the proclivity of the Court to rule with the government when the decision strengthens statist ideals, and ruling against the government when an affirmative ruling would serve to enhance individualistic freedoms.

419*The New Book of Knowledge* (1991 ed.), Grolier Inc., vol. 16, p. 323.

Conference of the States C A Dangerous Plan

These continual encroachments upon the sovereignty of the people and the local jurisdictions are fostering a growing unrest toward the federal government. In 1991, the city of Columbus, Ohio tried to pave a parking lot. They were told by the EPA that they would have to spend \$2.1 million to clean it up because some paint solvent was found in the soil. The tests conducted showed that the solvent created no danger. So the city's environmental health director became upset with the EPA's overweening and did the nation's first study on the costs of federal mandates.

Between 1991 and 1995 the yearly cost to the city rose from \$60 million to \$100 million. The State of Ohio's cost rose from \$150 million to \$400 million between 1992 and 1995.⁴²⁰ People are becoming upset about the federal mandates being placed upon State and local governments by Washington DC. This is real money, local money and it strips the communities of their ability to satisfy local needs.

This has been a growing problem for State and local governments. Even the establishment news media is finally calling attention to the inequities of mandating without funding. However, little attention has been focused on the unconstitutionality of the mandates themselves, regardless of funding.

It is obvious we have a constitutional problem that needs to be addressed. Throughout the last three decades there have been numerous calls for a Constitutional Convention. However, it has become well known that there are those who are anxious for such a convention that would allow them to restructure our government's foundation. Because of this danger most people are convinced that it would be better to plod through the mire than risk tampering with our Constitution.

Now the call has gone out, apparently from conservative circles, for a Conference of the States. The rallying cry is centered upon unfunded mandates and the potential of passing federal budget problems down to the States. The organizers view this as a danger to the 'balanced competition' of the various government bodies. They claim that local governments, "must step up to our constitutional obligation and compete for power in the federal system."⁴²¹

⁴²⁰ed. cit., "Federal Paydirt," *World* magazine, vol. 9, no. 32 (21 Jan 95), citing statistics from *USA Today*.

⁴²¹*Conference of the States: An Action Plan For Balanced Competition in the Federal System*, "Draft concept paper to be proposed at the Council of State Governments annual meeting. Dec. 2-6, in Pinehurst, NC. Nov. 14, 1994." No

This competition for power between the governments is sprinkled throughout the call. Clearly they are not aiming to solve a constitutional crisis because they do not see their roles as limited by constitutional enumeration. They are hoping to take advantage of the growing conservative movement and rising antifederalist sentiment. All they want is to gain their market share of unconstitutional authority.

One of the proposed outcomes of this convention will be, “a new instrument of American democracy called a *States’ Petition*.”⁴²² According to the organizers a States’ Petition would have no force of law or binding authority. However, they admit that its authority would be from the “sheer power of the process.”⁴²³ It is their hope that this ‘sheer power’ would be enough to make Congress take notice.

My question is simple. Did Congress take notice when the Confederate States seceded? Our Constitution has long ago been tossed in the dung heap. We are ruled by de facto autocrats.

If we believe that we can resort to any means peaceful to reassert that document to its proper authority, we too, if victorious, are de facto. If the Conference of the States is successful, this will be at the expense of article 1, section 10.1 of the Constitution.⁴²⁴ It is forbidden for the States to form an alliance of this sort.

If they are successful by ‘sheer power’ we will have a new de facto government. The problems will be the same. For these people do not happen to be lovers of the Constitution. The conference supporters have proposed several amendments and they also claim to be seeking “fundamental, longterm, structural change.”⁴²⁵ Their intent is to modify it and to give States the power to revise it on a regular basis through a tool called “process amendments.”

My claim that these people are no lovers of the Constitution is not unfounded. First, they have already acknowledged that their intent is to wrest their share of power from the feds, rather than to hold the feds accountable to the Constitution. Then they claim that, “No one is smart enough to assign specific programs and tasks to

publisher or author cited, excepting an annotation to contact Gov. Mike Leavitt’s office for more information.

⁴²²op. cit., *Conference of the States: An Action Plan...* p. 2.

⁴²³op. cit., *Conference of the States: An Action Plan...* p. 3.

⁴²⁴*The Constitution of the United States*, art. 1, sec. 10.1: “No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation. . .”

⁴²⁵op. cit., *Conference of the States: An Action Plan...* p. 3.

one level of government or the other, and make the system balance.”⁴²⁶ This is a direct assault upon the structure of the Constitution.

Our Constitution is not irrelevant, nor has it failed. We have failed. We have failed to maintain the separation of powers between the executive, legislative and judicial branches. Furthermore, we have failed to maintain the separation of powers between civil government, family, church, business and school.

There could be much more said to warn against the Conference of the States. Nonetheless, my final caveat is about their proposal to amend the tenth amendment. The supporters have proposed to insert a sentence, “stating that the courts have responsibility to adjudicate the boundaries between national and state authority.”⁴²⁷ Don’t they know that the courts have no intention to award what is fair, much less constitutional? The courts recognize power, not law. They will award to the side that has proven to hold the most de facto authority.

Even if we could be assured of a sympathetic Court, what will protect us when the makeup of the bench should change? Will our nation be caught on that pendulum that will swing endlessly between State and national sovereignties? Furthermore, as these governments wrestle against and amongst themselves, will the people be caught hopelessly in the midst of ever encroaching tyrannies? the fruit of this competition for power?

Judicial Resistance to States’ Rights

We commonly quote Lincoln’s paraphrase of the republic, that our government is “of the people, by the people and for the people.” This is an extension of the “deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed” clause of the Declaration of Independence. Those who signed that document understood the principle that governments are instituted among men to secure their Godgiven rights.⁴²⁸ Within this context the most dominant jurisdiction is a local one, where the threat of danger and the responsibility for protection is most imminent.

The purpose of instituting the federal government was “to

426op. cit., *Conference of the States: An Action Plan...* p. 7.

427op. cit., *Conference of the States: An Action Plan...* p. 8.

428“ We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . .” *The Declaration of Independence*, ¶ 2.

form a more perfect Union. . . provide for the common defense,”⁴²⁹ and other such matters that the smaller States would be unable to accomplish independently. The Founding Fathers understood the necessity of a limited national government. That is why the Constitution is specific as to the limits of the grants of power.

The State is not an extension of the federal government. It is responsible for the protection of the people and their assets, from threats and oppression including an overweening national bureaucracy.

The checks and balances of the threefold republican construction have been torn down through judicial precedent and legislative activism. Power to the government is like blood to a dog; having tasted, it will stop at nothing to get more. Just short of reverting to outright fascism, our leaders have stripped us of about all the blood that we can put out. It does not know when it is a good time to stop, it just wants more and more.⁴³⁰ It is time that the people put an end to federal tyranny and domination.

The only practical means to accomplish this is for the States to put their collective foot down and diminish the federal government to be the limited institution that it was designed to be. This means that States must put an end to federal agencies within their borders who are confiscating their peoples’ assets and revenue.

This will not be an easy task. We can expect to find strong resistance from the federal courts. At the close of the Roosevelt Franklin presidency, the Supreme Court declared that, “The tenth amendment does not operate as a limitation upon the powers, expressed or implied, delegated to the national government.”⁴³¹ The Court holds that the States cannot act to restrain an overweening federal bureaucracy. This is antithetical to the written word of the Constitution.

Furthermore, the federal government is acknowledged by the courts to have the ability to usurp State sovereignty through international treaties. The eminent law professor and court advocate, Laurence Tribe, wrote that, “Under the supremacy

⁴²⁹*The Constitution of the United States*, Preamble: “We, the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

⁴³⁰They will make more of us poor. With more of us to help out, they will have more dependents. After we are all reduce to penury, where will the money come to bail us out?

⁴³¹*Fernandez v Wiener*, 326 US 340 (1945).

clause, it is indisputable that a valid treaty overrides any conflicting state law, even on matters otherwise within state control.”⁴³² The “constitutionality” of both aspects rests solely upon precedent, as Tribe illustrates in his footnotes, and not upon the instrument of the Constitution itself.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes laid the foundation for the President to overcome States’ rights through treaties that could not otherwise be accomplished through statute. In 1916, President Wilson entered into a treaty with Great Britain for the protection of several migratory bird species. The State of Missouri contended that US game wardens enforcing the *Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918* was an unconstitutional interference of the tenth amendment.⁴³³ Justice Holmes decided that,

It is said that a treaty cannot be valid if it infringes the Constitution, that there are limits. . . . Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States. We do not mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treaty making power; but they must be ascertained in a different way. . . . Here a national interest of very nearly the first magnitude is involved. It can be protected only by national action in concert with that of another power. . . . It is not sufficient to rely upon the States. The reliance is in vain, and were it otherwise, the question is whether the United States is forbidden to act. We are of the opinion that the treaty and the statute must be upheld.

You may notice that in typical Holmes’ fashion, he got around the Constitution while upholding it at the same time. He affirmed that statutes must be made in pursuance to the Constitution

432Laurence Tribe, *American Constitutional Law*, 2nd ed., The Foundation Press, Inc., (1988), p. 226. He footnotes: “See *Ware v Hylton*, 3 US 199 (1796) (Treaty of Peace between United States and Britain voids state law confiscating British property). See also *Hauenstein v Lynham*, 100 US 483 (1880) (treaty providing inheritance rights for aliens prevails over state law disqualifying aliens from inheriting). Although the power to make treaties with the Indian tribes is constitutionally coextensive with the power to make treaties with foreign nations, *Holden v Joy*, 84 US 211, 242 (1872); *Worcester v Georgia*, 31 US 515, 558 (1832), and although states may not undermine such treaties, *The New York Indians*, 72 US 761 (1867), a rider inserted in an 1871 Indian appropriation act provided that ‘no Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States’ would thereafter be acknowledged. . . as an independent nation. . . with whom the United States may contract by treaty.” 16 Stat 566, Rev Stat 2079, now codified as 25 USC § 71. After 1871, United States Indian relations were instead embodied in bilateral agreements which have also been given supremacy status over conflicting state law. See *Antoine v Washington*, 420 US 194, 20305 (1975).

433*Missouri v Holland*, 252 US 416 (1920).

but denied that treaties must be held to the same standard. Then he declared that an overarching ‘national interest’ could usurp local authority. Thus he allowed States’ rights to be overrun by treaty, even if the provisions of that treaty do not stand up to constitutional mettle.

This set the standard for the courts until the 1950s when Senator Bricker led the effort to pass a constitutional amendment that would overrule Justice Holmes’ opinion. The senator and his supporters wanted to make all treaties answerable to the Constitution. “The proponents feared not only that a treaty could enlarge federal power over the states, but that it could be self-enforcing.”⁴³⁴

In the early 1950s, widely voiced concerns that the treaty power was the Achilles’ heel of the Constitution, that any and all constitutional limitations could be overridden via the international agreement route, spurred efforts to amend the Constitution. Justice Holmes’ broad statements in *Missouri v. Holland* proved popular and frequently quoted sources for those anxious to demonstrate the substantiality of the threat to constitutional restrictions. Moreover, the fears that generated popular support for the Bricker Amendment were fed by occasional arguments made in American courts that relied on United Nations provisions.⁴³⁵

In view of this, the Bricker Amendment included a provision that would nullify unconstitutional treaties and another that provided that federal powers could not be enlarged through treaties.⁴³⁶ In other words, if Congress or the President are unable to make a law because of constitutional restraints, they cannot make a treaty to effectively overcome this hurdle. This amendment eventually died (1954) because it was unable to garner the two-thirds majority vote necessary for a constitutional amendment. Several

⁴³⁴John E. Nowak & Ronald D. Rotunda, *Constitutional Law*, 4th ed., West Publishing (1991), p. 213.

⁴³⁵Gerald Gunther, *Cases and Materials on Constitutional Law*, 10th ed., Foundation Press, (1980), p. 2523. He includes a footnote regarding a 1950 California case, *Sei Fujii v State*, 217 P2d 481. A California District Court held an alien land law invalid on the ground that the UN Charter was self-executing. Fortunately, the California Supreme Court [242 P2d 617 (1952)] reversed this ruling, resting their decision on the fourteenth amendment, after finding the UN Charter was not self-executing.

⁴³⁶*Bricker Amendment*, Sec 1: “A provision of a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.” Sec 2: “A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.”

other amendments and measures were attempted in the following years.

Though the efforts to amend the Constitution failed, they were ultimately successful in turning the opinion of the Supreme Court. It is important to remember that no matter how avantgarde the Court may appear to be, it has never been known to intentionally buck the political tide of popular opinion, as we illustrated earlier.⁴³⁷ In 1957 Justice Black effectively reversed Justice Holmes' premise that treaties are not subordinate to the Constitution by stating that,

[It is] clear that the reason treaties were not limited to those made 'in pursuance' of the Constitution was so that agreements made by the United States under the Articles of Confederation [would] remain in effect. . . . It would be manifestly contrary to the objectives of those who created the Constitution, as well as those who were responsible for the Bill of Rights. . . . to construe Article VI as permitting the United States to exercise power under an international agreement without observing constitutional prohibitions.⁴³⁸

In other words, he clarified that the confusing syntax of article VI, section 2 of the Constitution was for the protection of treaties that were already made prior to the ratification of the Constitution. It would be contradictory to presume that the founders had meant for future treaties to usurp the document that they were writing. It would be absurd to conclude that they would allow an international agreement to annul the rights that they had just regained by blood. Justice Holmes cannot justify his position based upon the document nor the intent of the founders.

Along with the recent demise of the 'coldwar,' the President and Congress appear to be consumed with treatymania.

⁴³⁷Some may contend that the *Dred Scott* decision was an exception, but it is important to remember that the majority of the justices were from the South. Their ruling was contemporary to the popular Southern opinion of their day. This 'popular will' aspect was affirmed in a recent article entitled "Abortion Before Roe," by Russell Huttinger. *First Things*, magazine (Oct 94), p. 14. He points out that Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg claimed that *Roe* was unnecessary because society was moving in that direction. Justice Harry Blackmun [the author of *Roe*] said that *Roe* was not a revolutionary opinion. Whether we agree with their claims or not, they do reveal something of their mindset. Robert G. McCloskey, in his book, *The American Supreme Court*, [University of Chicago Press (1960), p. 224] wrote, "it is hard to find a single historical instance when the Court has stood firm for very long against a really clear wave of public demand."

⁴³⁸*Reid v Covert*, 354 US 1 (1957).

Some of these documents are so large⁴³⁹ that it is impossible for any of the lawmakers to read them. The bench is riddled with justices whose legal perspectives are antithetical to the Constitution and whose focus is upon a social justice that leads to socialistic ends.⁴⁴⁰ This is why it is even more important to elect qualified statesmen, not career politicians, to represent us in Congress and State legislatures.

We need people who understand the Constitution and are willing to stand up for the rights of the individuals and States that are contained therein. However, in order for us to elect these qualified people, it is important to get a copy of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. Everyone of us must read and study these documents so that we;

58* will understand what is ‘constitutional’ and what is not. After all, do we base our interpretation upon gut feeling, as many of us suspect the courts of doing, or do we know the document?

59* will understand constitutional issues. Once we have this knowledge, candidates take on a whole different perspective for us and it is easier to see who, or what, we are voting for.

Legislative Opportunities For States’ Rights

All of us have had some frustrations from dealing with our government agencies. We can agree with most of the arguments that it must be brought under control. Nonetheless, many view the government as largely benevolent. So we disagree about the methods and the scope to bring this control. The Founding Fathers were not so ignorant; they had an honest mistrust of government.⁴⁴¹

439GATT was reported to be over 22,000 pages and stood over eightfeet tall.

440Furthermore, the Court sees the United States’ role as that of leading a multiculturally diverse world. For the sake of retaining our position of world leadership, they will often trample individual rights in the name of diversity.

441James Madison, *Journal of the Federal Convention*, vol. 1, pp. 241f. *CD Sourcebook of American History* (1992). Mr. MADISON: “In order to judge of the form to be given to this institution, it will be proper to take a view of the ends to be served by it. These were, first, to protect the people against their rulers, secondly, to protect the people against the transient impressions into which they themselves might be led. A people deliberating in a temperate moment, and with the experience of other nations before them, on the plan of government most likely to secure their happiness, would first be aware, that those charged with the public happiness might betray their trust. An obvious precaution against this danger would be, to divide the trust between different bodies of men, who might watch and check each other. In this they would be governed by the same prudence which has prevailed in organizing

They also feared that a republic, without due vigilance, could revert to a socialist democracy.⁴⁴²

We have learned the history of our land, yet we take for granted the Declaration of Independence, the Revolutionary War and the blood that was spilled to sever our communities from all ties to oppressive government. We are glad for the freedoms that were won, but we have relaxed under the umbrella of a sheltering national bureaucracy. We consider those who still retain this honest mistrust of government to be radical. We fear radicals more than we fear the government.⁴⁴³

There are still a few people who have that honest mistrust. They believe in the Constitution and their right to self-government. The people of Catron County, New Mexico are a good example. They have set the standard for the States and counties of our nation. This small town depended upon grazing and resource extraction for their very survival, which was being threatened by the everincreasing regulations of an overweening federal bureaucracy. When faced with extinction they became radical and issued a 'declaration of independence' in the form of two county ordinances and one amendment.⁴⁴⁴

60* They adopted sections of the Civil Rights Act that secured

the subordinate departments of government, where all business liable to abuses is made to pass through separate hands, the one being a check on the other."

442 **Samuel Adams, 1768:** "It is observable that though many have disregarded life and condemned liberty, yet there are few men who do not agree that property is a valuable acquisition. Those who ridicule the ideas of right and justice, faith and truth among men will put a high value upon money. Property is admitted to have in existence, even in the savage state of nature and if property is necessary for the support of savage life, it is by no means less so in civil society. The utopian schemes of leveling and a community of goods are as visionary and impractical as those which vest all property in the crown are arbitrary, despotic and, in our government, unconstitutional." **Thomas Jefferson:** "I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. If we run into such debt, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. If we can prevent the government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

443 Our nation has lost its courage. We fear David Koresh more than we fear the government that destroyed him and his followers. [Didn't Janet Reno send the tanks down there to protect the children?] We fear Randy Weaver more than we fear the government that shot to death his innocent wife and juvenile son. We fear those who think differently than ourselves more than we fear a government that tells us what to think, will punish us for hate and tells us whether we can pray and display Christmas and Hanukkah decorations. We are willing to sacrifice our first amendment rights to constrain radical opinions.

444 Catron County Ordinance: No. 00291 (21 Aug. 90, amended 16 Oct. 90); No. 00491 (21 May 91).

constitutional rights and protected the local citizen from federal intimidation.

- 61* They allowed for the criminal prosecution of any federal, State or local agent that violates the constitutional protections of the citizens. Furthermore, it provided for local venue for such prosecutions, removing them from the federal courts.
- 62* They allowed for civil prosecution for those convicted of violating an individual's constitutional rights.
- 63* They increased the penalties for bureaucrats convicted of conspiring to usurp anybody's constitutional rights. If the conspiracy resulted in death, a life sentence would be imputed.
- 64* They affirmed the holding of the Supreme Court in *Lynch v Household Finance Corp.*,⁴⁴⁵ that "Property does not have rights. People have rights. The right to enjoy property without unlawful deprivation, no less than the right to speak or the right to travel, is in truth a 'personal' right.
- 65* They called for the federal government to comply with the Constitution of the United States, specifically to stay within the confines of article one, section 8.17 which limits their jurisdiction to specific lands.
- 66* They affirmed the rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence and acknowledged the limited scope of government.
- 67* They called for a net reduction of federally owned properties and what could be termed a 'no net loss' of private property. All property issues are locally controlled and the State and federal agencies are required to file their proposals through the county commission.
- 68* They affirmed the local rights to water resources, acquisition and production. State and federal agencies had to clear all water issues through the county commission.
- 69* They prohibited the federal and State governments from obstructing agricultural opportunities and provided incentives for ranchers to improve grazing lands.
- 70* They defined sustainable timber harvesting as, "continued at levels consistent with custom and culture and as affected

⁴⁴⁵*Lynch v Household Finance Corp.*, 405 US 538 (1972).

by prevailing market conditions.”

71* They called for local control of the Endangered Species Act.

72* They supported a return to the 1872 Mining Law.

73* Regarding the extraction of natural resources, they called for economic opportunity, reliance on selfdetermination, ensuring open market conditions and the protection of private property.

74* They adopted emergency provisions on these ordinances and called for the State legislature to codify them into State law.

In order for them to come to these resolutions they had to understand one important principle of the Common Law construction of the Constitution: local government has primary supremacy on local issues. Therefore, local issues cannot be construed to have national significance in order to bring them under the umbrella of the federal bureaucracy.

The Constitution grants specific powers to the federal government. They do not have any rights that are not enumerated in that document, period. Furthermore, the ninth and tenth amendments clearly affirm that enumerating these powers “shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people,” and all powers not delegated “are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”⁴⁴⁶

When US Forest Service law enforcement officials attended a County Supervisor meeting, they threatened to arrest the whole board. The head superintendent countered with a threat to convene a Grand Jury on the spot and have the Sheriff arrest the lot of them. The feds left in defeat. No longer do they conduct their business in Catron County without the knowledge and approval of the local authorities. No longer do they intimidate and harass local citizens.⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴⁶The Supreme Court has a long history of ignoring the constitutional limitations upon the powers enumerated to Congress in art. I, sec. 8, especially clause 17. In *Kleppe v New Mexico*, 426 US 529 (1976) the Court, upholding the sovereignty of Congress over federal lands, stated that “Congress exercises the powers of both a proprietor and of a legislature over public domain” (at 540). However, they opened a window for this to be partially reversed in the future by conceding that, “absent consent or cession a state undoubtedly retains jurisdiction over federal lands within its territory.” (at 543).

⁴⁴⁷As this book goes to press, I have just received unconfirmed reports that Janet Reno has filed suit against the people of Nye County, Nevada for a similar situation. If this is true, this suit should be of interest to everyone. This suit is not exclusive.

During the 1994 session of the Colorado legislature, State legislators Charles Duke and Jim Roberts introduced a resolution for State sovereignty based upon the tenth amendment. It was passed by both houses and signed by the governor. They based the resolution upon a now famous case, *New York v United States*.⁴⁴⁸ This case decided that Congress may not simply commandeer the legislative and regulatory powers of the States. By this action, the State of Colorado has lead the charge for the reactivation of the tenth amendment. We are beginning to reverse years of abuse by President Roosevelt's 'New Deal' policies.⁴⁴⁹

This is hard for us to understand at first glance because we have been programmed to believe from an early age that we are citizens of the United States. We have been instructed that we live within respective States that are a subordinate agency of the national government. What we have been taught in our government schools, however, is antithetical to the principles contained in the Constitution.

Despite all this, there are statutes still in force that continue to protect local autonomy. We just need to elect local officials that have the guts to go against the political powers that have been nationalizing, regionalizing and socializing our society for the last sixty years.

This is a good example of the importance of issues during local elections. It is difficult to avoid popularity because we may even know the local candidate through neighborhood, business, service club, church, or school affiliations. Next election remember this, good old boys got us into this mess. We need the radical James Madisons and Thomas Jeffersons who have that honest mistrust of government to steer us back out. The more local the election, the more important this admonition is.

She has sued everyone of us to remove our Bill of Rights.

448*New York v United States*, 120 L.Ed 2 120, 140 (1992).

449*US v Darby*, 312 US 100 (1941). Roosevelt's Solicitor General, Mr. Biddle, argued that "the plain purpose of the tenth amendment has been recognized by more than a century of litigation. . . . The court has repeatedly recognized the tenth amendment adds nothing to the Constitution." The Court replied in agreement, but in terms more palatable to the States and the citizens: "From the beginning and for many years the amendment has been construed as not depriving the national government of authority to resort to all means for the exercise of a granted power which are appropriate and plainly adopted to the permitted end."

Conspiracies

It is hard to write about government plots and intrigue without sounding as if there is some conspiracy teeming behind the scenes. Conspiracy theories abound. Some of these make our stomachs weak when we hear them.

We have reviewed a few conspiracies that have to do with international parks and the efforts of the elite to destroy our Constitution through environmental laws, brainwashing and population control. There is no way to revive and protect our Constitutional without an understanding of conspiracies and the fundamentals of liberty.

Nations and the Laws of God

At the core of all conspiracy is man's rebellion against GodÇ the Creator, Lawgiver and Redeemer. We opened the book with a review of the Tower of Babel. It was there that man rejected God's command to "be fruitful and fill the earth."⁴⁵⁰ Since that time, there has been constant intrigue and conspiracy to circumvent God's promises and the Godgiven rights of the people.

Of all the famous conspirators, Nebuchadnezzar was the greatest of all who ever lived. He dominated the EuroAsian continent and commanded absolute power. He even declared himself a god. Through Daniel, God told him that all the great empires that were to come, would descend from his Babylonian domain.⁴⁵¹ Every kingdom after him would increase in authority, yet diminish in strength. Then would come a kingdom, not of man, which would have absolute authority and never end; the Kingdom of Christ.⁴⁵²

Nebuchadnezzar refused to humble himself before God. He set himself up as a god and murdered those who would not worship him. So God humbled him. He became as an animal and ate the grass of the field for seven years. After he acknowledged that God was sovereign above all the governments of men, God restored him to his former glory.⁴⁵³

⁴⁵⁰Genesis 1:28, 9:1.

⁴⁵¹The Babylonian (the Roman system is derived from Babylon), system of government continues to this day. It is evident within our constitutional republic throughout our bureaucratic system of laws and regulations.

⁴⁵²Daniel chapter 2; the vision of Nebuchadnezzar.

⁴⁵³Daniel chapters 34.

Babylonian tradition and methods of government were carried forward through the Greek and Roman empires and into the AngloSaxon domain. This system continues to this day, even within our constitutional republic. William the Conqueror executed this form of government after he subjugated the Saxons of Briton. We already reviewed the Doomsday Book that he compiled, listing the assets of all property and lands within his domain. Now we use computers to database everything from products, inventories, payables and receivables, to information, land and people.

Some people have speculated that the beast spoken of in Revelation⁴⁵⁴ may be a computer. As it turns out, there is a computer in Europe that is said to be named 'the Beast.' Purportedly, it can track every man, woman and child in the world, but it won't. Not every person will accept the identity or the mark of the Beast.⁴⁵⁵

There is only One who can open the books that hold the final and absolute inventory of man.⁴⁵⁶ In the books are those who are listed for Life and those who are subject to the eternal Doomsday, the second death. The One who created the vastness of the heavens, the earth and everything on it, and the seas and all that is in them,⁴⁵⁷ will be recognized as the Ruler of the ages.⁴⁵⁸ He will destroy the Tower of Babel.⁴⁵⁹ The Bible promises that, "every knee will bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord."⁴⁶⁰ Whether we choose to reject Him as Nebuchadnezzar did or if we accept Him,⁴⁶¹ we will all give an account of ourselves to God.⁴⁶²

Nebuchadnezzar has come and gone; so also have Alexander the Great, the Caesars, Napoleon, Hitler, Stalin and others who desired to rule the world. Jesus Christ warned us not to fear conspiracies. These, at worst, could only kill our flesh. The One worth fearing is He who can cast body and soul into Hell.⁴⁶³

454Revelation chapters 13:14.

455Revelation 13:8.

456Revelation 5:114, 20:1115.

457Nehemiah 9:6

458Revelation 1:5.

459Jeremiah 51:4445.

460Philippians 2:10, Isaiah 45:2325, 66:23.

461John chapter 3. Verse 18 (NIV): "Whoever believes in Him is not condemned, but whoever does not believe stands condemned already because he has not believed in the Name of God's one and only Son."

462Romans 14:1112, Hebrews 9:27.

463Matthew 10:26, Luke 12:45.

The LORD spoke to me with his strong hand upon me, warning me not to follow the way of this people. He said: "Do not call conspiracy everything that these people call conspiracy; do not fear what they fear, and do not dread it. The LORD Almighty is the one you are to regard as holy, He is the one you are to fear, He is the one you are to dread."⁴⁶⁴

What does religious philosophy have to do with international parks and conspiracies? The answer is simple; all nations are subject to the laws of God. Regardless, whether you personally decide to follow the Lord your God with all your heart, soul and mind, His laws are immutable. His law for the nations is as constant as the laws of gravity and Thermodynamics.

Centuries before William's conquest of England, the laws of the land, and much of Europe, reflected the loss of Godly values. They coddled their criminals, requiring retribution from the community for the criminal acts of one person. Often, capital punishment was meted out by lottery. Rather than punishing the criminal, whoever drew the short stick paid for the crime.

We have left the law of individual accountability. Society and victims pay for the crimes of the lawbreakers while we try to protect them from 'cruel and unusual' punishment. We have redefined 'cruel and unusual' to represent any restriction upon the violators liberty or psychology. We are overconcerned about the self esteem of our criminals. Is it any wonder that we live in a barbaric society?

In his book, *A Concise History Of The Common Law*, Professor Theodore Plucknett describes the positive influence Christianity had in bringing England out of a pagan culture. Individual responsibility restored social order to the AngloSaxon⁴⁶⁵ countries. The Common Law, which birthed our legal system, was based upon individual accountability to God.

Christianity had inherited from Judaism an outlook upon moral questions which was strictly individualistic. The salvation of each separate soul was dependent upon the actions of the individual. This contrasted strongly with the customs of the English tribes which looked less to the individual than to the family group of which the individual formed a part. Necessarily such a system had little place for an individualistic sense of morals, for the

⁴⁶⁴Isaiah 8:1113 (NIV). see also 1Peter 3:14.

⁴⁶⁵Biblical law applies to all mankind. Examples of prosperity for adherents and destruction for detractors could be given for all nations and races. The AngloSaxon example is not used for any racial intent or bias. It is specifically used because that is the foundation of our law and our founding documents.

group, although it was subjected to legal liability, can hardly be credited with moral intention in the sense that an individual can. With the spread of Christianity all this slowly changed. First, responsibility for actions gradually shifted from the whole group to the particular individual who did the act; and then the Church (and later the law) will judge the act, if necessary, from the point of view of the intention of the party who committed it.⁴⁶⁶

When we follow God's law we have a sound society. When we reject His commands we have anarchy and chaos. This does not mean that we must set up a theocracy. The fact is that our nation was established upon Biblical principle, and we have never had a theocracy.

Our forefathers did believe that nations and individuals, were accountable to God. The Declaration of Independence manifests rights that are established by God. It lists the violations of these rights by the king of England and every argument can be supported with Scriptural principle. Our Constitution, though not mentioning God, was a supplement to our Declaration of Independence. It defined the limits of government with principles that can be supported Biblically.

We have been blessed by God. Now we are watching our blessings erode. Some of us are trying to resolve the problems while continuing to ignore the hand of God and His requirements of moral law. We are abandoning the principles that brought us an orderly and prosperous society and are amazed at the increasing barbarism around us.

During the time that our nation was struggling for freedom, the French and Italians were engaged in a similar struggle. Our nation recognized the providential hand of God and individual and national accountability to Him. The other two nations did not. Since that time, the French and the Italians have experienced many revolutions. These two nations continue their struggle for the rights of man, yet our form of government has been preserved these 200 years.

Do we recognize, as our Founding Fathers did, where our rights come from? If our rights are man-given or 'natural rights,' then to man we will be accountable. Thus, as in France and Italy, in the name of freedom the spoils go to the victor. The victor is accountable to nobody. The pecking order is established by power and to man we will be slaves.

⁴⁶⁶Theodore Plucknett, *A Concise History Of The Common Law*, Little, Brown and Co (1929, 1956), p. 8.

On the other hand, if our rights are Godgiven, our individual and national accountability will be to Him. Accountability to God instills honesty within the citizens and this advances honest government. When the people are honest, the government will be likewise and the same applies in reverse.

Therefore, we cannot solve the crises that embroil our nation without a return to the moral foundations that made our nation great. Our Constitution and Bill of Rights is the greatest document ever written by man among those enumerating the liberty of man and the limits of government. However, we do not have a blank check to do as we please or as Alan Keyes says, “We do not have the right to do what is wrong.” If we are not controlled by strong self-government, or God’s law, outside forces must move in to restrain us. That is why John Adams said,

We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passion unbridled by morality and religion. Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate for the government of any other.

Relative philosophy in a democratic society leads to socialism. Freedom can only be maintained by law, absolute right and wrong.

The Role of Conspiracies

Jeremiah, the Old Testament prophet, tells us that conspiracies are designed to lead us back to God.⁴⁶⁷ He warns that conspiracies will abound if we continue to neglect or reject God and His law. Eventually the conspiracies will prevail and we will meet with disaster.⁴⁶⁸ Ezekiel, another Old Testament prophet, affirms with Jeremiah that if we continue to neglect God’s warnings we will go into slavery.⁴⁶⁹

We can run around like Chicken Little, warning everybody that the sky is falling, or full of black helicopters, but we accomplish nothing. If all the conspiracies of the elite were real and immediate, and everyone knew it, then what?

This is not a complicated world. Our problems, nationally and internationally, are simple: we have rejected God. What is complicated is that we are trying to piece together a constitutional republic based upon liberty and equal rights while ignoring the

⁴⁶⁷Jeremiah 36:3.

⁴⁶⁸Jeremiah 11:612.

⁴⁶⁹Ezekiel 7:2327.

Lawgiver who gave us these rights. The conspiracies of International Parks and other New World Order paradigms are only a symptom of our neglect of God. To defeat them, the solution is simple; return to the laws of God.⁴⁷⁰

“My people are destroyed from lack of knowledge.”⁴⁷¹ If we recognize God’s law, we live in freedom and safety. If we reject God’s law, tyranny will prevail.

I am going to borrow a closing that I first heard from Cal Thomas, one of my favorite journalists. He borrowed it from another great statesman, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln quite likely borrowed this from Nehemiah chapter 9.

We have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.⁴⁷²

May God save our nation.

4702Chronicles 7:14.

471Hosea 4:6 (NIV).

472Abe Lincoln, *A Proclamation of Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer* (April 30, 1863).

