permissible under state law (ORS Chap. 190, Oregon). The contrivance works. Federal funds come into Baker county, example:

> OEO (federal Office of Economic Opportunity) sends poverty funds from D.C. to Seattle through La Grande (Ore.) to operate a storefront Community Action Center on Baker's (city) Main Street. Usurping traditional county welfare programs, OEO dispenses a wad of social services.
>
> The expeditor's contract (a "resource" man housed in city hall) was approved by the county clearinghouse; he writes fund applications and formulates "programs." No COG is involved.
>
> Further revealing the weakening role of COG's are member city/county withdrawal notices to COG's in various parts of the nation. Upon Los Angeles County's imminent withdrawal from a COG (So. Cal. Assn. of Gov'ts.), OMB assured that the severance would have no ill effect on the county's chances of getting federal funds. Still, an areawide agency review is required on funding applications going to the national bureaucracy in Wash., D.C.

That brings to the fore the Presidential 10-region system. If SCAG should collapse if huge L.A. County withdraws, Region IX (San Francisco) logically could supplant the COG's clearinghouse review role.

When the President staffed the ten regions with five agencies (HUD, HEW, SBA, OEO, Labor) and added more through the Environmental gimmick in A-95 (revised), he laid out a cybernetic course. Cybernetics is a word meaning "to steer, to govern."

The federal funding comes through the 10-region system to maintain a multitude of functions being usurped by federal government (housing, water, etc.) which can control almost everything a human being does in a lifetime.

It is brutally simple, and simply brutalizing.

How To Kill A C.O.G.

Readers frequently ask for a "list" of cities and counties which have done away with Metro councils of governments (COG's), extra layers of government. To date, there is no such list to the best of this knowledge. Only one of the hundreds of Metro COG's has been dissolved, and it did not stay dead.

The boundaries of that particular multi-county region, called CORCOG, was created by Oregon's Governor and he counted it Number Ten of his fourteen administrative districts. However, the ruling body of the three-county COG needed to be formed by city and county boards' actions and appointees drawn from the governing bodies of Deschutes, Crook, and Jefferson counties in central Oregon.

Elsewhere, other COG's have been created without a Governor's action, their boundaries automatically formed by the perimeter of the counties involved. The commissioners, mayors and councilmen then "moonlight," serving as the ruling body of the multi-county region they form.

Motives in creating regions boil down to several basics: to conform for federal handouts, to provide a regional tax base, to control by administrative rules and regulations — non-statutory "printing press laws."

When moonlighting on the regional governing bodies the officials can

operate as administrators, local laws permitting, whose administrative acts are untouchable by the voters.

A handful of citizens assisted in the demise of CORCOG. Upon request, the spokesman has furnished the following pointers on how to go about it:

> *Attendance* at COG meetings, before and after a COG is formed. Citizen attention is the most effective tool of all — the perseverance of constant attendance (even silent attendance) at COG meetings in delegations, or as just one lone individual. Citizens' presence, vocal or silent, makes the COG officials uneasy. In most instances, COG regions are unconstitutional and the officials know it. Metrocrats create the regions by hook or by crook, hoping to validate the regions later by constitutional revisions or by amendments.
>
> *Persuasion.* Elected officials at local level were repeatedly advised about the shortcomings of regionalism. In some instances, the personal misgivings of the officials themselves were strengthened by the citizen persuasion.
>
> Two-thirds of the requisite cities and counties balked at joining CORCOG but through a "self-starting clause" one county and its chief city formed the region, temporarily financing the operations.
>
> *Block the funds* which the COG attempts to collect from its city and county members. One COG county's representative at each meeting repeated his refrain that he "just couldn't" get his county board of commissioners to appropriate the COG dues which the COG levied on the county because the "taxpayers won't stand for more spending."

Another county misunderstood that "it wouldn't cost anything to join." A citizen objected when the COG presented a bill as that county's COG membership fee. The county refused to pay, and rescinded its resolution by which it joined the COG. Since at least 75 percent of the population of the cities and counties in the region were required for the COG to be official, the withdrawal wrecked the COG.

The activating county and its major city which had pushed the COG from the start, saw their investment go down the drain.

On October 19, 1970, the COG chairman, banging an ashtray for lack of a gavel, announced, "The Central Oregon Regional Council of Governments (CORCOG) is hereby dissolved and I resign as the chairman."

Metrocrats renewed pressure. Federal emergency Employment funds financed a propagandist.

Within months, the region was alive again as COIC (Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council), a $180,682 budget requested in March 1973.

THE MATCHING FUNDS HOAX

Daily, taxes are raised by hour-to-hour spending decisions of legislators, state, federal, city and county. Budget hearings once a year are far too late and are practically a waste of breath.

Tax-raising votes were cast in 1965 by city and county elected officials in Southern California to bury six counties and 142 cities under another layer of tax-eating government known as the So. Calif. Assn. of Governments (SCAG), Metropolitan governance's regional form.

Los Angeles City lagged as the last major holdout while the county supervisors dallied. The first week of 1966, they voted 3-2 in favor of joining SCAG. Taxpayer wallets all over the United States may be a little thinner because of that vote.

Eligible for federal funds itself, SCAG's major activity is that of a *reagent* which causes cities and counties to "buy back" dollars sent by taxpayers to Wash., D.C. via the federal income tax. The buy-back ratio runs as high as 8:2, 7:3, sometimes 1:1, local government forking over the larger amount of dollars to get back the lesser amount from Wash., D.C.

Hiking local taxes to raise the buy-back money, the cruel process is known as "matching funds." In the greedy race by which local dupes claim they "get their own money back," government costs all over the nation skyrocket, and the taxpayers, of course, pay all.

Take ABAG, a Metro region. Within the Assn. of Bay Area Governments, an 8-county region about San Francisco Bay, city and county taxpayers were duped into raising $4.5-million dollars to buy back about $1.9-million during 1964-65. The composite $6-plus million is being used to buy up private land to be turned to park and recreational purposes.

Patterned after ABAG, SCAG was formed expressly to qualify cities and counties within the Metro region for so-called matching funds. Los Angeles city and county taxpayers wanted none of it and said so. County officials yelled for help and Victor Fischer, Asst. Administrator, Housing & Urban Development Dept. (HUD) came from Wash., D.C. to apply pressure and to impress the citizenry at the final public hearing.

With finality, he told them, "No region, no money."

In an operation that can only be described as a "judas kiss," the supervisors first railed at the federal man, insulting him, lifting taxpayer hopes by feigning repugnance for Fischer's offer of federal-control-with-money; then the supervisors in an audacious reversal coolly betrayed the taxpayers by casting the pro-Metro region SCAG vote.

Congress likewise has betrayed millions of constituents by shifting them under HUD's executive shadow. To comply with recent new or amended laws (PL 89-174, PL 89-117) regionalization such as SCAG and ABAG is being attempted or is underway in other parts of the nation; 6-county Detroit and tri-state New York-Conn.-New Jersey are examples.

Regionalization of the United States stems directly from political Syndicate 1313 which promotes Metropolitan governance, the domesticated version of Treaty Law under the United Nations Charter.

It is a matter of public record that Victor Fischer, the "man from Washington" has worked with syndicate members from 1313 E. 60 St., Chicago,[3] also with the federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), fully controlled by Syndicate 1313.[4]

When faced with those troubling facts of a syndicate's capture and control of American government, Los Angeles county supervisors scoffed instead of expressing concern, and by vote started the county on its first step into Metropolitan regional governance.

Meanwhile, taxpayers keep paying for all the rising costs.

3. L.A. County SCAG open hearing 1/4/66, Hindman statement.

4. ACIR publication M-17 (1962) U.S. Gov't. Printer, Wash., D.C.

Backlash At Voters

The notorious drawbacks of regionalism throughout the United States provide enough grim examples to repel any reasonably intelligent individual. Why then, after listening to facts and logic, does your mayor, city councilman or county commissioner illogically cast his vote taking your city and county into a multi-county region?

Two of California's COG's (councils of governments) ruling over the regions ABAG and SCAG, prove classically that regionalism is a costly fourth level of taxation mutating into regional government.

While spending federal and local funds, ABAG (Assn. Bay Area Governments) waits for the state legislature to elevate it to governmental status. A minority of the members in SCAG (So. Calif. Assn. Gov'ts.) in 1972 voted to urge the legislature to make the region a mandatory government and force cities and counties to join. The vote was only 48-23 although SCAG covers six counties, 147 cities (of which 105 are SCAGers) and 10,046,529 population in the region's 38,528 square miles.

Before the SCAG vote, three amendments bit the dust. Reportedly no roll call votes were taken; no exact tally exists. The first would have permitted the citizen voters of the areas involved to pass on SCAG through the polls. The second would have given citizens the power to vote SCAG out. The third would have required all SCAG decisions to be reached only after public hearings and a two-thirds vote. At present, citizens are not permitted to speak before SCAG. The pattern is widespread elsewhere.

Regions are non-representative. Formed without citizen vote, regions outlaw voting by the people. Regions are administrative dictatorships. Lacking constitutional sanction, regions are illegal. Regions have been created by and are run by scandalous non-parliamentary procedures. Why then, do local elected officials fly in the face of such derogatory evidence? Why do they fall for regionalism?

Regionalism abounds with empty promises. Its bureaucrats advertise their political snake oil as a cure for everything. City halls and county courthouses are baited with federal promises claiming that regionalism will provide plentiful funding for spending. A more subtle message is: "Regionalism . . . a way to bypass the voters!"

The anticipation of federal assistance in spite of the fact that local taxpayers may have vetoed extravagant bond issues and tax overrides apparently is the deciding factor with local officials. Resenting the taxpayers' insistence on cuts in spending to hold taxes down, governing bodies bolt through the regional loophole that leads to the federal slush pots.

One city which refuses to pay its own way and engineered the formation of a region for the express purpose of getting federal sewer funds reaped bitter returns. To satisfy the bureaucrats, Bend (Ore.) established the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council from the ruins of defunct CORCOG, a 3-county region. Having played the fool, the city's federal sewer applications were turned down by five *administrative* federal agencies, reportedly.

Bend then attempted a *legislative* throwback to solve its problem. In the days when federal spending was limited strictly to constitutional federal installations before the Metrocrats designed regions as traps to regiment

free Americans, Congressmen and U.S. Senators obtained line-item appropriations for public improvements in their jurisdictions.

The City of Bend turned to an Oregon U.S. Senator who inserted a sewer assistance item in the Environmental Protection Agency budget, specifically for Bend. But in late 1972, the matter was snarled by claims and counterclaims between the EPA bureaucracy and the senator. No money was forthcoming.

THE BIGGEST TAX SHIFT IN NORTH AMERICA

When big cities start running out of taxpayers, they claim that the only solution "is some form of metropolitan government." Metrocrats spread the net of Metro regional governance to catch tax payers, make them divvy up for "regionalized" costs of public services.

Along with Atlanta, Seattle, Los Angeles, etc., Boston is one such city. Like pro-Metro hawkers everywhere, the Boston Metrocrats ignore the honest way to cut taxes — by cutting the costs of nonsense services. Rather, they favor Metro magicianship.

A Boston newspaper thought it had discovered a magic miracle in Metropolitan Toronto (Canada). On Oct. 22, 1969, an editorial burbled,[5] "Near insolvency 16 years ago but now growing at a record rate, its building permits per capita the highest of any major city in the world. . . . Toronto's tax rate (is) constant — all because it metropolitanized with its surrounding communities."

We have no idea how the Boston Globe substantiates the constant tax rate claim, but the following facts were supplied in part by Toronto's Commissioner of Finance and Treasurer.

Jan. 1, 1954, Toronto gathered in its neighbors to help pay its bills. Thirteen municipalities, including Toronto, were merged into six. A distribution table below, analyzed from the Canadian data on taxable assessments, demonstrates how Toronto shifted part of its tax load to its neighbors:

	1954	1966	Minus	Plus	Redistributed
Toronto	60.7%	43.7%	17.0%)		
York	7.1	5.3	1.8)		-20.2
East York	6.0	4.6	1.4)		
North York	9.7	20.2		10.5%)	
Etobicoke	10.0	15.2		5.2)	20.2
Scarborough	6.5	11.0		4.5)	
	100.0	100.0			

Source, assessment table on p. 13 of "Metropolitan Toronto," (1967) 37Pp.

The jump in annual tax levies prove Toronto's tax-shifting over the 16-year period;[6] the municipality of North York was walloped the hardest:

5. The Boston Globe 10/22/69

6. Metropolitan Toronto Levy Totals, 1954-69, p. 90

	1954	1969	Levy Increase	
North York	$ 2,975,139	$ 80,545,853	$ 77,570,714	2607%
All Six Mun.	34,945,099	380,421,749	345,476,650	989%
Toronto	21,601,505	161,020,525	139,419,020	645%

The foregoing reveals that all taxable property was reassessed by the new Metro, annual spending increased tenfold in the 16 year span, and the assessment base of taxation redistributed to Toronto's advantage.

"Inequality of taxable resources"[7] was the candid excuse for metropolitanizing (regionalizing) Toronto by an Act of the Provincial Legislature. The legislative forcing quelled the local opposition.

If Canadians permit that sort of Metro taxation, it is their business. No criticism is implied here by the use of Toronto's data; it is discussed here because Metrocrats in the United States are recommending the Toronto action. Tax shifting is repugnant to American taxpayers. They want less public spending and more tax cutting instead.

Another fact which damns Metro in the eyes of Americans is the *lack of representation* in the Metro structure. Americans dumped British tea into Boston's harbor because the predecessor of Canada's present government, also of our own, was taxing American colonists without representation.

In Toronto, members of the Metro Council are not elected directly to that governing body but become members by virtue of election to office in their local municipality as mayors, aldermen or controllers.

The pattern in the U.S.A. is similar. In our Metro COG's (councils of governments), the members are not elected; they are mayors or councilmen sitting on Metro councils by virtue of their local offices. Non-elected, they represent no regional constituency because there is no regional electorate.

---

7. Statement by Commissioner G. Arthur Lascelles of Toronto (Can.) at Metropolitan Government Symposium, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce April 8, 1958.

C H A P T E R T H R E E

The Tyranny of the Non-Laws

"Printing Press Laws" Mock Justice

If you are having troubles with government at any level — *locally*, a threatened invasion of privacy by a housing inspector; *state*, unreasonable tax-devouring school building standards set by appointees; *federal*, forcing regionalism on your city or county as a condition to obtain loans or grants — take a second look. You may be the victim of a non-law, an administrative rule or regulation, not a statutory law enacted by Congress or your state legislature, or city or county councils. For non-law definition, see Appendix B.

When passed by Congress, an Act becomes part of the United States Code (U.S.C.), statutory laws.

When printed in the daily Federal Register (FR),[1] an administrative rule written by a bureaucrat becomes part of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).[2] Almost unknown to the public, that vault of "loose leaf" administrative rules and regulations runs a massive portion of government today.

Take the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) amending rule in the FR of May 26, 1970;[3] it decrees that persons, firms or organizations dissatisfied with BLM decisions cannot take their cases to court until an obstacle course of BLM administrative review has been exhausted.

The First Amendment prohibits Congress from making a law that would prevent citizens from seeking a redress of grievances. How can a BLM rule hope to stand in the way of citizens seeking help through the courts?

Federal administrative regulations restate the applicable statutory law enacted by Congress, then add details — and there's the pinch. A Housing and Urban Development (HUD) bureaucrat authored "Housing and Housing Credit,"[4] an administrative policy on U.S.-guaranteed private obligations that finance "new town" land development. Admittedly, the guarantee regulations are not subject to statutory requirements, yet they enjoy the force of law.

Administrative rules, regulations, orders, notices, also presidential Executive Orders take legal effect when published in the daily Federal Register. Later renamed the Office of the *Federal Register*, part of F.D. Roosevelt's New Deal, the FR helps bring to pass FDR's "cradle to the grave" welfare state.

The list of federal rule-making agencies is lengthy. Significantly many are

---

1. Daily Federal Register 20¢ ea., Supt. of Documents, Government Printing Office, Wash., D.C. 20402
2. Code of Federal Regulations, $175. annual subscription.
3. CFR Title 43, 102 FR 5/26/70, page 8232.
4. CFR Title 24, 35 FR 4/23/70, page 6497.

identified with Metro governance which stresses administrative power: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), Appalachian Regional Commission, Delaware River Basin Commission, Economic Development Administration, HEW, IRS, Federal Reserve System, etc.

States maintain a similar administrative rule-making setup, including a bulletin (counterpart of the daily FR), and an administrative rules code (counterpart of the federal CFR).

However, federal administrative rules supersede state administrative rules. That portion of a state agency supported by federal funds is not bound by state administrative rules. In exchange for federal assistance, the state surrenders part of itself to federal administrative rules (bureaucrat control). The process turns free men into political cattle.

It is considered opinion that, by permissive tolerance of such legislative power delegated to non-elected agents/agencies, Members of the Congress are phasing out their own roles and violating the Constitution.

Where does the U.S. Constitution permit the delegation of legislative power to appointees? It doesn't.

World Rule: International Non-Laws

Two federal laws in the United States have come out of the blue — United Nations blue via the UN Charter Mandates — Model Cities (Public Law 89-754) and the region making Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (PL 90-577).

So important are they to the globalists that two U.S. Presidents and their staffs aided, and are abetting the two measures which will topple America as we know it.

"Model Cities" (enacted in 1966 under the title Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act) reaches into almost every facet of private life to dictate, control, regiment and dispossess. Implementation will bring a socio-economic-cultural upheaval to the U.S.A. on a regional scale as embodied in PL 90-577. Local government will be replaced by regional governance.

The trick is accomplished by Congressional delegation of lawmaking power to the executive sector of Government, a violation of the U.S. Constitution's separation of powers principle, the tri-partite check-and-balance between legislative, executive and judicial powers.

By Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, citizens vested Congress with lawmaking power. Unconstitutionally, Congress gave lawmaking power to The President who gives it to bureaucratic appointees.

Charted here is the actual process, as per the two laws named above: President Johnson's lame duck Executive Memo of 11/8/68 transferred the legislative power Congress gave to him in region-making PL 90-577, to an administrative body which, under the Nixon administration, tightened the nuts and bolts of a regional network over the face of America.

Circular A-95,[5] the document produced, draws together the bureaucratic

5. Circular A-95, 7/24/69, Exec. Office of The President, Office of Management and Budget (formerly BOB), Wash., D.C.

review and veto system under sections of the two laws.[6] Their influence covers, in part: airports, hospitals, libraries, water, sewage, highways, transportation, land-use, natural resources, air, housing, jobs, income, welfare, schools, health, crime, culture, recreation, etc.

The whole conduit leads *upward* into the United Nations system of unlimited power, and *downward* through the domestic administrative rules apparatus that neatly bypasses our U.S. Constitution of limited powers.

When the U.S.A. joined the United Nations in 1945, a global general grant of power (GPG) was conferred on Congress. Limitations placed on Congress by the Constitution were struck off by Articles 55 and 56, the UN Charter's power grant. See the late U.S. Senator Pat McCarran's expose of the situation in the Congressional Record of January 28, 1954.

After World War II (1945) and under the aegis of UN Charter law Congress began legislating in areas not permitted by our Constitution. The foregoing list from "airports to etc." proves the point. Most UN Charter mandates are not self-executing.[7] The concepts must be enacted as "laws" by legislative bodies, to become effective.

Regionalism is the geography of global law per Chapter VIII of the UN Charter. Administrative (non-statutory) law is the power used to control the outrageous system. Capstone is the federal Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 as amended,[8] by which Congress enabled administrative authorities/agencies to rule and regulate you.

Before you scoff, answer this: When was the last time you won a bout with urban renewal's nitty gritty, or zoning, or a court case to uphold your right to referendum? Or with any of Model Cities' babylonian pursuits? Or with the IRS over your income tax? Or with gun law inspectors?

Almost endless and growing longer is the list of rule-making agencies[9] which carry out the disgusting United Nations administrative dictatorship within the United States of America.

Non-laws appear to be of two types: international and domestic.

International non-laws come from the siamese mandate-commitment arrangement under the treaty of the United Nations Charter. Mandates become commitments to be fulfilled. *Most UN mandates are non-self-executing.* They need the breath of legislative authority in order to come to life. Congress, under commitment to the UN by ratification of the charter, executes (enacts) the UN mandates into "law," deriving the false authority to do so from the UN's General Grant of Power (Articles 55 and 56, UN Charter) to legislate in areas forbidden to Congress by the U.S. Constitution.

It has been argued that the House of Representatives is not necessarily bound under the UN mandates because it was the U.S. Senate which ratified the UN Charter, and suggested that the House be given equal status in voting on treaty ratifications.

When the controversies stemming from the UN commitments hit the U.S.

---

6. Sec. 401, PL 90-577, Sec. 204, Model Cities law.

7. Fujii vs. State (Calif.) 242 P. 2d 617.

8. PL 79-404, Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 as amended (for 1967 amendment to prior amendments see. pp. 560-63 U.S. Government Operations Manual 1970-71).

9. *Ibid.* Appendix C, p. 729.

court system, Metrocrat judges adhering to the UN Charter but exploiting the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, enforce the international non-laws within the United States. That accounts for the recent growing phenomena of 14th Amendment "class cases."

Domestic non-laws (administrative rules and regulations) rest on the quicksand of administrative authority. Either the regulations are non-legal extenuated surplus written by appointees beyond the limits set by statute, or they are wholly administrative, resting on the zero of no binding authority whatsoever.

Regulations, if fully backed by valid legislative authority (not invalid delegated authority) are not to be classed as non-laws.

More About Circular A-95, The Non-Law

Circular A-95 originated in the Executive Office of the President in July 1969 and seems to be a still-expanding document. By the date, you can see that A-95 is a Nixon administration document. It sets up a clearinghouse system to carry out sections of two federal laws: the regional Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-577) and the Model Cities Act of 1966 (PL 89-754). The Johnson (D.) administration produced both laws. The Nixon (R.) administration willingly implemented both laws.

In regional PL 90-577 Congress unconstitutionally passed on to the President the power to *originate* rules and regulations governing regional review and veto of local plans and projects involving federal funding.

Nixon was elected President on 11/5/68. On 11/8/68, President Johnson issued a lame duck memo to one of his administrative bureaus called the Bureau of the Budget (BOB), now the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The Executive Memo was published in the Federal Register 11/13/68 delegating authority to establish rules and regulations governing review of federal programs, and giving the coordinating role to BOB, or a like agency. President Johnson ordered "this memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register," and named the regional PL 90-577 law as his authority to *redelegate* the lawmaking power to ordinary employees.

I was told by a federal official that details of Circular A-95 are not required to be published in the Federal Register, perhaps because the President's blanketing memo transferred the legislative power that Congress gave him, over to an executive department to accomplish the specific purpose which A-95 embodies — the regional clearinghouse network now placed over all fifty (50) states.

Circular A-95 includes Section 204 of the so-called "Model Cities Act" (actually Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act.) The coordination of parts of the two laws was assigned to the executive BOB, now known as OMB.

The "Model Cities" law provides for a radical and complete socio-economic upheaval in the United States. Examine the "Model Cities" rewritten law in the Federal Codes Annotated and you will find cross-references to F.C.A. Titles on Banks and Banking; Public Buildings, Property and Works; Public Health and Welfare whose sections, in turn, deal with urban renewal and relocation, etc., operations of which are run by the bureaucratic printing press rules.

Put into action, the Model Cities social-engineering structure becomes subservient to administrative rules and regulations and includes such nonsense as "street elections" without official voter lists and with members of the League of Women Voters in charge rather than lawful Registrar of Voters deputies. The Model Cities structure completely bypasses constitutional representative government, and that accounts for the feverish support of it by the Metrocrats.[10]

The Model Cities law also is an example of Congress legislating in an area beyond its jurisdiction — i.e. areas not permitted by enumeration in the U.S. Constitution, the overworked "general welfare" clause in the Preamble, notwithstanding.

The Democratic administration's lame duck memo (LBJ) and the July 1969 (Nixon) Republican administration's A-95 circular illustrate why we have a Metro One-Party and not a check-and-balance two-Party system in the United States. Presidents may come and Presidents may go, but Metro and the Metrocrats go on uninterruptedly.

A-95 sets up an "early warning system" based on three types of clearinghouses: state and regional clearinghouses designated by state Governors, and metropolitan clearinghouses to be designated by the federal government. Local governments are under the web. All plans seeking federal assistance must be reviewed by the clearinghouse system. "Early warning" means that local governments should notify clearinghouses that plans will be submitted.

Title IV of the regional PL 90-577, the region-making law, contains a delegation of legislative power *from* Congress *to* the President. Circular A-95 was the response to the President's redelegation of that legislative power to one of his executive offices. A-95 illustrates vividly how that unlawfully delegated legislative power is turned into non-laws, administrative rules and regulations written by non-elected bureaucrats.

Hailed by the Metrocrats Circular A-95 is being taken to and explained in various parts of the United States as a system that is required and must be submitted to in order to receive federal assistance. Reaction has set in against the forced regionalization that the circular implements.

Section 204 of the "Model Cities" Act requires that a broad spectra of public facilities-type projects which seek federal assistance must be brought under the aegis of areawide comprehensive planning agencies — the clearinghouse system.

In brief, the lawmaking power (entrusted by American citizens to the elected legislative sector of government) is being conferred (unconstitutionally) upon executive appointees. Exercises of that abused power has produced the clearinghouse "planning network" that is now flung over the entire U.S.A. to force all independent units of local government under an administrative dictatorship.

Since the U.S. Constitution provides for no such socialistic control, the A-95 system is revealed as a domestic outgrowth from one of the UN international non-laws.

---

10. *Regional Planning Issues*, Hearings Part I, Oct. 13-15, 1970.

METROCRATS IGNORE U.S. LAW, MAKE NON-LAWS

Virtually unchallenged, the bureaucrats threaten local governments, giving out the false impression that federal assistance will be withheld from a city or a county which does not join a region.

There is no federal statute mandating regional membership.

Local governments are being hoodwinked into believing that they will lose distributable funds if they refuse regional planning.

And yet, after dropping out of a COG region, Crook County (Ore.) applied for and was apportioned $12,600 in Emergency Employment Act funds in Sept. '71. Other instances have toted up a significant score.

Most vigorous of the "join up or else" threats come from COG leadership, those Metro councils of governments that look to HUD (Housing and Urban Development) and other federal agencies for support.

The "cog game" gets underway when Metrocrat agents (they who promote Metro governance) call together local officials where the audience is told by pro-regional speakers that regions are being formed so that cities and counties can get federal assistance.

Newspapers print the elements of the message as each reporter hears it, usually interpreted as mandatory regionalism based on a quote delivered by a misled local official. Who checks it out? Practically no one.

But fund-starved local officials often rush to the regional trough.

Thriftier solvent governments don't fall so easily. One or two have even dug a little deeper and have exposed the bare bones of the true situation: that there is no legislated mandatory regional law, just a non-law written by delegated bureaucrats. The product is known as administrative rules and regulations.

In instances where a local government hesitates joining a COG, the Metrocrats haul out a crying rag embroidered with the questionable theory that if the holdout doesn't join to help create a region, its city or county neighbors will be denied the opportunity of applying for federal funds. That unfair argument is based on a HUD regulation which holds that a region must be composed of governments which represent 75 percent of the population of the region's geographic area.

The whole non-law situation has been a long time surfacing. First, the U.S. Congress shrugged off its lawmaking power. Enacting the Administrative Procedure Act in 1946, Congress has permitted the executive-administrative branch of government, through agencies, to rule the citizens by regulatory red tape of which, some rules are non-laws not backed by statutes.

One of the agencies, HUD, admits the truth. To the point-blank question, "Can a city or county obtain grants from HUD without belonging to a regional government?" HUD's Portland area branch office (Region X, Seattle, Wash.), replied August 23, 1971: (refer to 10.2PMM (Lang))

"Theoretically — yes, but from a management standpoint, the answer would be no . . . those public bodies that support the goals and objectives of this department, which include comprehensive planning, will have a better chance in the general competition for grant and loan assistance."

In other words, HUD brands U.S. Constitutional law as "theory," and enforces its own ersatz non-laws.

The unlawful situation is a hotbed capable of political harrassment and unauthorized impounding of funds withheld from independent governments which refuse the Administration's regional yoke.

Next time someone tells you that your city or county is required to join a regional planning setup to receive federal funds, demand to see the federal law that says so. But take heed, lest a non-law be palmed off as a true legislated statute.

SECRECY OVERKILLS PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

The public information section of the federal Administrative Procedure Act in 1972 was studied by a subcommittee of Congress with emphasis on abuses of the defense security system, but a lesser known aspect — a citizen's right to know about bureaucratic changes in his domestic government — also received attention.

More than any other law possibly, the federal Administrative Procedure Act is contributing to the downfall of American representative government. Approving the original Act, Congress abdicated its lawmaking trusteeship. In practice, the bureaucracy claims the orphaned legislative power. Result: the citizens are disenfranchised and prevented from making the laws they want to live under.

Far beyond the controlling statutes, bureaucrats are writing non-laws (administrative rules and regulations), the system which is converting the United States into an administrative dictatorship.

Enacted originally in 1946, the Act was recodified (Title 5 U.S.C.) in 1966, and its Sec. 552 amended in 1967. That amendment, ironically called the "Freedom of Information" law, affords the federal bureaucracy an alarming measure of secrecy.

A condition of the original law was relaxed. Materials which should be published in full in the Federal Register (administrative publication), now are being "incorporated by reference" — which is to say, not printed at all (Sec. 552 (a) 1-E). Under the system bureaucrats can enforce non-laws that have not been made public.

The controversial A-95 circular issued by the OMB (executive Office of Management and Budget) and administered by HUD (Housing and Urban Development) is a case in point. Never published in the Federal Register, the A-95 clearinghouse system is smothered under confusion generating from the many-times-revised administrative edict which is further altered by day-to-day, hour-by-hour interpretations, some by long-distance telephone conversations between HUD and its field offices.

Even with Federal Register publication of the rules and regulations, a citizen is hard-pressed to keep informed; he needs a lawyer at hand in order to be sure where true law ends and where non-law begins.

Without Federal Register publication, a citizen is rendered completely blind; he has no way of knowing what new bureaucratic rules and regulations are being written to shackle him.

Hearings were in process in 1972 before the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, Congressman Wm. S. Moorhead, Chairman.

A reliable Washington source indicated that the director of the Federal

Register had proposed a revision of the "incorporation by reference" standards and that a further relaxation of the requirement was contemplated. That would lead to even greater secrecy for the bureaucracy, less chance for the public to know what the executive sector is doing.

This further threat to the public's right to know must be scotched. Congress must reclaim its lawmaking power. Citizens insist upon consenting to the laws they live under as enacted properly by their elected representatives.

The entire Administrative Procedure Act needs to be expunged from the statutes. But until that time arrives, publication of all the non-laws in the Federal Register should be restored, no exceptions allowed.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE DICTATORSHIP

An influential Congressman has verified that the controversial condition of regionalism is not a requirement imposed by federal law.

If no federal law requires cities and counties to join a region as a condition to qualify for federal assistance, then why are thousands of local governmental units being pressured into regional membership?

Almost universally, local elected governing bodies have been told that regional arrangements "are required" before cities and counties can receive federal assistance. Told by whom? Required by what?

The shocking situation is caused by the unbelievable mishmash of contradictory information being issued by the federal Housing and Urban Development Department headquarters in Wash., D.C. and HUD's field offices in the ten federal regions over the fifty sovereign states.

The facts reveal that HUD spokesmen addressing local government leaders say "must join a region," whereas HUD heads have admitted, "there's no mandatory federal regional law."

HUD in Wash., D.C. in 1972 topped it off with a letter to a Congressman that stated, "There is no statutory requirement that a local governmental unit must be a member of an areawide council" (to get federal funding). That letter was signed by Joseph Westner, Assistant for Congressional Relations, Office of the Secretary of HUD.

Congressman Al Ullman (Ore.) passed a copy of the letter to a constituent in the Pacific Northwest on April 26, 1972 with the comment, "The attached reply from the Department of Housing and Urban Development indicates that there is no statute requiring membership in a regional planning organization as a prerequisite for funds under the water and sewer grant program."

Water-and-sewers was the grant category under discussion. The situation applies equally to other federal assistance programs.

A totally different and contradictory set of answers on the same topic — water, sewers, and regionalism — was given a few days earlier in the midwest by another congressman and another HUD spokesman. Published in the Goshen News (Goshen, Ind.) April 21, 1972, was a letter written by Steven J. Hans, HUD director in Indianapolis, to county commissioners stating, "Elkhart County must rejoin MACOG to be eligible for certain grants." The county had dropped out of bi-state (Mich.-Ind.) Michiana Area Council of Gov'ts.

Congressman John Brademas (Ind.) in an explanation to Robert Conrad, newspaper editor, wrote, "If Elkhart County is to avoid a cutoff of Federal funds in the near future . . . HUD officials advise me that the county must take steps to rejoin MACOG as an active participant."

How has this tempest of confusion, uneven application of regulations and bewildering congressional contradictions come about?

Because Congress has franchised bureaucrats with lawmaking power. Non-elected administrators write rules and regulations then change them from moment to moment, between morning and night and between dusk and dawn — even without publication in the Federal Register, the diary of administrative federal action.

The whole United States lies trussed under that tyranny of administrative dictatorship. The situation lies beyond the purgative of the ballot since citizens can't vote appointees out of office nor veto the rules and regulations (non-laws) which have the effect of laws.

It is imperative that our representatives in Congress begin an inquiry into the Administrative Procedure Act (Title 5 U.S.C.A.), and the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (PL 90-577), also the "Model Cities" Act (PL 89-754), and other unconstitutional delegations of legislative power.

OSHA: A Non-Law

A state governor, public anger, and a newspaper page provide a dimensional view which you cannot get by merely reading the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (OSHA), the law that controls employers and employees, and without constitutional authority.

That's because OSHA's non-law rules and regulations are written by bureaucrats after Congress approved the policy, wrong from its start. The offspring non-laws apparently are nastier than the parental non-law.

An almost full page display in the Summit Sun (Miss.) pointed out that OSHA writes, administers, and has the last word on the regulations it enforces under the name of the law.

Exercise of the three powers by one body (OSHA) constitutes a system of dictatorship. OSHA (the system) moves in where state-type OSHA's are lacking. The federal regulation of private matters within a state is falsely called a "partnership" by the OSHAcrats.

Governor Meldrim Thomson reportedly is discontinuing the so-called partnership in his state, New Hampshire. According to the Sunday News (Manchester, N.H.), the governor charged that OSHA "goes beyond" normal safety measures, and enforces regulations so strict that they harass employers and impede the progress of business.

He condemned the practice of compliance inspectors who reportedly levied on-the-spot fines without hearings, a type of tyranny out of keeping with the American concept of due process of law.

The OSHA Act as passed by Congress provides a sort of judicial referral. But, dealing out its own instant punishment OSHA demonstrates how the non-laws can sprout so easily on the fringe of a statute.

OSHA is enforced by the Dept. of Labor, one of the nine agencies that staff the regional councils of New Federalism's 10-Region U.S.A.

These are the facts of OSHA: The unconstitutional law as passed by

Congress fills 31 pages, 6″ x 9″. The non-law written by bureaucrats in the same type size reportedly fills 248 pages 8½″ x 11″ in the *Federal Register*, depository for non-laws.

What's in those 217 surplus pages? Your lawyer might tell you. And certainly OSHA's compliance inspectors will tell you!

"Through May 31, 1972, OSHA had issued more than 380,000 words of un-indexed rules and regulations plus supplementary instructions on record-keeping, notice posting, etc., which . . . would form a 17-foot high pile of papers." (Summit Sun 9/20/73)

In New Hampshire, the governor said three OSHA inspectors levied 18,712 fines against 91 business firms between Jan. 1 and June 30.

The governor laid out his course: He "divorced" OSHA. He sent out non-support notices to the Boston regional office (Region I). Copies were sent to members of the state's congressional delegation. Businessmen were asked to report further incidents of harsh and perhaps unlawful constraint of trade by the OSHAcrats.

Then the governor apparently confused the statute with the non-laws. He was reported saying that if Congress revised the law to remove harassment features he would be "happy to cooperate" again.

Does Congress have the power to revise the non-laws of the administrators? Having given the law-writing power to the executive sector that produced OSHA, it would seem that Congress would have to pass a special law to make a correction.

The Administrative Procedure Act, the source of non-laws, should be repealed. The entire non-law system of administrative rules and regulations goes against the Constitution.

Metro Water Law A UN Non-Law

A revolutionary tactic, a non-law falsely labeled as a proposed law, aims to control all drinking water in the United States and to fine violators five thousand dollars ($5000) per day.

Introduced May 10, 1972, H.R. 14899 would subject entire States and all Americans under the control of one individual, the Environmental Protection Administrator, with absolute power and authority over the nation's entire water supply, primary, secondary, and bottled water.

The administrator would decide drinking water standards, control water sources, establish regulations on underground sewers (waste injection control.) Under the broad powers, he could fluoridate all drinking water in the nation as a so-called "protection" for U.S. citizens. If his order regarding a sewer program were ignored, a $5000 per day fine could be inflicted as punishment and he could bring suit against States and persons should they thwart his will.

The 39-page recital of threats carries the title, "Safe Drinking Water Act." If the contents are startling, the format of the measure is more so; it appears to be a forerunner of the type of world (United Nations) non-laws that Americans can expect under the UN's Metro control.

H.R. 14899 wasn't a proposed statutory Act of Congress. Congress merely introduced the title; the language turned over the lawmaking to the ap-

92D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14899

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 10, 1972

Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MONAGAN, and Mr. ROBISON of New York) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

A BILL

To amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure that the public is provided with safe drinking water, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Safe Drinking Water Act".

PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS

SEC. 2. (a) The Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after title XI the following new title:

"TITLE XII—SAFETY OF PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1201. For purposes of this title:

"(1) The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

"(2) The term 'Agency' means the Environmental Protection Agency.

"(3) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law, or an Indian tribal organization authorized by law.

"(4) The term 'person' includes a State or a municipality.

"(5) The term 'public water system' means a system for the provision to the public of piped water for human consumption, if such system has at least fifteen service connections or regularly serves at least twenty-five individuals. Such term includes any collection, treatment, storage, and distribution facilities under control of the operator of such system and used primarily in connection with such system, and any collection or storage facilities not under such control which are used primarily in connection with such system.

"(6) The term 'supplier of water' means any person who owns or operates a public water system.

"(7) The term 'contaminant' means any physical, chemical, biological, or radiological substance or matter in water.

"(8) The term 'Council' means the National Drinking Water Advisory Council established under section 1210.

"NATIONAL DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS

"SEC. 1202. (a) (1) The Administrator shall publish proposed national primary drinking water regulations within 180 days after the date of enactment of this title, and he shall publish proposed national secondary drinking water regulations within 270 days after such date of enactment. Within 60 days after publication of any such regulation, he shall promulgate such regulation with such modifications as he deems appropriate. The Administrator may from time to time revise such regulations.

"(2) No primary regulation promulgated under this section, or revision thereof (other than a revision making only technical or clerical changes in a regulation), shall take effect until one year after the date on which such regulation or revision is published in the Federal Register.

"(3) In proposing and promulgating regulations under this section, the Administrator shall consult with and shall take into consideration the recommendations of the Secretary,

pointed Administrator. The non-laws he makes (administrative regulations) need only to be published in the Federal Register to take effect. The proposed measure so provided.

The Administrator would name his own 15-member advisory council. Presumably the ten regional EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) directors in the ten (10) U.S.A. regions would report to him on the monumental task of inspecting and monitoring that would be required.

Made responsible for enforcing the water non-laws, the States would face lawsuits and fines if they didn't. ACIR (Syndicate 1313-dominated federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations) openly assisted by several 1313 groups, has a package of water and sewer laws prepared for state use (ACIR "Cum" 1970, 87-51-00 a,b, and c.)[11]

By ratifying the UN Charter, the U.S. Senate committed The Congress to legislate in areas which are closed to Congress by the Constitution. The Constitution doesn't give Congress the power to enact an unlimited spate of laws. Nor water control laws.

Alien UN laws are coming into the U.S.A. via the United Nations Charter as mandates that aren't self-executing. After execution (enactment by Congress) those UN non-laws are being upheld by the Courts using the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Each State clouded its statutory sovereignty in favor of the federal laws when the States ratified the 14th Amendment. The controversial ratification claim itself is moot.

Abused by the tortured interpretations of the Courts, the 14th Amendment has been turned into a shelter for alien UN "laws" and enforces them in the States. The switch from the UN Charter mandate to the 14th Amendment argument in Fujii vs. State set the pattern. (See Fujii vs. State [Calif.], 1950 & 4/17/52 — 242 Pacific Reporter P. 2d 617.)

The Amendment sets up dual citizenship for Americans: state citizenship and U.S. citizenship. Speaking of the latter, the Amendment says, "No State . . . shall . . . deny to any person . . . the equal protection of the laws." A command for every State to obey "national" laws. Abused, the command is being made to justify alien UN non-laws within the United States.

In writing the national drinking water non-law, the political vandals may have gone too far too fast. They failed to take into account the traditional supremacy of a Constitution, including state constitutions, over executive orders and administrative regulations (the non-laws such as the water measure.)

The error might be fatal for that and other Metro governance controls.

Control Over Water Sought Through Fluoridation

At a time when LBJ was charging the nation with water pollution control, another program, moving silently, continued its crusade to contaminate every glass of drinking water in the United States.

Falsely claiming that addition of sodium fluoride, about one part per million water, reduces tooth decay, proponents were foolishly relying on propaganda that has been rated as a statistical illusion many times over.

One such condemnation of false statistics was made before the New York

---

11. See Bibliography.

City Board of Estimate by a research and development engineer. His summation stemmed from definitive research that proved fluoridated water was not a tooth cavity preventative. Holder of numerous professional and civic awards K.K. Paluev said, "Were it not for the sincerity of its promoters, fluoridation would have gone down in history as the greatest con game of all time — snake oil peddling come of age."[12]

A false contention — that fluoride dosage of water is no deadlier than common table salt — was dramatically unmasked in Chico (Calif.). During a pro-fluoridation meeting, Dr. O. E. Dunaway appeared with two tumblers of water, offering to mix sodium fluoride (an ingredient used to poison rodents) in one glass, salt in the other and to drink the saline mixture if a fluoridation proponent would drink the fluoridated potion. Nobody accepted the doctor's challenge.

Prior to 1939, fluoridating water was practically unthinkable, no doubt because the high toxicity of fluorides was considered comparable with that of arsenic and lead. Yet, on Sept. 20, 1939, a Dr. G. J. Cox proposed fluoridation for Johnstown (Pa.). The idea originated in 1936 when he was Senior Industrial Fellow at the Mellon Institute founded by Andrew Mellon, also founder of Aluminum Corp. of America (ALCOA.) Fluoride is a by-product of aluminum production.[13]

In January 1950, ALCOA started advertising sale of fluoride as an additive to public drinking water.

In December of the same year, interestingly, a federal court awarded $60,000 to a cattleman who had brought suit against ALCOA's Vancouver (Wash.) plant. He complained that fluoride slag had contaminated grass and forage which resulted in injury and death to his cattle. The court agreed that ALCOA was at fault in dumping 1,000 to 7,000 pounds of fluoride each month into the Columbia River.[14]

A court case, Readey vs. St. Louis County, also rendered a verdict favoring a plaintiff who filed suit against water fluoridation. Court ruled a May 1959 ordinance for fluoridating the county water supply to be invalid and unconstitutional, violating the U.S. Constitution, the Missouri Constitution and the St. Louis County Charter.[15]

The 800-page transcript indicated that fluoridation does not prevent tooth decay in any age group of human beings and that dental caries increased 36 percent in ten years after the addition of artificial fluoridation under the famous Newburgh, N.Y. fluoridation study.

Dr. Wm. A. Albrecht, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Soils, University of Missouri warned against fluoridation of water. Coming from distances to testify, Dr. F. B. Exner, M.D. (Seattle) exposed as false the claim that all medical and dental associations have endorsed fluoridation: Dr. George L. Waldbott, M.D. (Detroit) proved the fluoridation program to be a political scheme without scientific basis.

---

12. Fluoridation Benefits — A Statistical Illusion, by K.K. Paluev, Pittsfield, Mass. (1957).

13. National Fluoridation News, Vol. VI No. 1, Detroit, Mich.

14. Seattle Times quote *Id.*

15. The Case Summary (1961) by D. Readey.

The political charge is supportable by Syndicate 1313 getting into the act. 1313's National Institute of Municipal Law Officers published the booklet, "Fluoridation of Municipal Water Supply," containing draft laws to implement the fluoridation of public water supplies.

THE IRS: FREQUENT NON-LAW USER

Working separately, the endeavors of two exceptional Americans converged on one major irritant, the U.S. Internal Revenue Service.

Agents of that bureaucracy which collects your federal income tax were taken to court by Austin Flett in Illinois and Willis Stone in California. Stone is founder and national chairman of the Liberty Amendment Committee which proposes phasing out the federal individual income tax.[16]

The Liberty Amendment's case against the IRS was filed in Los Angeles Federal Court April 6, 1970, charging the IRS with rewriting sections of the U.S. Constitution and the statutes by the method of publishing the following "definition " in the Federal Register 6/26/59:

> "The term 'legislation' . . . includes action by the Congress, by any State Legislature, or by a local council or similar governing body, or *by the public in a referendum, initiative, constitutional amendment or similar procedure.*"

Since the Liberty Amendment is a proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution and inclusive in the above, the IRS, empowered through its own declaration or definition is attempting to strip the Liberty Amendment Committee of its tax equity as a non-political, non-profit organization.

Beyond the tax angle, the test case sought to determine whether or not bureaucrats in administrative government can continue to exert lawmaking-by-ink — a process of merely printing laws ("rules") on the paper of the daily Federal Register, a publication whose staff additionally assists agencies in the rule-making.[17]

A similar case history, that of insurance broker Austin Flett, began in 1942 when Flett complained to the U.S. Treasury Dept. that unfair federal law forced him to pay income taxes while his underwriting competitors, under shelter of a "cooperative" conglomerate, went tax free.

Flett's research revealed to him that the insurance group was part of a worldwide socialist movement financed by unlawfully untaxed funds.[18]

Proof furnished to the Treasury Dept. by Flett was to have been used to collect from illegal exemptees several billion dollars in unpaid taxes. No action resulted — except that harrassment of Flett began.

In 1969, Mr. Flett signed his Form 1040 in blank. As he had done for eleven consecutive years, he filed under protest and paid no tax.

Flett declared, "There is nothing in the law that states that taxpayers, under threat of prison sentences shall be forced, unlawfully via withholding taxes, audits, liens, levies, seizure notices, summons and court orders, to pay

---

16. Liberty Amendment Committee, U.S.A., 6413 Franklin Ave., Los Angeles, Calif. 90028.

17. U.S. Government Organization Manual 1959-60.

18. Flett research publications, 134 S. LaSalle St., Chicago, Illinois 60603.

the Federal Income Taxes of approximately 1,200,000 tax exempt organizations that unlawfully escape the payment of twenty-five to fifty billions of dollars each year in Federal Income Taxes.

"Rules and Regulations Title 26, U.S. Internal Revenue Code, as promulgated and enforced under the 'Administrative Procedure Act of 1946' is in complete violation of the rights of all citizens under the Constitution of the United States and Title 18, Section 241, U.S. Criminal Code."

Flett wrote on another occasion, "IRS will not bring me to trial in my cases started May 1965 and April 1966, as decision can only be: Unconstitutional! IRS is in deep trouble. Look for repeal of the Internal Revenue Code as illegal."

Climaxing his long fight, Flett filed Case No. 70 C 680, March 18, 1970 in the U.S. District Court, Ill., Northern District, Eastern Division. Flett pinpointed the trouble-making federal Administrative Procedure Act, originally Public Law 79-404, (Title 5 U.S.C.) The law defines "agency" and "authority" as being the same. A "rule" becomes "any agency statement . . . designed to implement . . . or prescribe law or policy" (when) "published in the Federal Register."

Importantly, Flett's case was to have determined the Constitutionality of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Rules and Regulations of the IRS Code as enforced in the courts via "this unlawful Act."

Flett named three defendants, a judge, U.S. Attorney, and IRS agent, and charged them with four counts of harrassment in violation of Title 18, U.S. Criminal Code.

Of supreme significance is the fact that administrative lawmaking by Federal Register ink became the target of both lawsuits, the Liberty Amendment's and the late Mr. Flett's. The splendid warrior for constitutional government died unexpectedly during a lecture tour. His several court suits, feared by the IRS, were never brought to trial. The Liberty Amendment case is on its way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Shifting legislative power to the executive sector, delegating lawmaking to administrative appointees — that's what Metro governance is all about. A violation of the U.S. Constitution's tri-partite separation of powers. Now here it is, exposed working at the federal tax collecting level.

GOVERNANCE VICTIM: A SCHOOL

Watching the incredible destruction of Shelton College, a private non-denominational school in New Jersey, knowledgeable citizens recognized the weapon used as fashioned from dread Metro materiél: 1) a comprehensive education *masterplan* and 2) *governance*, bureaucratic control powered by administrative regulatory devices, not by processed laws.

The concept of geographic regionalism capped by dictatorial *governance* has produced Metro, the antithesis of U.S. Constitutional government, and Shelton's decease provides an example of governance working in education as well as in government.

Dr. Ralph A. Dungan, Chancellor of Higher Education, N.J. reportedly wrote in an *executing memorandum* used against Shelton, "New Jersey has created a single comprehensive system of higher education which includes all institutions, public and private, at all levels of higher education.... The

New Jersey system . . . has the advantages of a simple and direct system of *governance.*"

In brief, private Shelton College at Cape May, N.J., was by forcible governance, incorporated into the state's monolithic educational system, was measured, found at variance with the masterplan elements, was then impaled by a 19-item bill of charges, declared unworthy of accreditation and closed down.

Typical of the unsubstantiated charges aimed at Shelton: didn't have enough money to pay a competent faculty, no proper library, etc.

Dr. Carl McIntire, president of Shelton, claims that the college more than met minimum requirements by any fair appraisal, and that the state education board was fault-finding with generalized accusations. Established to serve the state and its people, the Board — he said — actually made the rules, interpreted the rules, and judged the suspect. The description fits "governance."

In his message at the last Commencement at Cape May, May 1971, Dr. McIntire remarked, "Could it be that our Christian warriors, the ones that we are training could be at the root of all our trouble? Is it that Dr. Dungan did not want to see men raised up in this State to provide the leadership in the battle to expose the liberals for their humanism?"

Also speaking at the farewell Commencement, The Hon. Charles Sandman, representing the second congressional district of New Jersey, deplored the ruthless destruction of Shelton College, and at a time when the state needs educational facilities so badly. The Congressman recalled what he termed other "blunders" made by many of the New Jersey educators while turning Rutgers into the State University (1957).

Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers draws Metrocrats from all over the nation where conferences and workshops crank out Metro schemes to dominate American government.

The state long has been a Metro hotbed. In 1936, New Jersey passed the law that launched Syndicate 1313's unconstitutional Council of State Governments to which all fifty states now pay annual tribute.

In mourning the death of Shelton at the hands of New Jersey "governance" it is recalled that radio station WXUR and WXUR-FM, headed also by Dr. McIntire, was ordered off the air by federal "governance" due to an alleged violation of an *administrative doctrine* promulgated by Federal Communications Commission.

Appalled by these contemptible events under Metro "governance," angered Americans take a measure of satisfaction in the *resurrection* of Shelton. The college opened its 1971 Fall term September at Cape Canaveral, Florida.

C H A P T E R F O U R

The Courts and the Lawyers

Legal Pack Action By Syndicate 1313

The strange type of government being dealt out to Americans since the United States signed the United Nations Charter, is causing organized "group pressure" to war upon those brave individual Americans who stand up against the outrageous laws of encroaching World Government.

The group-vs.-individual phenomena, predicted by psychiatrists more than two decades ago, has served up some extraordinary examples over the period of years. The following two are drawn from the domestic franchiser of UN Treaty Law, Syndicate 1313 at 1313 E. 60 St., Chicago.

NIMLO (1313's National Institute of Municipal Law Officers) played "friend of the *court*" against the case of a householder who barred a health officer's entry without a search warrant. The event took place in Baltimore (Md.) in 1958.

The homeowner offered to admit the inspector if a search warrant were presented. No warrant was ever sought, although an entire day elapsed between the attempted inspection and the arrest. The householder was convicted and fined, the court holding that the Baltimore city code was valid and that the search without a warrant did not violate the Due Process clause of the 4th Amendment.

The case was carried to the U.S. Supreme Court level and NIMLO filed again as amici curiae (friends of the court) for member cities whose attorneys belonged to NIMLO, part of the 1313 Metro complex. Metrocrats support the practice of "administrative search" (without court-approved search warrants) as a means of gaining easy entrance to private property "to do what needs to be done" — as Metrocrats put it.

A dissenting Justice pointed out that, as far back as English common law, a man's cottage was protected from entry without warrant, even if the King himself, wanted in. The Justice also stated, "It was not the search that was vicious, it was the absence of a warrant. . . ." Yet, the Supreme Court majority with 1313's NIMLO as *amici curiae* upheld the lower courts, setting precedent that helps strike down the right to privacy.[1]

The second example of Metro-1313 pack action against an individual occurred in the City of Bakersfield vs. Miller building code case.[2] A hotel was condemned by the city using a retroactive (ex post facto) building code published by Syndicate 1313's International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO).

The trial court ruled against the hotelman. The appellate court reversed

1. United States Reports, Vol. 359, p. 360, Oct. term 1958.
2. California Supreme Court, L.A. Number 28224, 1966.

the decision and criticized the practice of code adoption "by reference," — a method by which a city can adopt a pre-packaged "mail order set of laws" such as the ICBO code, merely by naming the code title. ICBO's code runs to about 364 pages in length.

The hotelman took his case to the California Supreme Court and lost; he asked for a rehearing.

Joining in as "friends of the court" on the side of the City, 1313's network of city attorneys closed in on the hapless individual, listing more than 40 California cities as "amici curiae."

One city attorney exploited a city name without getting prior consent from the city council. Other attorneys representing from one to four little cities on a part-time basis, added the names of these to the list, usually under a so-called "blanket approval" which gives the city attorneys a free hand to do as they see fit.

The toils of Metro-1313 can ensnarl other citizens whose city attorneys hold membership in NIMLO, and whose city code includes ICBO "administrative" law. Such "law," written by outsiders such as political Syndicate 1313 or appointed administrators, consists of punitive rules and regulations which, when uncontested, are as binding upon citizens as statutory law.

URBAN RENEWAL AND THE U.S. COURTS SYSTEM

Citizens who are being plunged into involuntary bankruptcy forced on them by urban renewal have been asking if any property owner anywhere in the United States has ever won a case against Urban Renewal.

Generally, urban renewal court cases based on concept, with plaintiffs asking for: 1) cessation of an UR project, or 2) relief or exclusion from the boundaries of a specific UR project, or 3) a contention that UR is unconstitutional or in violation of state law — all such cases have ended in defeat for the property owners. Seemingly, the courts are pro-urban renewal and render decisions accordingly.

An attorney has generously volunteered the following: "My experience as a lawyer indicates to me this sort of practice prevalent in urban renewal: An immature do-gooder draftsman (appointed, not elected by the people) draws a rectangle on a city map thumb-tacked to his drawing board and in accord with his arrogant non-elected colleagues proclaims a 'finding,' which is non-appealable by judicial process, that the area within the rectangle must be demolished and then rebuilt according to sophomoric whims.

"That kind of dictatorship has resulted in the destruction of a Wash., D.C. department store business as in the case of Berman vs. Parker (cited in *Terrible 1313 Revisited* by Author). It resulted in the demolition of a freshly modernized building as in a certain Massachusetts case. It has resulted in the razing of a new business venture erected only three years before the urban 'improvement' scheme and the award of the land to a different private business, as in another Massachusetts case.

"The Massachusetts Court has held: 'The fact that the dwellings of the plaintiffs... (were not decadent)... is immaterial, for the test is the area as a unit and not dwellings located in the area."[3]

---

3. Stockus vs. Boston Housing Authority, 304 Mass. 507, 510.

An owner who brings suit based on price has a slight chance of winning. One plucky citizen group in Los Angeles (Calif.), the Hoover Area Improvement Assn., Inc.[4] which sued on UR's specific violation of state and other laws was stopped cold by the entire California court system, and waited it out as the Community Redevelopment Agency prepared to take private properties. An HAIA spokesman put it this way:

> "Our members expect to refuse the CRA's first and second cut-rate price offers. If the third step, an arbitration hearing before a judge between the owners and the CRA, reaches no agreement, then the CRA can sue. Only then will each owner get his attorney. If the owners win, Los Angeles city taxes will go up to cover the court awards, but Angelenos deserve to pay — they failed to speak out against CRA when we needed help."

It is Urban Renewal's senseless and extravagant demolishment of perfectly sound, economically healthy structures which someday may break the backs of the taxpaying American public and thus bring urban renewal to a stop.

On the other hand, analytical citizens will recognize urban renewal for what it is: An alien concept brought into the United States through the United Nations Charter's treaty law. As the economic offshoot of Metropolitan Governance, world government cut to size for the U.S.A., urban renewal has been sponsored from its inception by political Syndicate 1313's NAHRO (National Assn. of Housing & Redevelopment Officials), 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, Illinois.

THE COURTS REFUSE TO JUDGE

The American people are being injured by administrative rules and regulations sometimes passed off as red tape. But when the tape begins to sprout barbed wire, *governance* by administrative rules has gone too far.

An administrative rule or regulation is written by a bureaucrat; it is not a law arising from citizen consent through elected lawmakers.

Only recently, citizens have discovered their subjugation under regulatory administrative rules and regulations but many public attorneys and judges apparently have known, all along. Now, when asked to judge specifically on cases involving administrative rules, the courts are balking in a curious manner.

According to a complaint, citizens in Coffeyville (Kans.) wanted to vote on urban renewal. A city attorney advised the city commission that it was not necessary to have an election. Apparently the legislative power over UR had been transformed into administrative power when the city council "did business" by administrative *resolution* rather than by *legislative* ordinance.

The citizens took the matter to court, and lost. Without commenting on the federal administrative nature of urban renewal through the Housing and Urban Development Dept. (HUD), a rule-making agency, the judge declared the case "laches" — too late. Yet, the citizens claim that they presented their

---

4. HAIA, Inc. 1040 W. 35 St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90007 (Premises razed by UR).

petition prior to the city's entering into contract with urban renewal. *Why did the Court duck?*

The Liberty Amendment Committee of the U.S.A. vs. United States, *et al.* involves an adminstrative "definition" by the Internal Revenue Service, a rule-making agency. The nationwide Liberty Amendment Committee (to repeal the federal individual income tax) contested the IRS action which denied a type of tax exemption. A Writ was requested to force the IRS to abide by the Constitution and the laws of the United States. The federal court in California termed the suit "premature" and claimed that the relief requested fell outside the court's jurisdiction. *Why did that court sidestep?*

Editorially, the Liberty Amendment Committee commented,[5] "The bureaucracy . . . established the technique of replacing our law with their 'regulations' or 'definitions' long ago. . . . The acts of collusion between the bureaucracy and the federal court emerged with the greatest possible clarity on June 19, 1970." (date of decision by Federal Judge H. Pregerson re: the committee's case.)

Elsewhere, in Illinois, Mr. Austin Flett who filed his case against the IRS agents *et al* was likewise put down by a federal court. The late Mr. Flett paid no federal income tax for more than a dozen years. He alleged that the defendants, collaborators in a secret government functioning through administrative rules, are not competent to administer the laws of the United States.

In a letter dated June 29, 1970, the IRS admitted that the Internal Revenue Service is an "Agency" as defined by the federal Administrative Procedure Act (Title 5 U.S.C.). That law delegates power to agencies to make "printing press laws" — administrative rules printed in the Federal Register and its Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

Like the Kansas and California courts, the Illinois U.S. District Court (Judge Bernard M. Decker) dismissed Flett's case, stating that the court was without jurisdiction.[6]

If the devil were to lose his asbestos boots, his gyrations would be scarcely more grotesque than the behavior of the courts when confronted with an administrative rule situation. Using similar tactics, the three aforementioned courts ducked the true issue and cloaked the malefactors.

Why are judges refusing to judge on the malfunctions of administrative rules?

METRO PERILS AMERICAN JUSTICE

Metrocrats found an opening into the judicial sector of government when Congress established the Federal Judicial Center (Title 28 U.S.C., Chapter 42, Sections 620-29) in 1967.

The Center may turn out to be, in the federal judicial sector, what Metro-1313's ACIR is in the legislative sector, a trojan horse, for the Metrocrats to capture the judicial processes.

The reason for the Center never was made quite clear by the legislators

5. Freedom Magazine, Summer 1970, Liberty Amendment Committee of the U.S.A., 6413 Franklin Ave., Los Angeles 90028.

6. Flett vs. Campbell et al No. 70C680, U.S. Distr. Court, No. Distr. of Illinois, Eastern Division.

who voted for it.[7] It was fuzzily described as a means to improve the administration of justice. What type of justice? Metro's?

The Act (PL 90-219) certainly opened the way for Metrocrats to assume control over the judicial process by using the administrative reins whereby the breed controls all agencies and governmental departments which its offspring invades.

One section of the law authorizes the study of and ways in which ADP (automatic data processing) systems might be applied to court administration.

Another section authorizes the Center's Board to request information from any department, agency or independent instrumentality of the Government, and those sources are directed to "cooperate." It puts the Judicial Center into a unique position of power control over the other branches through information control that can be speeded by electronics.

In warning against the Center in 1967, Hon. John R. Rarick pointed out, "*The separation of the powers* of our government into the three divisions of legislative, judicial and executive has been basic for survival. The balance is further eroded by H.R.6111 [Center bill, Ed.] As is par for the day, the unelected minority leads and directs the elected majority. The legislative branch has now perfected the machine by which it [unelected minority, Ed.] may obtain advice and consent from the judiciary. . . . One might think the Congress would start resenting their powers being usurped and the responsibility of their duties as elected officials to their people being suppressed. But apparently not."[8]

In turn, the judiciary is vulnerable to being impregnated with advice and counsel dispensed by the Metrocrats.

The Center's door is open to political Syndicate 1313's hucksters. The Board may contract with government and "private agencies" (descriptive of the 1313 organizations) or persons, for research projects and other services.

Federal administrative agencies, such as HUD, regularly sign contracts with purveyors of Metro governance, the units of the Syndicate 1313, core at 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago. Under similar contracts, the Metrocrats can develop programs and mould personnel in the judicial branch, including judges, referees, clerks of court, probation officers, etc., to suit the purposes of Metro.

Syndicate 1313 quasi-juridical units already exist, such as the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators Assn., the Conference of Chief Justices, and National Conference of Court Administrative Officers to "advise" the Center. Those 1313 units operate under the aegis of 1313's all-pervasive Council of State Governments (see MetroChart, front of book).

With the Metrocrats imbedded within ACIR in the legislative sector, and with their access secured to the Federal Judicial Center in the judicial sector, Metro's aggrandizement appears almost complete as to structure.

Regional Court Decision Garrotes Counties

The California Supreme Court has ruled that El Dorado and Placer coun-

7. Congressional Record pp. H7401-07 6/19/67 passed by House. Passed by Senate 11/17/67.

8. John R. Rarick, M.C. June 1967 press release re: H.R. 6111, American News Service.

ties must pay the levies imposed by the bi-state Lake Tahoe region: El Dorado $136,944.68; Placer $84,272.98; total $221,217.66, 1969-72.

The decision amounts to an "end run" circumventing the State Constitution. The tragedy is made shockingly worse because the U.S. Congress has joined in the power push.

Californians objected to the region headed by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency but citizens never had a chance to vote on the changeover to the radical new form of governance. The Nevada and California legislatures voted in the region, asked for congressional consent.

Citizen anger followed the matter to Wash., D.C., delayed it during two sessions, but Congress approved the bi-state 5-county region (PL 91-148).

Not one syllable of the opposition appeared in the measure's federal reports of the Senate (Rept. 91-510) and House (Rept. 91-650), due to Wash., D.C.'s type of book burning. Sterile, lacking objectivity, those federal reports nevertheless were quoted at length by Judge Sullivan who handed down the decision on The People vs. County of El Dorado, et al (Sac. 7896, filed 8/17/71). Six judges concurred: Wright, McComb, Peters, Mosk, Schauer and Devine.

In effect, the court bypassed California's constitution. The court upheld the new and additional political subdivision (a region that covers pre-existing territory); it validated the region's false power to perform functions already assigned by statute to the counties; it swept away good Constitutional defenses, as well as the people's right to vote. All done by applying specious "regional" tags and arguments.

It is appalling to observe the court's footwork in avoiding the time-tested Constitutional prohibition against delegation of lawmaking power from a legislative body to an administrative group. The court opined that the legislature can "leave to some other body, public or private, the task of achieving the goals envisioned in the legislation."

In other words, while the legislature plays hookey, the Agency can crank out red tape — administrative rules and regulations — change them between morning and night and change them again between midnight and dawn, and the citizens are forced to obey.

Where the statutes left off and delegated administrative governance took over, the fearsome Metro system clicked into gear: a new measuring stick, the declaration of deficiency — counties not meeting the new standards, the book burning of dissent, and lastly the pro-regional court decision.

Because Tahoe's waves lap at both state shores and "observe no political boundaries," the court rationalized in favor of the new layer of governance capping the lake and environs. By the same Metro reasoning, the trade winds that blow, the clouds that drift, the currents of the seven seas become rationale for regionalism under world governance.

By reference, the court blamed Tahoe resident home owners for alleged inadequacies. The county governments were deemed too weak to cope. So the big regional Agency sought and won a court order to wring the thousands of dollars out of the captive counties to finance functions now denied to their performance by regionalism.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the successful 14th Amendment "class action" case re: California's public housing referendum law (City of San Jose *et al*, April 1971) reaffirmed the citizens' right to vote.

If a "class action" appeal by a California citizen in the Tahoe region should go before the U.S. Supreme Court, would the Court likewise protect the citizen's right to vote? Citizens were denied their right to vote on the bi-state regional governance which was created by the legislatures of California and Nevada.

THE LAWYERS HAVE KNOWN IT ALL ALONG!

By now, a couple of million Americans know what the trouble is: Americans are losing ground, falling back step by step as the bureaucratic dictatorship spreads out from Wash., D.C. It regulates Americans by non-laws enforced through the regional Metro system. When the President regulates the whole United States, he does so by Executive Orders. The non-laws and orders both are part of the non-American practice.

"We have developed something quite different than what our Founding Fathers talked about," said Dr. Frank Newman of the University of California. "I think it is very clear that most of our laws — certainly our most important laws — at the present time are not enacted by the legislature — by the Congress — but rather by government officials to whom Congress has delegated legislative power. *The lawyers know that*!"

The professor of international law was speaking to a meeting of the World Peace Through Law group (WPTL) reportedly of the American Bar Assn. Its members, occupationally slanted, claim that worldwide law could bring peace.

In his taped remarks, the lawyer went on to say that the bulk of legal work today is concerned "with that kind of law, that is — laws from the bureaucrats, rather than law from the Congress."

Why don't the many Americans who know about the peril defeat the peril? Sadly, in trying to make themselves heard, they can't compete with the prizes among the popcorn in the Federal Cracker Jacks.

Mayors and other public officials throng Washington, D.C., leaving unsolved problems at home while they jostle each other in competition for federal aid. "We want that money," they say, "We've got it coming to us."

An administrator of one of the free Medicare-serviced "convalescent homes" haughtily stated that many of the patients, perfectly capable of paying their own medical expenses, were wealthy people. "Why shouldn't they take advantage of Medicare — they've got it coming to them," she said.

The "new poor" demand and get luxury appliances, stylish clothing and child support based on a bounty system — so much per head. "They've got it coming," in the new parlance. "Pass the application blanks."

A businessman warns his wife "not to make a fool of herself" down at city hall where a tax payer group is protesting the Model Cities mess. He's got steel pipe to sell and wants the government contract.

Money for everybody in this grotesque Metro-America! The "gimme" seekers are, in their own eyes, just getting what they've got coming.

The WPTL speaker, approaching his conclusion: "that by focusing on *human* concerns, we'll get a better international government," revealed what he called "fantastically competent and effective enforcement devices."

He said, "We use the *money power*. There's an awful lot of people in this country that 'need' government money from Wash., D.C. And Wash., D.C. has

learned that people want that money so bad that they are willing to do all sorts of things in order to get it.... Now that they (the bureaucrats, Ed.) have a device for controlling — I don't know whether it is 40 percent, or 50 percent, or 60 percent of our economy... in general we are much more dependent on the decisions of those determining contracts than we are on decisions of public utilities commissions and old-fashioned regulatory agencies. In other words, you use the *contract power* much as you use money power in 'modern governing' to get things done that you think have to be done!"

In addition to the "gimme" seekers, what about the vast mass of passive neutralists who take no part in the needed drive to banish governance-by-enforcement? Do they have anything coming? Yes! Bondage under the dictatorship.

Foes of Right-To-Vote Menaced Nine States

Time almost ran out for a good law which citizens in nine sovereign states had approved in order to protect their environment and their over-taxed wallets.

The law provides that no public housing project can be started until the voters have approved the project. The law, held in common by California, Colorado, Iowa, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Oklahoma, Texas, and Virginia, hung under threat in 1970 waiting to be argued before the Supreme Court of the United States.

The original controversies erupted in the City of San Jose and County of San Mateo (Calif.). The two cases were consolidated (Brief for Appellee Housing Authority City of San Jose, by O'Melveny & Myers, Los Angeles, Calif.).

Non-taxed National Urban Coalition in Washington, D.C. and its medusa-like appendages immediately spearheaded a drive to influence the Supreme Court to deny taxed citizens the right to vote on how their tax dollars are spent.

The law enjoys constitutional muscle in California, being Article XXXIV of the state constitution. It was added by an initiative measure approved by the citizens in 1950.

But opponents tried to strike down that law, and to topple the laws of the other eight states, also to prevent the right-to-vote likewise in all fifty states. Reportedly, the tax-supported parasitic National Urban Coalition was to file a "friend of the court" brief urging the court to rule the California law invalid on the grounds that it is discriminatory — i.e. alleges that it prevents public tenants from getting what's due 'em.

The powerful Urban Coalition, headed by former HEW Secretary, John W. Gardner (Health, Education, Welfare), was hosted at a black-tie dinner by Pres. Nixon in 1969. The Coalition which gets money from HUD (Housing and Urban Development Dept.) drafted former U.S. Attorney-Gen. Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach as chairman of its 22-member task force on law and government. The task force was made up of lawyers, judges and other legal sinew usable by Urban Coalition. (The Urban Coalition Report June 1969.)

To its steering committee, Urban Coalition thoughtfully added special interests which would benefit from unrestricted public housing construction and interest-bearing bonds, notes and other financial paper — such as

ALCOA (Aluminum Co. of America), Kaiser Industries, Chase Manhattan Bank, Allied Stores Corporation, insurance companies, labor unions, racially oriented councils and federal anti-poverty officials.

Then the Coalition marched out to whang against the dikes which tax payers had erected to save themselves, the laws which mandate a referendum before neighborhood-glutting public housing projects are started.

According to a reliable report from Washington, D.C., "The earliest these cases (James vs. Valtierra, Shaffer vs. Valtierra, Housing Authority of San Jose, Valtierra et al) could be heard is during the two week December session 1970, and it is likely that they will not be heard until January 1971. Thus, this is the time to submit 'friend of the court' briefs before the case is argued."

Without a doubt, the Metrocrat lawyers, through their Metro-1313 NIMLO (National Institute of Municipal Law Officers) asking for abolishment of the right-to-vote law, flooded the Supreme Court with their "friend" briefs. They do it all the time.

It is noted that citizens of the nine states which had much to lose if the right-to-vote law is struck down, likewise instituted "friend of the court" briefs through their legal representatives on their own behalf.

In 1971, the Court, in upholding the California amendment/law sustained the citizens right to vote.

C H A P T E R F I V E

The Metrocrats' Syndicate

Into Serfdom By Metro Decree

The Inner Core

Presidents of the United States from Franklin D. Roosevelt to the present have taken whacks at the attempt to do over representative government and to substitute an administrative dictatorship.

FDR got things rolling by appointing an administrative management team (1936-37) headed by Louis Brownlow with Luther Gulick and Charles E. Merriam, all co-founders of the Public Administration Center (clearing-house), 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago 60637. Self-named "1313," the political syndicate propagates Metro regional governance, the current embodiment of the reform movement. Upon request, the 1313 Center offers a free 15-page booklet, Brownlow's photograph included.

President Nixon presented his reorganization plan (Doc. No. 92-75) March 25, 1971, praising the Brownlow committee among others. That explains why Thirteen-Thirteeners (Metrocrats) have been flocking to the Wash., D.C. hearings,[1] offering testimony favoring reorganization. The principle — to throw more power to the administrative sector — is a Metro basic at all governmental levels, city to federal.

Nixon made no mention of where FDR got his radical ideas. One tracing leads to Jacob L. Moreno, European psychiatrist, who entered the U.S. in 1925. Eventually he reached President Roosevelt at Hyde Park who said, "When I am back in Washington, I will see where your ideas can be put to use."[2]

Moreno boasted that he had come to implant his social-change notions in the United States rather than in Soviet Russia because another fellow, Marx, had already got a similar system working in the U.S.S.R. The two systems now seem to be drawing together.

Moreno envisioned for the U.S.A. an administrative Dept. of Human Relations as a nuclear structure reaching down to sub-group units at the neighborhood level.[3] The feedback would deliver the wants of the people to the people-department within the executive sector.

Today, Moreno's structure is stunningly evident in the "model cities" neighborhood voter systems where low income/welfare cases vote for their "needs" in elections that are not based on legal voting rolls. The group consensus is directed by city managers (administrative sector) upward to

---

1. Reorganization of Executive Depts., Part 1, June 2-July 27, 1971, House Government Operations Committee, Wash., D.C. 20515.

2. "Who Shall Survive?" by J. L. Moreno.

3. "Sociometry: An Experimental Method and the Science of Society," both by J. L. Moreno, Beacon House, Inc. Beacon, N.Y. 12508.

the federal Housing and Urban Development Dept. (HUD). The process bypasses the U.S. Congress, and people are conditioned to shun their representative processes of government.

Aside from being dead-ringers for Moreno's models, the model cities people groups also resemble the existing Red China and Soviet structures, successive layers of assemblies and committees built between the local level and the control authority at the top.

The president in 1971 wanted four giant departments to cover the United States: Community Development, Human Resources, Natural Resources and Economic Affairs with branch linkage to his existing ten regional councils. Call them soviets, if you wish. Some people get more excited by the word soviet than council. Both words, along with region, appear in the U.S.S.R. Constitution.

In Nixon's proposed reorganization, HUD, now administrating model cities and the street-voters, would be absorbed in one of the four giant governing units, the Community Development Department.

Caught between the pressure from the new illegal voting caste at the bottom and the reorganization behemoth at the top, Middle America is being forced toward the administrated serfdom in between.

1313's Anonymity Needs Airing

A student of Metro reported, "I've started to ask what I would guess are embarrassing questions about Metro, and I'm not doing too well. I've asked "——" (a weekly publication) why there is never any mention of Metro activities in their columns. To this date, I've not received a reply. I've asked "—— ——" (a bulletin) the same question. Their reply is that they are not educational, but rather an action group. I've even asked the "—— —— ——," admittedly educational, why they're not doing anything about Metro. No reply, other than that they carry your (Hindman) books[4] on their book list. Is the situation really this serious? I can't believe that all the major conservative outlets are deliberately allowing Metro such anonymity," the letter ended.

Metro grew like crabweed during the 30's and 40's due to anonymity. Louis Brownlow, founder of the Metro-1313 syndicate, titled the second half of his autobiography "A Passion For Anonymity."

Known as 1313 from the core Chicago address, 1313 E. 60th St., the Public Administration Clearing House was born in Europe at Geneva over a bottle of burgundy shared by Brownlow and Beardsley Ruml. Brownlow, Franklin D. Roosevelt legman, had the political connections. Ruml, director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Fund, had access to the money.

Following a roundup of exploitable groups of that era (1930s), including National Municipal League, N.Y., expansion by affiliating groups, additional financial support from Carnegie, Ford, and other tax-exempt foundations, the wine-toasted "center" launched Metropolitan Government. Today, Metro — executive governance administered by appointees, is in sight of its goal to take over American representative government. An

4. "Terrible 1313 Revisited," and "Blame Metro," books by Jo Hindman, The Caxton Printers, Ltd., Caldwell, Idaho, 83605.