

Along with the other pro-Metro appointees announced by the White House, Woodbury's appointment to the Commission puts him in the conflicting position of rubber-stamping his own prior ideas. In the pro-Metro government publication just named he upheld ACIR's goal that the "respective facets of metropolitan area planning must be closely geared into the practical decisionmaking process regarding land use, tax levies, public works, transportation, welfare programs and the like."

Woodbury then advocated Metro regions; he said, "... no one should claim or imply that really effective metropolitan area planning can be done in the absence of an areawide government with the power . . . to adopt and carry through policies and programs."

Out of that welter of pro-Metro opinion the National Commission on Urban Problems (NCUP) was formed, and began publishing reports as components for its final report.

1313's ASPO prepared 80-page "Problems of Zoning and Land-Use Regulation" as background material for the Commission members.

The National Housing Conference's contribution complained² about a "too little . . . too long" approach by the "nation" in "Housing America's Low- and Moderate-Income Families" (title of the publication).

NCUP's final report *Building the American City* excited a flurry of comment in late 1968. Among other recommendations, it urged large doses of federal aid to encourage Metro consolidation of local governments within Metro areas.³ Also a new system of massive federal block grants to states and cities⁴ — a precursor of 1313's revenue-sharing victory in 1972.

The NCUP commission was disbanded and HUD's Public Affairs office took over the answering of the correspondence in late 1969.

Although rumored to be a lightweight among advisory commission reports, NCUP nevertheless is oft-quoted. Worse, its Metro recommendations are being implemented, an example of law-creating by the Metrocrats.

Rather, Congress should use its own legislative advisory committees to look into matters and to write laws with the consent of the citizens; or, better still *to refuse to write into law* the UN's social mandates and economic measures.

1313'S PATRONAGE LOBBYING

A feeble attempt in 1969 to reform the federal income tax failed to flush out the political adventurers of certain tax-exempt Foundations. Under the facade of charity, the organizations abuse the tax-exempt privilege.

The Tax Reform Act of 1969, HR 13270, contained in its 367-page length a 7½% tax on the billion-dollar incomes of Foundations, plus stern 100% penalties for violations of the taxable expenditures curbs.

A Foundation official attacked the curbs. President Alan Pifer of tax-exempt Carnegie Corporation complained that the efforts of several private foundations to promote "modernization" of the fifty state legislatures would have to be abandoned. Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller tax-exempt founda-

2. NCUP release 11/12/68.

3. *Boston Herald Traveler* 12/15/68.

4. *Santa Ana (Calif.) Register* 12/15/68.

tions long have contributed heavily to the 1313 political syndicate which spearheads that and other attempts to demolish American government. Tax-exempt Rockefeller (Spelman Fund) built the syndicate core at 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, site of the Rockefeller university.

Pifer probably was referring to a current "legislative modernization" effort by the Council of State Governments (CSG), a Carnegie beneficiary and ringleader of the 1313 syndicate. Also, Carnegie has contributed \$400,000 from 1965-68 to the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures which is linked to 1313.

Further, Pifer complained that various research projects to aid the state Governors would be undermined by the proposed income tax. Carnegie, through 1313's CSG, has supported "studies" for 1313's Governors Conference. CSG furnishes the staff and, as the secretariat, runs the GC.

Carnegie tax-exempt sums go to 1313's National Municipal League (NML) which spearheaded the cataclysmic one-man-one-vote movement, legislative reapportionment, and the toppling revisions of state constitutions to establish 1313's executive regional Metropolitan Governance.

Tax-exempt Ford Foundation contributes heavily to 1313's political goals through National Municipal League to influence state governments.

National legislation is tampered with, too. The burial of the 1970 Census-correction bill, HR 20, demonstrates. Tax-exempt money, expended by a tax-exempt foundation to other tax-exempt outfits combined to work against the best interests of U.S. citizens. HR 20 and similar bills would have limited the census questions to a basic six; it would have freed Americans from penalties should they decline to answer a long census questionnaire.

The National Service to Regional Councils (later NARC) a 1313 propaganda service that reaches newspaper editors, government officials, etc., launched an attack against HR 20. NSRC-NARC is jointly sponsored by National Assn. of Counties (NACo) and the National League of Cities, both 1313 adjuncts.

Likewise inviting the federal lobbying law penalties, NACo went even further, urged its members to contact legislators, naming names.⁵ NACo is tax-exempt. Ford Foundation which has given at least \$485,000 to NACo in recent years, likewise is tax-exempt.⁶

The Foundation and the county groups should draw penalties under a stiffened income tax reform law containing 100% penalties for political abuses, and also be subject to the existing lobbying violation statute.

METRO-1313 LOBBIED FOR ANTI-PRIVACY CENSUS

Syndicate Metro-1313 worked feverishly against the efforts of Congressman Jackson E. Betts and others who had hoped to make the 1970 decennial census safe for Americans.

Representative Betts' measure (H.R. 20, 90th Congress) would have removed the jail sentence penalty and the \$100 fine on all census questions except six subjects essential to the population count as required by the U.S. Constitution. Congressmen from 39 states sponsored similar measures, and

5. NACo Washington Report 4/14/69, 1001 Connecticut Ave., NW, Wash., D.C. (since suspended).

6. The County Officer magazine by NACo, issues of June 1963 and October 1968.

100 representatives and more supported action to abolish the destructive features that disgraced the prior decennial census of 1960.

But the politico-syndicate 1313 is against all those safety measures. 1313's National League of Cities (NLC), Conference of Mayors (USCM), and National Assn. of Counties (NACo), to name but a few 1313 agencies, placed themselves on record opposing Congressman Betts' bill specifically, and all other similar measures.⁷

During May 1969, public hearings were held in Wash., D.C. on the matter of the census questions. Yet 1313's NACo had announced a month earlier, "The 1970 questionnaire is now on the press . . . if unduly restrictive legislation is passed, the questionnaire would be unusable.⁸ Data on state and local areas is essential for legislative apportionment and districting, for local planning, administering programs such as . . . urban renewal. . . . If the (restrictive) legislation were passed, both the Census and users of census data would suffer."

The 1313 syndicate thus revealed that nothing less than a repetition of the outrageous 1960 census would be acceptable to its purposes.

Syndicate 1313 groups are avid census users. In 1960, the census user list was topheavy with 1313 organizational names,⁹ and probably still is.

In the meantime, 1313 sounded the alarm throughout its nationwide web against Congressman Betts' census reform bill. 1313's National League of Cities and NACo through a joint newsletter circulated by their National Service to Regional Councils (later NARC), specifically attacked the Betts proposal.

In its own "Washington Report," NACo again urged Thirteen-Thirteeners to pressure U.S. Senators and Congressmen to retain the "present" census with all its prying questions.

Americans had resented the meddling, punitive 1960 Census and raised an outcry against another census like it, but no correction was made in the 1970 effort.

Later, censustakers in Oregon's Crook County culled a lot of blank census returns April 1 — blank beyond the first constitutionally valid eight questions, that is. The fact may be of national significance because the county is one of the nation's five "weather vane counties."

Crook County earned the "weather vane" distinction by voting with the majority throughout the United States in every presidential election since 1884 when Grover Cleveland carried the County. Thereafter, Crook's voter opinion has commanded interest as a gauge of prevailing opinion on certain national matters.

Crook County's indicator read: Americans have turned thumbs down on the 1970 census third degree tactics.

According to the census official who supervised nine eastern and central

7. 1313's National Service to Regional Councils, 1700 K St., N.W., Wash., D.C. 20006, Newsletter 4/3/69.

8. National Assn. of Counties "Washington Report" 1001 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Wash., D.C. 20036, 4/14/69.

9. *Terrible 1313 Revisited* by Jo Hindman, The Caxton Printers, Ltd., Caldwell, Idaho 83605, p. 122.

Oregon counties, the incidence of citizen census silence ran higher in Crook than in the other eight counties.

A request for a percentage estimate drew "just a guess" from the census supervisor — about one percent (1%) of those polled among the county's 9,517 population figure. To him, the undisclosed total appeared large — they who said, "It's none of the government's business."

The U.S. Secretary of Commerce, overseer of the Census Bureau, stated on the census forms, "Every question asked in the 1970 Census has a national purpose."

That disturbs a lot of people, inasmuch as Question H-1 on the '70 Census "living quarters section" asked, "What is the (your) telephone number?" The same question was H-35 in the trouble-making "Household Questionnaire" of the 1960 Census prior.

Even the census takers readily admit that their primary purpose is "to count people." Practically all Americans will go along with that. The balking occurs when the Census begins its taxpaid market research questions headed by the telephone number followed by queries about the kitchen sink, cook stove, hot water, income, land value and homesite acreage.

If the market research section of the Census were non-mandatory, the sampling would remain unimpaired because there are many people who welcome an opportunity to talk about themselves and their affairs.

The Census Bureau entertains opinions from self-interest advisory groups, including Metro Syndicate 1313 units, which shape the content of the census questions to provide data for political purposes.

Many of the syndicate organizations that are collectively responsible for attacking private property through urban renewal, masterplanning and other Metro programs are members of the Census Bureau's Conference of Population and Housing Census Users, namely: The Council of State Governments, National Assn. of Counties, National Assn. of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, American Society of Planning Officials and others.

Before the 1980 Census comes around, it is hoped that Congress will return the Census to a head count as intended by the U.S. Constitution. Answering questions beyond that should be on a non-mandatory, voluntary basis only.

BOOTCAMP FOR LOBBYISTS

A joint convention of 1313's U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities in Wash., D.C. in March 1972 turned into a bootcamp for lobbyists otherwise known as mayors and city councilmen.

NLC and USCM are the units of political Syndicate 1313 assigned to exploit mayors and councilmen in promoting Metro regional governance. Many of the men vote dues and funds to send themselves to the 1313 meets. Put on the defensive by complaints, they ride roughshod over the objections of citizens who object to that sort of wasting tax dollars.

Major purpose of the Congressional City Conference (the joint meeting) was to gather the hometown clout behind the 1972 general revenue sharing legislation that is vital to the syndicate's regional program.

Patrick Healy, former executive vice president of the NLC and John J. Gunther, executive director of USCM co-signed the invitation letter. In the file examined, a NLC-USCM Capitol Hill lobbyist's card was enclosed.

Helping to keep 1313's fences tightly interlocked, 1313's National Assn. Housing and Redevelopment Officials sent a speaker. NAHRO brought urban renewal into the U.S. Atlanta's Mayor Sam Massell, president of NLC addressed the crowd. A few months earlier, he had welcomed to Atlanta (Ga.) another 1313 convention — that of the National Municipal League, 1313's "civic" exploiter.

On the morning of the last day in Wash., D.C., the delegates were briefed on "how to lobby" by ex-congressmen who are now mayors: Harry G. Haskell, Wilmington (Del.), Frank W. Burke, Louisville (Ky.), Donald J. Irwin, Norwalk (Conn.), John V. Lindsay (New York City).

A reprint authored by Frank N. Ikard was stashed in the delegates' convention packets. It is not known whether Ikard also briefed the mayors and councilmen, but he was eminently qualified to do so. The latest roster of lobbyists in Wash., D.C. lists Frank N. Ikard, 1801 K St., N.W., as the lobbyist for the American Petroleum Institute.

In the afternoon, blank report forms in their pockets, appointments arranged by NLC-USCM aides, the mayors and councilmen were to go in busloads on Capitol Hill to interview the congressional delegations from their states.

Upon their return to hotel headquarters, they were supposed to hand over for the 1313 files the completed forms on which they had recorded the attitudes and statements made by congressmen and senators visited, the data to be used by the NLC-USCM federal lobbyist.

Federal lobbying law (PL 79-601) requires the registration of organizations and individuals who work directly or indirectly to influence the passage or defeat of federal legislation. Although Dita Beard, the embroiled ITT lobbyist, was properly registered, along with soybean growers and several Indian tribes, the latest available quarterly lobbying reports failed to show any trace of the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors or other of the key 1313 tax-exempt organizations.

At the time the 1970 census legislation was being considered, 1313's county units, NACo (National Assn. of Counties) and others, were discovered lobbying vigorously. Reported to a member of Congress the fact was ignored.

Why are the 1313 organizations, such as NLC and USCM, NACo and others given special dispensation that excuses them from registering and filing the legally-required quarterly lobbying reports?

SYNDICATE SELLS LOBBYING SERVICES

The syndicate whose units did not register under the federal lobbying law is selling lobbyist services in Wash., D.C. The practice undoubtedly influenced the controversial revenue sharing legislation approved in 1972.

In discussing revenue sharing, a Congressman stated that in his mail most of the support for the idea comes from a few tax-supported organizations which stand to gain tremendously by the passage of the measure.

Identifying the pro-revenue groups, Rep. Sam Gibbons (Fla.)¹⁰ named the National League of Cities (NLC), the U.S. Conference of Mayors (USCM), the national Governors Conference (GC), the Council of State Governments

10. Congressional Record, p. H 5719 6/15/72.

(CSG), the National Assn. of Counties (NACo), and the International City Management Assn. (ICMA).

Called the "Big Six," they all are units of Syndicate 1313, the political machine that promotes big-spending Metro regional governance, a 20th century dictatorship. The history of revenue sharing¹¹ is spotted by references to these and other Metro-1313 groups which write Metro laws, then lobby for them.

Even the wire services gave the lobby of mayors and governors major "credit" for getting the big revenue sharing bill through the House, June 22 vote 274-122. The "rare alliance" of Democratic and Republican leaders noted by the press went unrecognized as the Metro One-Party which is comprised of Metrocrats who travel under partisan disguise.

The lobbying mayor and governor groups, NLC-USCM and GC, are part and parcel of the 1313 political machine. Also they help to steer 1313-dominated ACIR (federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations) whose staff is trying to keep the ACIR exempted from much-needed congressional control measures over advisory commissions and task forces.

The lobbying "front" jointly sponsored by NLC-USCM is known as the League of Cities-Conference of Mayors, Inc. (formerly the Joint Council on Urban Development.) LC-CM, Inc. offers contracts to provide federal lobbying services to cities, through a League staff member.

One contract of record was current due to expire Aug. 31, 1972.¹² For \$3,125.00 a month, the LC-CM, Inc. covenanted to provide a man-in-Washington-service to represent the City of Los Angeles (Calif.). An individual, unregistered but operating as a lobbyist, was or is located at 1612 K St., N.W., headquarters in D.C. for 1313's NLC and USCM.

The clerk offices of the House and Senate which act as repositories for registrations and quarterly lobby reports, were advised of the situation. The House Clerk referred the writer to the Attorney-General of the United States. The Senate Registration Clerk, verifying that the National League of Cities and the Conference of Mayors are not registered under the federal lobbying Act, referred the writer to Mr. Henry Petersen, Acting Assistant Attorney-General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice, Wash., D.C.

Apprised of the facts and asked why NLC-USCM and the LC-CM, Inc. subsidiary are not registered as lobbyists, the official had not replied as of late 1972. In 1973 the matter was under Dept. of Justice consideration.

Senators and Congressmen know about the NLC and USCM — attend their conventions and give speeches there. But do they know that the groups are linked to tightly interlocked Syndicate 1313 whose conglomerate of groups offer interesting studies in conflict-of-interest?

SYNDICATE TO FORCE REVENUE SHARING INTO U.S. CONSTITUTION

Politically powerful Syndicate 1313, stubborn advocate of revenue shar-

11. The History of Revenue Sharing, The Domestic Council publication, Executive Office of the President, Washington (1971) 27 pages.

12. Contract No. 40803 and File No. 125190 City of Los Angeles, California.

ing, wants the controversial practice to be written into the U.S. Constitution, has drafted a sample law leading to that effect, and has mailed the copies to all the State legislatures!

Tax *payers* deplore the magicanship whereby the federal government gives to public tax *spenders* a portion of federal income raised by taxing the earnings of individuals. The flow of grants back to the states detours around the nationwide tax payer demand for cuts in tax spending that would make funds available for local spending projects which have been blocked or turned down by local tax payers.

Sensible government requires the spending unit of government to collect the taxes it would spend.

It is fatal nonsense to separate the tax-collecting level from the level that spends. The split levels make it impossible for tax payers to call government to account on how it uses or misuses the funds.

But Syndicate 1313, Metro mentor, goes all out for revenue sharing, the kick-back term used in the 1970's.

1313's "law factory" wrote a sample bill: to call Congress into a convention to graft revenue sharing into the U.S. Constitution. A tiff in 1313 developed when the National Municipal League¹³ editorially attacked the sample law but without identifying the Council of State Government faction as the author. Both the NML and CSG are powerful lead units in the political 1313 conglomerate, Chicago-headquartered.

1313's mail order samples, bearing the markings LC 838 1/15/71 hit all state legislatures meeting in early 1971, ready for copying. A legislator who introduced LC 838 as a House Joint Resolution in his state, admitted that the measure was a nationwide effort sponsored by the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders (NCSLL) and the National Society of State Legislators (NSSL).

In 1970, those two organizations popped up in the company of the National Legislative Conference (NLC), the Office of Federal-State Relations of the National Governors (GC), the National Assn. of Attorneys-General (NAAG), the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors (NCLG), and the federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) when those 1313 adjuncts collaborated under the CSG whip to get the U.S. Con-Con proposal on the road.

The NML supports the concept of revenue sharing; it merely objects to the U.S. Con-Con idea, fearing that revenue sharing (NML-defined as of statutory nature) will be put into the Constitution where, NML opines, only "new principles belong."

NML, claiming civic status, includes in its membership bankers, lawyers, professors, League of Women Voters, etc.; its treasury regularly receives tax exempt funds from Ford Foundation, Carnegie Corporation and other such institutions.

The CSG, composed of careerists in government, exacts annual tribute from the fifty state treasuries; its "secretariat" controls a legion of syndicate puppets, all active.

13. NML's "State Legislatures Progress Reporter" Sept.-Oct. 1970, and National Civic Review magazine Feb. 1971, both published by National Municipal League, 47 E. 68 St., N.Y. 10021.

The time has come for Congress to heed the wishes of the American constituency rather than to listen to syndicate lobbyists.

It is high time for Congress to cut spending and to stop revenue sharing which, in the long run, is merely debt-sharing (the national government has been spending more than it takes in).

METRO TURNS BUS PIRATE

Frightful strategy used by Metrocrats in their scheme of reshaping American Government has pirated a bus firm owned by private stockholders, because the firm stood in the way of Metro's region building.

It began, perhaps, when Charles M. Haar, HUD's Asst. Secretary for Metropolitan Development in 1967, briefed the American Institute of Planners, telling AIP that "urban *public* transportation is potentially the most important single force" for reshaping the nation's communities in Metro areas.

Next, HUD (Housing & Urban Development Dept.) was telling five counties in Georgia to link social planning with a proposed rapid transit artery that would "shape and renew" the Atlanta Metro area. That prerequisite or no federal help. Atlantans turned HUD down, only to be harassed a second time and overcome.

The National Transportation Act of 1969 introduced by Senator Magnuson (Wash.) proposed multi-state transportation commissions to slap public transportation networks across state lines.

All that, despite the fact that since 1912, the number of riders on public passenger carriers decreased, and 50 years later had declined 40 percent while population increased almost 90 percent, according to John C. Kohl, Office of Transportation, (former) Housing & Home Finance Agency 4/4/62.

In update terminology, "mass transit" means conveying public passengers over surface streets; "rapid transit" usually refers to controlled rights-of-way. Both methods are under fire from voters balking against the exorbitant tax costs, rapid transit scarcely getting a toehold, and public mass transit systems going broke, soaking up tax money to exist.

Trying to lure commuters, a dreamtype portal-to-portal bus service went into operations Sept. 1968 in Flint, Michigan (Pop. 196,940). By Nov. 1969, the \$1.9 million experiment, mostly federally backed, had gained only 300 additional riders a day and was losing \$200 a day, reportedly.

The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, created by the state legislature in 1965, lost \$20-million-plus during its first 13-months operation and \$24 million in its second period. The impact was reflected in the tax rates of the 78 cities and towns comprising the MBTA district.

On the other hand, a private transit company — making a profit, paying \$9 million yearly federal, state and city taxes — was put out of business. In an anguished double-page ad, Wall Street Journal 2/29/68, the privately owned Philadelphia Transportation Co. charged, "The Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA) is trying to take over the local stockholder owned PTC for *integrated regional planning*."

PTC fares were lower than those in most cities with publicly owned transit lines — Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, St. Louis, Los Angeles.

On Jan. 9, 1970 a telephone call to PTC in Philadelphia was answered by SEPTA Information.

Question: "Has SEPTA taken over PTC?" SEPTA reply: "Oh, long ago!"

Sifting the ashes, it appears that SEPTA planned to enforce a 60-year-old purchase option assigned to it and construed as permitting SEPTA to tuck everything under its wing, paying less than \$3 per share on stock valued at \$71.75 per share.

Why did public SEPTA want to kill private PTC?

Because private transit businesses don't furnish an exploitable base on which to build regional Metro governments. On its deathbed remember, PTC accused regional planning. And as Mr. Haar said, ". . . public transportation is the most important single force for guiding development" of the Nation's communities in metropolitan areas."

FAVORITISM, METROCRAT STYLE

Bureaucrats long have winked at their own rules and regulations, breaking them as suited to the purpose, but now the practice is erupting in open threats against existing local laws.

The city of Houston, Texas, selected by federal HUD to participate in the "Model Cities" funded program, is non-zoned. For all other cities, zoning is an universal prerequisite, yet non-zoned Houston won out over zoned city contenders. Questioned, a HUD spokesman explained lamely, "The city (of Houston) agreed, when selected to receive a planning grant, to work for enactment of a zoning ordinance." Flagrant favoritism.

Another HUD program, "Operation Breakthrough," is a gigantic prototype housing construction competition, open to subsidy-seeking private firms, also cities wanting forced growth. 571 industrial firms and 215 site proposals came from cities in 34 States and the District of Columbia. A few were chosen. Later, the "pattern housing systems" were expected to go into nationwide mass production, underwritten federally.

A string of "Breakthrough" utterances in 1970 issued from HUD officials on speaking tours around the nation:

"Breakthrough can help introduce . . . new methods of financing, land-use . . . can help remove such restraints as unwieldy code requirements, rigid labor practices and *restrictive zoning*." (Houston, Tex. 1/19/70)

"I (HUD Secretary Geo. Romney) hope we can break through code, zoning and trade practice barriers using a voluntary approach with the authority we now have. But if it turns out that we cannot, because of local, state or private control, we will have to develop alternative measures." (Phoenix, Ariz. 3/11/70)

While Americans remain strapped under land-use and zoning laws, the Metrocrats expect to go free. For their own protection, citizens can enact as a statute or a constitutional amendment the measure partially reproduced here:

“THE PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION ACT¹⁴ . . . no public or private body shall have the power to regulate or control the use of land or any building thereon, of any property owner of the State of

Sec. 2(1) “Public body” means the state, a county, city or town . . . also a combined city and county, or metropolitan municipal corporation, school district, public utility district, housing authority, port district, other authorities or districts; or the state, counties, cities, towns or townships combined in a regional organization; or in an interstate compact; or any federal agency, public organization or urban renewal agency, or semi-public corporation or any combination of the foregoing; (2) “Private body” means any non-elected appointive commission, hired board, agency or group, also any private non-governmental, or private enterprise organization, or a semi-public corporation or any combination of the foregoing.

Sec. 3 No public or private body shall have the right or power to control or regulate the use of the land or any building thereon, as between agriculture, industry, business, residence and other purposes, of any property owner of the State of _____, through the enactment of policies, resolutions, ordinances, standards, precise detailed maps and/or other criteria, zoning, official controls, required elements or optional elements. Sec. 4 Insofar as the provisions of this act being inconsistent with the provisions of any other law, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.”

HANGUP IN HOUSTON

Houston (Tex.) and federal HUD (Housing and Urban Development Dept.) joined in an off-beat “Model Cities” arrangement that has backfired.

The city and the agency differ in their stories on what may be described as either a classic case of misunderstanding, or an arrangement that shriveled under public scrutiny.

Houston is the only city known to have received Model City status without declaring compliance with HUD’s zoning requirement.

Questioned, HUD issued a now controversial letter, dated 11/13/69¹⁵ stating that Houston agreed to work for enactment of a zoning ordinance when selected to receive a planning grant.

Disagreeing with the statement, Houston’s Mayor wrote to HUD¹⁶ that the city “never agreed to work for enactment of a zoning ordinance.” He claims that zoning was discussed with and laid to rest by HUD officials. The officials he named were *former* appointees under the Johnson Administration and are now gone from the HUD posts.

The present appointees remind that Houston in 1968 did agree to “secure

14. Based on original PPP Act, Initiative Petition 238, State of Washington, circulated by the Committee for Private Property Rights.

15. George Creel, former Director of Public Affairs, HUD, to Jo Hindman, MetroNews 11/13/69.

16. Mayor Louie Welch, Houston (Tex.) to Undersecretary Richard C. Van Dusen May 6, 1970.

an approved *Workable Program* prior to submission of a comprehensive Model Cities plan," and that (one of the) "requirements for Workable Program certification (is) a zoning ordinance or other comparable means of land use control."¹⁷

Land use in Houston is controlled by a private deed restriction system which, although eminently successful in practice, does not meet HUD rules.

The Mayor argues that the city has honored all commitments mentioned in a certain HUD letter bearing an old 1968 date.

HUD counters the Mayor's allegation as being not entirely correct, as the city agreed to *secure* certification of a Workable Program prior to submission of its Comprehensive Plan, not merely to *apply* for certification.

Houston's application for Workable Program certification was submitted to HUD in April 1970. Final determination was delayed as to whether or not Houston's private deed restriction system would satisfy HUD.

Houston's program was stalled. No certified Workable Program — no federal assistance for all public and private parties involved.

Meanwhile, rank-and-file Houstonians wanted to know what was going on. Their city is uniquely and prosperously non-zoned and they're mighty proud of it. They observe that the Model Cities program will require zoning in Houston. At city council the controversial HUD letter dated 11/13/69 kept bobbing up, referring to the "Houston zoning promise."

As the Mayor put it, the letter "continues to haunt us." He begged HUD to issue a statement to clear the air and to get Houston's program moving again.

A moot question appears: Is the zoning requirement a statutory law under the U.S. Constitution, or is it merely an administrative ruling clothed with the effect of law?

A graver question: Is the incident another example of governance by men rather than government by law — i.e. governance by administrative decree?

If it is, then does not Houston or any other city deserve its comeuppance as an equitable return for dealing with such a system?

HOUSTON-HUD ACCORD TURNS OFF ZONING

Among the thousands of cities in the United States, there are 150 chosen to carry out the so-called "Model Cities" program of the federal department of Housing and Urban Development. As the 150th city, Houston (Tex.) is the only city not held to zoning, required of all other 149 participants. Also, Houston is one of 20 "planned variation" model cities, assertedly, which can spend federal funds freely on innovative projects.

Some anti-zoners mistakenly think that the citizens are in control of the city because Houston voters turned down zoning.

Actually the Metrocrats, those who promote radical Metro governance, have merely cut a new channel detouring zoning and are going about business as usual. For instance, housing inspections are every bit as fatal and can lead to property condemnation in Houston as in zoned cities.

Houston city council passes model city ordinances on an emergency basis. The practice skips the requirement to read and to publish ordinances three times before the city council's final vote.

17. R. C. Van Dusen to Mayor Welch, May 18, 1970.

If the registered voters discover that the ruse has kept them in the dark on important matters, what will the voters think? Houston's model city director, E. A. Kiessling, was vociferous, "We don't give a damn what the voters think!" On loan from the University of Houston, the professor was in 1972 returning to the institution to teach behavioral management.

His contempt, of course, did not apply to model city street-voters (not from registered voter lists). Anyone staying at an address within a model city neighborhood can vote at a neighborhood election. It is possible for Houston's model city residents' grandfathers, uncles, aunts, cousins and transients from below the Mexican border, or from other parts of the nation, to flood into Houston's model city areas to vote for the "needs" of their relatives in Houston.

Covering two years (1970-72), \$26,766,000 has flowed into Houston from HUD to provide model city "action" including art classes, dominoes and checkers, hot lunches, drapery making and a host of custodial services for inhabitants (100,000 Pop.) of the model city neighborhoods, only.

HUD accepted the city's deed-restricted land use system as a substitute for zoning. Houston got its Fed credit card (1971 Workable Program).

The accord between HUD and Houston is a study in the preposterous.¹⁸ The city offered HUD what it called a "new concept for land uses," really Houston's long-time owner-controlled land use system. Some old surveys were pieced together and labeled as a 1980 General Land Use Plan. On it, HUD sprinkled its bureaucratic blessings.

By reversing itself to accommodate Houston, HUD has provided the best evidence to date proving that privately imposed land-use controls (non-zoning) in city growth are superior to governmentally imposed zoning controls.

Big in Houston's future are proposed capital improvements on the 14 sq. mi. crescent-shaped real estate in the designated model city neighborhoods embracing the downtown business district. That foretells acquisition of private land and relocation of dispossessed owners, tenants, and small businessmen. Houston offers as justification its litany of problems.

Houston has its problems, of course. What city doesn't?

But the fact remains that Houston, despite its glittering billionaire image is simply too poor or too unwilling to pay its own way and has called in the Metrocrats who are tearing down representative government.

The tiniest hamlet in America, working out its problems with its own hard cash, stands taller than all the skyscrapers of Houston.

METROCRATIC CONNIVANCE AIDS GET-RICH

Misplaced is the joy of strawgraspers who try to read "private enterprise" into the baffling arrangements inked between government Metrocrats and various firms and individuals. The federally guaranteed no-failure arrangements cannot be passed off as private enterprise.

Rather, the facts suggest that a giant system of connivance is working to benefit opportunists at the expense of tax-plucked Americans.

¹⁸. Houston's Workable Program (1971) and Comprehensive Model Cities Second Action Year. Also personal interview.

One instance reveals a state senator voting to pass a state law, then later in bureaucratic transactions governed by the law, reaping the harvest seeded for himself while holding the position of public trust.

Congress paved the way for the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships¹⁹ which can promote non-governmental corporations-for-profit and joint venture partnerships. Despite adverse money-market conditions the Corporation raised \$41.7 million capital easily in 1970.

Knowing that investors in housing ventures can scarcely lose under the federal guarantees, 265 purchasers stepped forward to buy the securities. HUD (Housing and Urban Development Dept.) stated that these investors included 134 industrial and business firms, 74 banks, 23 insurance and title companies, 10 utilities, 7 mutual savings banks and 3 labor unions. In addition to dividends, the system also provides the investors with readymade tax-guaranteed markets for each and all.

Federal law once required newly built communities to be raised on open space land. Jonathan, Minn., was the first of the new towns started.

The Minnesota law that created the 7-counties Twin Cities Metropolitan Council (TCMC) which approved and forwarded the federal funding application for Jonathan new town was enacted during the 1967 legislature.²⁰

The federal law, amended in 1970, allows "new-towns-in-old-towns," to be built on sites bulldozed within established cities. The first of these, Cedar-Riverside, is being built in the same TCMC region where the other "first new town," Jonathan, was christened.

Existing buildings on the C-R proposed 340-acre site are being demolished, 12 blocks from the heart of the Minneapolis business district. Being urban renewal land, it will be "cheap" for the redeveloper. Under UR, bulldozed owners are denied the right of free enterprise pricing.

A planner's scale model depicts Cedar-Riverside as a proposed high density professional-university-medical community of luxury towers. Three-fifths of the land will be tax exempt. This "first new-town-in-a-town" (C-R) may be "paired" with the "first rural-new-town" (Jonathan), i.e. linked by some yet undefined system of socio-economic arteries.

HUD announced in June 1971 the \$24 million offer of guarantee assistance to Cedar-Riverside, "The federal offer to guarantee the debt of the developer was approved by the board of directors of the New Community Development Corporation of which HUD Secretary George Romney is chairman. . . . The developer of the new community is Cedar-Riverside Associates, Inc., whose board chairman is Henry T. McKnight, who also is a principal stockholder in the new town of Jonathan."

A year earlier when Jonathan's \$21 million debt guarantee was announced by George Romney, HUD noted, "On hand to accept the first commitment was Henry T. McKnight, president of the Corporation (Jonathan Development) and a Minnesota state senator."

The Clerk of the Minnesota State Senate furnished information 8/17/71 disclosing that Senator McKnight did vote "yea" on the bill (H.F. 1508) that

19. HUD Act of 1968.

20. Minnesota Senate Journal page 2474, 1967 session.

created the TCMC regional bureaucracy (to approve federal funding applications, Ed.) but that McKnight is not now a senator. He did not run for reelection in 1970.

Constitutions and Charters

1313 WANTS TO JUNK YOUR CONSTITUTION

Syndicate 1313, promoter of the one-man-one-vote fiasco¹ which destroyed rural representation in State Legislatures, carries on — this time, zeroing in on State Constitutions in the United States.

Although 1313's syndicate nerve center is located at 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, on the Univ. of Chicago campus, the "think tank" in New York, 1313's National Municipal League, decides on matters of critical policy.

So, on May 13, 1968, NML mailed out quantities of a pamphlet titled, "Let's Junk Our Obsolete State Constitutions."

Accompanying the reprint, a clip-on note said, "On the chance that you may have missed James Nathan Miller's article when it appeared in the April *National Civic Review* . . . here is a copy of the condensed version which appears in the May 1968 issue of *The Reader's Digest*." The *National Civic Review* is a Syndicate 1313 publication.

Unflatteringly, the reprinted article described American constitutions as "ludicrous." The article charged, "They are designed not to help government officials govern, but to prevent them from picking the taxpayers' pockets."

This writer wants to know what's wrong with protecting oneself from pickpockets? By retaining state constitutions that so guard us?

Unfortunately, gullible citizens are contributing to their own downfall. For instance, in Oregon members of the League of Women Voters circulated a petition asking for a constitutional convention to rewrite Oregon's Constitution.

But when it comes to a showdown at the polls, voters have expressed themselves as less than impressed by 1313's attempts to junk good constitutions for Metro constitutions. In 1966, Kentucky rejected a new Metro constitution. In November 1967, New York voters did likewise, three-to-one. On April 16, 1968, Rhode Island resoundingly defeated a revised Metro constitution, votes against, 68,940; 17,464 favoring.

Still another Metro-revised constitution met smashing defeat in 1968 in Maryland, votes against 366,574; 283,050 for. Marylanders were frankly fearful of the Metro regional government proposed, whereby the tax base is broadened, forcing the rural to pay for urban ills and costs. Also, the concentration of executive power in the state Governor caused voters to stamp firm No votes.

But seems like pesky Syndicate 1313 won't take No for an answer. In the following letter, dated May 25, 1968, from Silver Spring, Md., following the vote a citizen resented, "At this writing, even before I've had a chance to attend a forthcoming 'Victory Dinner' I learn that a 'salvage process' is now

1. *Blame Metro*, by Jo Hindman, The Caxton Printers, Ltd., p. 89.

in the making. A Committee consisting of a majority of 12 pro-constitution members (1313 Metrocrats, Ed.) against eight anti-ones, will soon meet with Maryland's Governor in an effort to persuade him to call a special session of the legislature so that many of the items rejected by the people may be resuscitated."

Concerning the resubmission move accepted by the committee, the letter ended, "I agree with the remark expressed by a state senator who said (to Metrocrats), 'You people want to cram this thing down our throats one way or another.'"

True. The Metrocrats are behind the junking movement from start to finish. Early in the start, they usually haul in Syndicate 1313's so-called "Model State Constitution" to be used as a pattern. It strips citizens of control over their government, introduces unworthy features such as regional non-elected rule.

CALIFORNIANS APPROVED PHASE 1, DEFEATED PHASE 2

Years ago, experimenting psychiatrists predicted that future generations, bereft of self-determination, would be subjected to "committee or group rule." The social engineering, then in its early stages, was tried out on school children and on hospital inmates.

Watching a California Constitution Revision Committee in session is witnessing the social engineering nightmare in full swing. The committee is the group "unit." As predicted, there is a leader and his bouncer, the so-called "experts." They toss the discussion and bring things around to a predetermined conclusion that wipes out good features of the existing California Constitution. Passively in between sit the outwitted rank-and-file members of the committee.

On a larger scale, all Californians would have been brought under group control had the 1968 Proposed Constitution Revision (Phase 2) been approved. Phase 1, as Proposition 1A, was voter approved in 1966.

Printed up, presented to the state legislature, fed out in canned doses to the mass media, Phase 2 propaganda did not deceive Californians.

Under the proposed Revision, Californians would have lost their hard-held control over public education. Article IX proposed changing the present elected state superintendent of education to an appointed head.

Local city and county governments would be paralyzed by Proposed Article XII which paves the way for a corporation-oddy to profiteer on municipal services rendered on a regional scale.

Perhaps the most shameful bilking lurked in Proposed Article XI, Section 8(a) quoted: "The Legislature may provide that local government bodies may contract among themselves or with other government bodies for transfer of powers and performance of functions."

The proposal would bleed local representative government into extinction as powers and functions would be drained from cities/counties into super regions. It is reported that the New York Constitution Convention² in '67 rejected a similar concept of interlocal transfer of powers which New York voters defeated Nov. 7, 1967.

2. Convention proposition of State of New York 6/12/67.

Such intergovernmental siphoning is being practiced now in California by SCAG, ABAG and other of the regional "councils of governments." COG's pool local funds and the rubber-stamping votes of city/county officials. Away from their home-town desks, the local men permit themselves to be outwitted by the tactics of the so-called "experts" who run COGs.

Battered by citizen hostility, the COG regions in California now survive on statutory law only. The Phase 2 Constitution Revision would have cemented them into the Revised Constitution, from where to dislodge would require monumental effort and expense.

That provision dangerous to local government went down in defeat when Phase 2 of the California Constitution Revision was turned down at the polls.

To see how the Metrocrats in 1972 attempted to circumvent the rescued section of the Constitution, see chapter 1, page 35 this book, "Contract to Kill Local Government."

BEGINNING OF END FOR CONSTITUTION FOES

All Californians and other Americans whose state constitutions are undergoing political strafing from Syndicate 1313 have reason to take heart.

Morning after Maryland voters defeated a pro-Metro constitution, 1313's NACo (National Assn. of Counties) began running scared with this revealing confession, "Our first reaction in our state of shock and bewilderment is that May 14, 1968 may go down in history as the beginning of the end for modernizing state government by constitutional revision."³

Maryland's Governor Spiro Agnew, later Republican vice-president once was a county executive and a 1313-NACo director.

Voters had flocked to the Maryland polls to protect the State Constitution. Resoundingly, Marylanders voted down the monstrous pro-Metro thing that would have turned their state into Metro regions, raised taxes, accelerated the COG revolution (non-representative councils of government) and opened the way for the city of Baltimore, with its high taxes, high crime rate and overcrowded schools to annex the county⁴ and thus harness it to big-city troubles.

It cost the state taxpayers \$4 million for the Metro-writing revisionists to produce the unwanted new constitution. Reportedly, it was praised — now get this — by 1) both political parties, 2) the press and news media, 3) the business and labor community, 4) and by virtually every "power center" — whatever that means politically — in Maryland.

Just the voters were against the Metro constitution.

While the Marylanders and you continue paying federal taxes, Carnegie Corporation's untaxed money, more than \$285,000 of it, has gone to researchers and 1313's National Municipal League to finance a three year vivisection study of constitutional conventions,⁵ including mop-ups on defeats in Maryland and elsewhere. The Maryland rebuff was the fourth such major defeat. Other defeats have followed.

3. American County Government (magazine) published by NACo, June 1968.

4. National Civic Review (magazine) published by 1313's National Municipal League, July 1968, pp. 344, 378.

5. Carnegie Corporation Annual Report 1967.

Now the Thirteen-Thirteeners are pondering, "What does it mean? . . . this could be curtains for state government reform. It is apparent that the people in Maryland, and apparently in the other states, too, do not want any change at all."

Why should citizens vote themselves into Metro servitude?

NACo, the 1313 syndicate unit assigned to Metrovize urban county and rural government, mulled the situation: "Will it be possible for our urban counties to adopt charters of their own and bypass the state governments?"

By July, NACo came up with an answer. NACo presented to a U.S. Senate committee a suggestion for a "model county" program similar to the infamous "model cities" farce. Federal "model cities" bypass state government.

By turning its fund-seeking palm toward federal government, NACo is merely fulfilling the purpose for which it was formed back in 1937. The directory of 1313 organizations described NACo as serving "county government and county officials in their relations with federal government."

But NACo-1313 is scared and could throw in the sponge getting out of the Metro constitutional fracas. That would be a time of rejoicing among Americans who want to keep their control of government through intact state constitutions; and they have formidable opposition enough from other units of political Syndicate 1313 in its campaign to destroy existing state constitutions.

METROCRATS HOLD POST MORTEMES ON DEFEATS

While the alarmed heads of tax-free Foundations milled about in Wash., D.C. arguing for continuing tax-exemption and extended license to tamper with American Government, their subsidized products continued to muddy the mainstream of U.S.A. affairs.

One bold publication bears the revealing title, "The Politics of the Rhode Island Constitutional Convention."⁶ The booklet about the men and women selected to rewrite the R.I. state constitution was produced by Carnegie Corporation money with the effort of Brown University and Wheaton College scholars supervised by 1313's National Municipal League.

In the analysis, Con-Con delegates were listed by name in one table, and in others were dissected as to religion and the snobbery of socio-economic status measured by their *fathers' education!* Purpose: to find a sure-win formula for Metrocrats to use in overturning existing state constitutions in favor of power-grabbing Metro constitutions.

Political reverses start the Metrocrats digging for answers. In 1963, Michigan's new Metro constitution barely squeaked through an election, requiring a recount. In 1966, Kentucky rejected a Metro constitution, as did New York in 1967, Maryland (1968), New Mexico (1969), Oregon (1970), Arkansas (1970), Idaho (1970), North Dakota (1972).

Rhode Island's Constitutional Convention, dawdling since 1964, was seized upon as a specimen that might yield a formula to avoid defeat. In studying the R. I. Con-Con delegates' political behavior, the research team noted the Party affiliations but discarded the Republican/Democrat labels

6. *The Politics of the Rhode Island Constitutional Convention*, No. 1, State Constitutional Convention Studies (1969) by NML 47 E. 68 St., N.Y. Pp. 96.

as measuring tools. Rather, the researchers segregated the men and women into "typologies," excerpted as follows:

Aspirants . . . young professionals, often lawyers, on the political make; *Reformers* . . . including the League of Women Voters; *Chieftains* . . . individuals with an existing power base in state politics; *Statesmen* . . . (has-beens) in high public office; *Stand-Ins* . . . who enter the convention to satisfy private ego, expected to follow the advice of those who provided them with the con-con nomination — for whom they are "stand-ins"; *Stand-Patters* . . . state/local officeholders in consistent opposition to change. (In Metro semantics, "change" means Metro rule.)

The delegates were interviewed, classified, weighted according to certain factors and ended up in three voting blocs, 1) status quo, 2) reform, 3) unaccounted for. The Stand-ins and Standpatters, comprising the bulk of the powerful status quo bloc, were classified as coming from the homes with the least educated fathers; 88% of the Democrats were Catholic, 87% Republicans were Protestant, Jewish 4% (Dem.), 7% (Rep.).

Those Con-Con specimens tossed out Metro's cherished unicameralism (one house legislature), rejected a Metro "blank check" arrangement on bond issues, and split into two factions which ended up in court.

In a photofinish decision on the squabble over the proposed spending of Con-Con funds on a publicity scheme, the courts ruled that the draft constitution text could be published in the newspapers, but that "public education" could not be financed by Con-Con funds.

Rhode Island voters caught the Status Quo message, defeated the Metro constitution on April 16, 1968, 68,940 votes to 17, 464.

In postscript, the researchers admitted, "There do not appear to be any simple answers to the question of how to succeed at constitutional reform. To provide even tentative answers," they forecast, "it will take *detailed analysis of a series of conventions* of the sort being undertaken under the Carnegie grant made for this purpose to the National Municipal League and Brown University."⁷

A box score shows Metro Constitutions being rejected almost two to one (2 to 1):

Constitution Revision Elections

Year	State	Rejected	Accepted
1963	Michigan		x
1966	Kentucky	x	
1967	New York	x	
1968	Pennsylvania (limited revision by several amendments. General Power Grant to local governments)		x
1968	Rhode Island	x	
1968	Maryland	x	
1969	New Mexico	x	
1970	Oregon	x	

7. *Magnificent Failure*, No. 3 (1970) *ibid*, Pp. 239.

Year	State	Rejected	Accepted
1970	Virginia		x
1970	Illinois		x
1970	Arkansas	x	
1970	Idaho	x	
1972	North Dakota	x	
1972	Montana (contested in court)		x
	Totals	9	5

CITIZENS ASK ABOUT CITY AND COUNTY CHARTERS

The nationwide Metro movement to rewrite city and county charters, or to establish Metro's mis-named "Home Rule" charters for the first time, has several underlying purposes: 1) *to eradicate* 10th Amendment type charters which reserve self-determination power to American citizens; 2) *to impose* Metro charters where citizens already are enjoying a measure of satisfaction under state laws that govern cities and counties.

Metro often includes: 3) interlocal (intergovernmental) sections in the proposals. Those pave the way for regional governance.

Most American constitutions, statutes and ordinances preserve the sovereign independence of republican (independent) units of government as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. Interlocal agreement or intergovernmental amendments to constitutions, charters, statutes, or ordinances become weapons to demolish that sovereignty and veto power.

You of course know that the 10th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, added after the recital of powers, reserves all non-delegated governing power to the People or to the States. Citizens living under charters drawn under that constitutional principle enjoy the greatest measure of personal freedom and prosperity.

Under 10th Amendment type charters, citizens list the services they want their governing body to perform. The citizens then yield just enough power to the governing body to perform the duty or duties. All remaining power stays with the citizens.

On the other hand, Metro charters concentrate all governing power (or as close to 100% as possible) in the governing body.

The first article in a Metro charter usually contains the General Grant of Power giving all power and authority to the governing body. That power has to come from somewhere. It comes from those governed who have surrendered their power by "voting in" the new charter.

The Metro-1313 political syndicate offers several versions of the Metro type charter: the appointed manager type, the elected manager type, and an elected governing body armed with a broad grant of powers.

It must be remembered that elected officials are not infallible simply because they are elected to office. It is foolhardy, then, to arm them with too much unrestricted power.

10th Amendment charters put handcuffs on the elected governing body with citizens holding the keys.

But uncontrollable danger lies in the Metro charter by which foolishly trusting citizens have yielded their self-governing power to the governing body or to appointees chartered with sweeping powers. Also, an oligarchic

monopoly may result from abuse of administrative powers usurped by governing bodies. This becomes dangerous to the citizens when elected officers run local revenue-producing "authorities," not by ordinances but by resolutions where ordinances should be used instead. Resolutions cannot be repealed by citizens, but ordinances are subject to voter referendum.

Metro organizations, the National Assn. of Counties (NACo) and its web of associations of counties by states, and the National Municipal League, parent of the 1313 syndicate, print up and sell the Metro charters.

College professors, for a price, offer Metro guidance and counsel. An ambitious local yokel who has been exposed to Metro "workshops," often sits on the local charter-writing commission as legman between the Metro mentors and to pressure the local folk.

But citizens have a choice between Metro charters and 10th Amendment type charters.

The clear mandate of the 10th Amendment is available to any charter-writing group which will seek, find, and write the constitutional principle at the beginning of a proposed charter, such as: "The (city council or county commission) of (city or county) shall have the jurisdiction and powers as enumerated in this charter and which are not in conflict with the state constitution."

The balance of the charter should follow, including the duties of the elected officials. Also the list of powers granted, and the restrictions imposed. The shorter the former and the longer the latter, the greater the freedom retained by the citizenry.

CHARTER WRITERS, ATTENTION

When citizens are called together by one means or another to write or to rewrite city and county charters or state constitutions, they often are deluged by guidelines originating from the nationwide Metro syndicate. The syndicate's Chicago-1313 and Lexington (Ky.) cores team with the National Municipal League, 47 E. 68 St., N.Y. as key syndicate leaders.

NML's latest history released Dec. 1969⁸ admits that the Metro charters contain the all-power-to-the-government concept. NML discloses that in its prepackaged charters, a "general grant of powers replace(s) the detailed enumeration" of powers.

Enumeration of power, as referred to, is the sensible American concept contained in the "reserved power charters" that have served Americans well since the beginning of this nation. Reserved power charters *limit the government*. Any government power not enumerated (listed) in the charter is reserved to the people.

On the other hand, Metro general power grant charters *limit the citizens* and unshackle unlimited Metro government which is the exact opposite of American government.

More and more, the Metro charters are criticized as being unconstitutional whereas reserved power charters and constitutions are completely attuned with the U.S. Constitution, Amendment X: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are *reserved* to the States respectively or to the people."

8. NML history, entire issue of National Civic Review magazine Dec. '69.

In addition to publishing pilot Metro charters and constitutions, the Metro syndicate is responsible for such radical innovations as urban renewal, the one-man-one-vote upheaval and the short ballot movement that abolishes elective offices, to name a few. The NML history acknowledges its fathering of the Public Administration Service, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago. There, Metro's city and county manager profession burgeons.

NML, the syndicate parent, began as a civic group to fight corruption but was hijacked by agile members with influence over wealthy tax exempt checkbooks. Today NML has fallen into boasting about the big names formerly on its letterhead, talking about its corruption-chasing days, and over-rating Metro-trained city managers.

Take this NML quote for an example, "Phoenix, Arizona, had had the council-manager plan for a quarter of a century, but had not had good government." Trouble was, as NML put it, the managers were "local politicians." Plugging for its kind, NML advised a change for Phoenix which was accepted, thus supplying the Metro touch (quote): "The next city manager, a professional from another city, served effectively!"

At this time of oppressive taxation which is being forced upon Americans to pay for Metro spending sprees, the Metro syndicate avoids the topic of how to reduce taxes by cutting spending.

Excessive spending is keeping the hordes of Metrocrats on public payrolls.

In the meantime, the syndicate's Metro charters and draft laws continue taking the helm and the oars of government out of the hands of the American people. Stripped of their power they cannot pull back to safety.

Charter writing committees would do well to arm themselves with the time-tested reserved power charters containing enumerated powers that spell out the *limitations* on government.

NML's Metro charters and constitutions and others of that ilk which handcuff the citizenry can be used to serve up examples of what to avoid.

ASSAULT ON OUR CHARTERS

A self-appointed group, delegates coming from different parts of the United States, gathered in Atlanta (Ga.) July 26-29, 1970 with the stated intent "to modernize county government into New County, USA."⁹

Sponsoring the impudent assault on American county charters, the National Assn. of Counties expected to have its New County, USA, action program soon in place in all the states and counties of the nation. The National Assn. of Counties Research Foundation is co-sponsor.

The present NACo web will be strengthened to extend from a center in Wash., D.C., tied to existing associations of counties in the states and connecting with the nation's 3,049 counties.

NACo is trying to abolish citizens' reserved-power charters that are keyed to the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. NACo will try to replace that basic all-American right by a general-grant-of-power to ruling bodies which, in turn, are to be subjected to non-elected administrators.

The gigantic power shift will force the property and holdings of county citizens to knuckle under the total Metro pattern of collectivization.

9. The American County magazine, January 1970, published by the National Association of Counties, Wash., D.C.

NACo, remember, was one of the loud lobbying voices during the 1970 Census controversy in Congress. NACo assisted in imposing the mandatory, punishing census questionnaire upon the American people.

That same raw force now will pressure NACo delegates — county elected officials from rural and urban counties. In accepting and implementing the Metro general-power-grant principle, the elected officials will be doing themselves out of their trusteeships. Worse, they will betray the citizens into the hands of non-elected managers who control by ersatz rules called administrative regulations that have the effect of true law.

Mixed up with NACo in the planned war upon citizen self-rule are other units and adjuncts of political Syndicate 1313, promoter of Metro. To name a few: National League of Cities, Conference of Mayors, International City Management Assn., Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Council of State Governments, Public Personnel Assn., Committee on Economic Development, Urban Coalition, League of Women Voters and, ill-advisedly — the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In times past, the Metro movement has blown hot, sometimes cold, on counties, almost bypassing their involvement. But now, the syndicate is going all out to force counties into the Metro mould. Why?

Because the county level of government in the United States is a strong sector that cannot be bypassed, ignored, or leapfrogged by the Metro takeover. NACo's New County, USA, thus takes its place in Metro's massive power shift — away from the citizens to Metro managers and authorities.

Broadly, the procedure follows the course of writing the transferred power (taken from the citizens) into the charters under contrived manager control; then to prescribe and promulgate administrative rules and regulations which are *not* true laws legislated by the elected representatives of the citizens; and finally, to administer the Metro "governance" (ersatz power) above the heads of the disenfranchised citizens.

By such action programs, the terrible Metro movement grows stronger on all fronts each day. NACo's New County movement is news today and trouble tomorrow.

KNELL TOLLED ON DEADLY METRO CHARTERS

Metrocrats — they who want to manage you by Metro governance — unceasingly seek to rewrite basic American law which reserves control of your government to You.

A few years ago, Metro emphasis was on city manager charters. In the '70s the heat is on county government. Invariably, the ubiquitous local charter study groups, strewing blossoms before Metro, recommend manager government. The manager, whether city or county, is chartered with wild hire and fire, plan and spend powers beyond the control of voters.

Comatose Bergen County (N.J.) came awake on Metro's operating table, disrupting Metro-1313's massive law lift.

The county manager plan for Bergen County was sidetracked by Republicans who delayed its getting on the ballot.¹⁰ Considered as being a tactful retreat of the Republican Party vacating an untenable pro-Metro position

10. The Bergen Record, Hackensack, N.J. 5/6/68.

maneuvered rashly by a chairman without Party consent, the charter's death knell was accomplished by massive education of Bergen county leaders via *locally prepared* literature.

Being the shadowy One-Party of American collectivization, Metro seldom is attacked on a bi-partisan basis: The Democrats and Republicans (Metrocrats) are too busy holding hands behind the Metro scenery. But in the New Jersey incident Metro met defeat bi-partisanly.

The prepackaged charter for Bergen County (1968) resembled in principle the infamous Metro charter that resulted in Florida's "State of Dade." The Bergen charter would set some county laws above state law, and would exercise powers jointly with other counties, other states, and even federal agencies.

At a public hearing, someone dryly observed that there would be no need for Bergen County to go to the expense of sending assemblymen to the New Jersey Legislature; the lawmakers would be permitted to legislate only for other counties, not for Bergen County.

In Deschutes County (Ore.) an irresponsible newspaper editorial¹¹ written from the top of the head stated that public concern over costs would make a manager charter possible. But does the expense go down, or up? The Bergen charter called for *increasing* the Freeholders (governing body) from nine to thirteen members; *staffing* the NEW office of county manager; *spending* on new county-wide urban services such as sewage and air pollution control, hospitals, welfare, traffic, transportation, etc.

Salt Lake City's (Utah) search for a mayor-council form of government whereby voters exert the greatest measure of control, seemingly got out of hand and into the hands of the managing Metrocrats.

The Salt Lake Area Chamber of Commerce in April 1968 put on the road a "study group" proposal padded with the Chamber's own prepackaged regional ideas¹² lifted from pro-Metro sources, such as CED (Committee for Economic Development) and ACIR (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations), a federal body completely controlled by Syndicate 1313.

Extra-territorial powers over unincorporated areas, a Chamber "solution," pioneered in North Carolina, actually resulted in the jailing without a hearing, and prosecution-without-cause of a property owner.¹³

Intergovernmental agreements, another Chamber "solution," is causing the nationwide "cogging" upset whereby Metrocrats betray citizens into non-representative councils of governments (COG's) manipulated by Metro managers.

With deliberate Metro slants of that nature, only an alert citizenry can sidestep Metro's nightmarish government.

METRO CHARTERS GET SPANKED

Oregonians turned down a Metro county-manager charter (1968) described scornfully as a "kissing cousin charter." The seven-man commission

11. Bend Bulletin 1/20/68.

12. Modernizing Local Government, Salt Lake Area Chamber of Commerce, 4/18/68.

13. "Zoning Jumps all Fences," p. 155 this book.

proposed for Deschutes County was condemned as a self-perpetuating body due to an odd nomino-election procedure.

The defeated charter would have provided for county-wide election of seven commissioners, six nominated from restricted districts, the seventh nominated by county voters at large. The biggest city, Bend, permanently assured of the power of three commission positions would need to pick up only one "cousin" from among the other commissioners in order to gain majority control over the county's government.¹⁴

The Rockland County (N.Y.) proposed charter contained another Metro curio — an elected county chief executive armed with veto power. The innovation was rejected three times, the last time noted in November 1968.

Grand Rapids (Mich.) toyed with a proposal that seemed to fit the Metro pattern for an elected chief executive armed with veto power. Apparently, the citizens were trying to dump the present city manager form of government. A referendum petition asked for a charter amendment during the Feb. 1969 election that would abolish the city manager title but elect a mayor with veto power, plus authority to exercise all powers now vested in the city manager. Only a vote of two-thirds of the city commissioners could override the mayor's veto.¹⁵

In attempting to correct maladministration, is any true improvement accomplished by mere name changing (manager to mayor), leaving the power structure concentrated in the top executive position?

Swollen executive power, elective or appointive, is a Metro hashmark. While it is true that Metro-1313, the political syndicate centered in Chicago at 1313 E. 60th St., can keep tight hold on a city's direction through 1313's ICMA (International City Management Assn.), it is equally true that 1313 maintains liaison with mayors and other city officials through 1313's National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Under the traditional council-mayor form of government, still popular despite Metro-1313 hostility, power is equalized among the council members, including the mayor, he being just one of the boys although he presides with the gavel.

The best interests of local citizens are protected from irresponsible acts of officialdom by the council-mayor form, especially when based on a charter of *enumerated* powers. The city officers, in the name of the city, can exercise only the powers listed, nothing more.

The Metro charters (city manager type) destroy that protection. The "power grant" section of a Metro charter gives practically all power to the city, demotes citizen control.

The proposed city charter for Torrance (Calif.) contained that type of Metro power grant. The defeated Santa Barbara (Calif.) Metro charter (1967) carried the same language, word-for-word. The Deschutes County (Ore.) defeated charter (1968) contained the identical concept with slight variation in wording.

14. Deschutes (proposed) County Charter, 1968.

15. Grand Rapids News Magazine 10/23/68.

The common source is found in the Metro sample charters published by political Syndicate 1313's National Municipal League, New York.¹⁶

The defeat of Metro charters, more and more, demonstrates that Americans are battling to keep local government under citizen control.

RETREADED CHARTER UP FOR VOTE

With the exception of just one holdover member from the old Memphis and Shelby County Charter Commission of 1962, ten of the eleven-member 1971 revision commission were new.

Their rubberstamping chore must have been easy.

With very few exceptions and some renumbering, the proposed Memphis-Shelby County Consolidated Government (1971) was a reread of the charter offered, and rejected by the voters in 1962.

Compared, the salary stipulations more than doubled in the proposed charter; it called for thirteen (13) councilmen each \$500 per month, and a mayor \$30,000 annually.

Sections 1.04 of both the defeated and the proposed, show that the defeated charter required proof that actual urban services were available at the effective date of rural annexation; the proposed charter required only promises and a plan.

The fuse was merely lengthened on schools. The defeated charter's consolidation of two systems delayed until August 1974 in the proposed charter.

Both the defeated and the proposed charters were patterned after the "mail order" Metro charters issued by units of Metro-1313, the political syndicate that propagates Metro regional governance. The revealing stripe of such charters is the "General Grant of Power," located in Article II of the proposed Memphis-Shelby charter. The Article gives any and all powers, now and hereafter, to the governing body. In the process "any and all" *rights* are taken away from the citizens.

By contrast, true American charters are the opposite. Based on the 10th Amendment, U.S. Constitution, all powers are retained by the citizens, except for powers assigned to the governing body by enumeration or listing in a charter. The governing body's power stops where the list stops.

But the proposed Consolidated Government charter stated that it was not restricted generally by any enumerations should any be listed (Sec. 2. 02).

Art. II (general power grant) is perhaps the one most dangerous feature of the proposed charter. All else that followed — the unrestricted service districts, open-end debt and interest — become immeasurably more frightful under the proposed consolidation; at the outset citizens and voters were to be stripped of their right of self government. Approving the Consolidated Charter would be like handing a signed blank check to the consolidated County Council.

Take the issuance of bonds, relaxed under consolidation. Under Secs. 15.04-.06, the proposed County Council could issue tax bonds without a vote of the citizens and without a limit on the debt.

The Metro regional principle of forcing rural areas to pay for the costs of city operations appeared as proposed Section 14.25 called "Power to allocate

16. National Municipal League (sample) City Charter Article I, 6th edition, 1964, 47 E. 68th St., New York.

costs." The broad text allowed the County Council to spread costs of planning, health services, port and harbor, or "any other function," over the entire consolidated city-county tax grid for all taxpayers to pay, whether or not their area received the services.

Such unfair practices of regional governance are uncalled for.

A sensible alternative exists which costs not an extra cent if used in good faith — the "joint exercise of power" principle. When used sparingly, the law permits a city and a county, retaining individual sovereignty (veto power), to exercise a single function common to both. Flood control is a proper example, under valid circumstances.

But the existing Memphis-Shelby joint planning function, another example, is an improper, dangerous exercise, inasmuch as joint planning presupposes regional government, the consolidation that wipes out local governments.

MEMPHIS-SHELBY: O, THOSE METRO BLUES

In one section of Tennessee, they're humming, "Metro Blues . . . no got 'em anymore!"

The musty Metro charter for Memphis-Shelby County consolidation, defeated in 1962, retreaded and resubmitted in 1971 was turned down a second and (hopefully) final time, June 22, 1971.

City and county voters combined walloped Metro consolidation — 39,863 against, 36,157 for. Memphis gave a slight lead to Metro; the county vote turned it down. To be effective, voters in both areas had to approve the proposed charter.

Metro-No!, a citizen committee,¹⁷ skillfully mapped the victory, financing their campaign by less than a fourth of the amount splurged by Metrocrats. Metro-No! didn't have the money or the TV coverage, but did have volunteer workers in every precinct. They won the victory.

Reportedly, pro-Metro forces included a daily newspaper in Memphis, the chamber of commerce, a state senator, the Memphis mayor and most of the city council, but audiences were unimpressed by the uncertain Metro "let us reason together" approach.

On the other hand, Metro-No! speakers dragged out the nitty gritty: the proposed charter's uncontrolled spending, unlimited taxation, unlimited fees, unlimited assessments and the "no Debt limit" section. "Don't add to your woe, vote Metro-No!" became the battlecry.

Star Publications, a suburban-rural newspaper chain, charged that Memphis had "walled itself" in with special benefits under the proposed consolidation whereas, "the charter was devised to bring the county into the city to provide financial aid."

Other Metro fiascos in the South were cited. Chattanooga had defeated a Metro government proposal, and an official from Metro Nashville-Davidson County was quoted. "Metro has gotten so big," he said "that you can't run the government or any office of the government from city hall and have the slightest idea of what the people are thinking . . . high taxes and low effi-

17. *Metro No!* chairman, Mrs. Hillman P. Rodgers (Ellen Davies), Davies Plantation (Brunswick) Memphis, Tennessee 38128.

ciency have cost Metro government public confidence . . . the results are disturbing." (Trustee G. Ferguson)

Metro-No! distributed thousands of mimeographed leaflets and printed fact sheets, also sent letters to influential leaders. All material was *locally written* and circulated by the Metro-No! members. Additional facts were broadcast over two daily call in, talk shows.

One mayor, Thomas Hall of Millington, had so many speaking requests that he couldn't fulfill all of them because of conflicting time demands. His city defeated the Metro charter 10-1.

Swelling the ranks of Metro opposition, other suburban-rural aldermen left no doubt about their disapproval against consolidation. A newspaper poll disclosed a deep-seated, ingrained aversion to Metro.

Alderman Wm. McKelvy said, "I haven't changed my mind one bit in ten years." He was actively against Metro during the 1962 charter try.

Cleo Hollingsworth, alderman, said: "I am against Metro government 100 percent. If we must have that, I say just turn everything over to the federal government and let them run the whole thing."

One interesting casualty was the pile of rejected Metro charters. Fifty thousand (50,000) were printed, paid for by the charter commission out of tax money. Forty-two thousand (42,000) copies were on hand after the election.

Workmen carted them off. Where they were taken, no official spokesman would say.

HOME RULE AND THE NAME ABUSE

The mail that came from Douglas County (Ore.) where a so-called "home rule" charter initiative qualified for a vote Nov. 1972 sounded panicky. Citizens wanted instant information, neatly in a capsule.

An editor said he thought that locally things were pretty bad — would maybe the charter be an improvement?

If shipwrecked persons were drifting in a raft, they would be worse off if they had no oars. The situation exemplifies a citizenry who have cast away their oars by voting approval for a Metro charter; it gives their rightful control over government to the ruling body. It's done by the Metro "general grant of power."

The difference between the constitutional *concept* of "home rule" and the *abuse* of the "home rule" term has been pointed out many times. As a *generic term*, home rule means that a state permits local governments to operate under charters. Citizens can choose a good, citizen-controlled charter freeing them from outside interference, or they can be misled into choosing a Metro falsely labeled "home rule charter."

By the former, citizens list the powers they delegate to their government so that it can perform the services listed. They retain all powers not delegated.

On the other hand, a Metro general power grant charter robs citizens of their governing power. Known as the "universal powers" concept in Europe from where it derives,¹⁸ and basic to the United Nations charter, *municipalities under the general/universal power grant may do whatever is not denied to them.*

18. New Towns: Laboratories for Democracy (1971) by 20th Century Fund, N.Y.

The proposed Douglas charter appeared to be an unclear mix. In it, the county claimed the grant of general power; the charter also listed specific powers; it reiterated its claim on "all power."

Americans who wish to stay free must limit their public servants to the greatest extent possible. It appears advisable that delegated-powers type city/county charters should contain a version of this clause: "Any enumeration of rights/powers and privileges shall not be construed to impair or deny others retained by the people."

Four different meanings of home rule appear in Newsletter No. 26, March 1972, S O S, Box 29, Winnetka, Ill., 60093 as follows:

Citizen view: Home is local government. Rule is under the people's control;

Misguided Elected Official: Home is the name of a unit of government. Rule is in the politician's hands;

Planner: Home is eventually Wash., D.C. Rule is in the hands of appointees;

Socialist-Communist-One-Worlder: Home is the world. Rule is under the United Nations.

MIAMI-DADE STILL STUCK WITH METRO

The magazines and newsletters of Metro literature are hailing three Metro regional governments that toppled the former governments of Nashville (Tenn.), Jacksonville (Fla.) and Indianapolis (Ind.).

Taxpayers in Tennessee are sending out sour notes. Jacksonville is too new (1968), and Unigov (Indianapolis-Marion County consolidation) just went into effect Jan. 1, 1970. So let's look at U.S.A.'s oldest Metro, Miami-Dade, saddled with a Metro county charter. The people can't muster the strength to throw it off. *Metrocrats on the teeming public payroll swing the vote.*

A tenth year anniversary critique in 1967 charged that the Metro Court handling all traffic cases for Miami and 25 other cities in Metro-Dade, operated only as an income-producing mill. Violators, in most instances, were reported convicted and fined on the testimony of a lone officer.

In December 1969, a Miami columnist wrote, "Miami is a city of 350,000 people which seems to be sitting at dead center, teetering between hardening of leadership arteries and fiscal bankruptcy."

Another columnist took it up, "The city, admittedly, is in the throes of an organized crime wave, a Grand Jury deploring 'knifings, shootings, robberies, assaults, use of drugs by pupils in public schools. . . .'"

"Seldom has the image of this once-glistening 'Gold Coast' resort area been so tarnished. . . . The mixture of Metro (countywide) government and more than 20 municipal governments isn't working. *Traffic* is so bad it'll cost \$1.5 billion in the next 15 years to solve it. Of 90 *Sewage* plants in the county, 88 are operated in apparent violations of various health and anti-pollution ordinances. As a result, canals, rivers and bays are severely *polluted*. Surface cars and airplanes *pollute the air*. Dade has the highest rents, highest building costs. . . ."¹⁹

19. Newspaper quote credits to Miami News and St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times.

In January 1970 news from the Dade county courthouse revealed the latest tax figures then available (9/30/68) furnished by the Dade County Finance Dept. Total adjusted tax levies had more than doubled in ten years. Real and personal property taxpayers paid 63.6¢ of each tax dollar collected, 1967-68.

A Miami-Dade businessman and taxpayer stated "The one thing that Metro rode into power on (1957) was the promised consolidation of the tax offices. That has been done, *but nary an employee has been let out*. The bill for Miami and Dade taxes comes in one statement, all payments go to Metro and it sends the city's share to the city hall. For instance, I have three lots next to my house. In 1962 my county tax on the lots was \$50.57. Last year it was \$142.49. *None of this is city tax*. The total bill last year was \$333.05."

"I try not to be a pessimist," the taxpayer's letter continued, "However, the County (Metro) is going broke. If your boat is leaking more water than it is bailing out, it can't stay afloat for very long."

Apparently some passengers are abandoning ship. For instance, Pierre Salinger, a former press secretary to the late Pres. John F. Kennedy, appeared in the Pacific Northwest about 1969-70 as a senior vice-president of Amprop, Inc. The Miami-based real estate development and investment firm reportedly planned to invest \$30 million in Portland income producing property in Oregon.

Who can afford to own Florida real estate under Metro regional taxation?

METRO NASHVILLE RINGS SOUR, NOT SWEET

In Metropolitan-Nashville, the aging city-county consolidation experiment, the unrelenting criticism reported by the local press garbled Metro's victory song to such an extent that the Metrocrats called for outside help.

Business Week magazine sent in a trumpeter. The article (9/25/71) claimed that Metro-Nashville's merger has "kept key business in the city, held down taxes and upgraded services."

The residents who live there become cynical about reporting such as that.

Business was "kept in the city" by the Metro expediency of capturing the firms by the two-into-one consolidation. As is perfectly normal, businesses were beginning to expand to open space sites in the county as much as ten miles beyond Nashville's built up city core. Then, under Metro, the county became known as the city. The region-size tax grid transferred the city costs to the suburbs. Example of Metro tax shifting.

Taxes were not held down, they rose. Like "hot" being unbearable if you're sitting on it, taxation in Metro-Nashville apparently is a matter of degree. According to (Mr.) Mayor Beverly Briley who was quoted, "Taxes have climbed more slowly under consolidation than they would have under the old two-government system."

Reportedly, the new Metro "favors business." For example, the city's official tax assessment rate runs about 40% of assessed value. But business, especially the downtown variety, pays 20% to 25%, according to Briley and *Business Week*. Although rather ambiguously stated, it seems to indicate that a homeowner's tax base can be closer to one-half the assessed value of his property, while a business tax base could be as little as one-fifth. Example of Metro tax-gouging of private tax payers.

As to services, the pre-election promises have not been kept. Both sides, Metro governance and citizens, agree to that.

Costs rise but services do not. Sewer-laying has come to a halt. Water rates rose 45%. A 10% tax was placed on sewer bills. People are paying a higher sales tax. They've got to buy a \$15 auto sticker. Tax bills for 1971 due and payable, increased 61 cents each \$100 assessed valuation in the General Services District. Owner of a house assessed at \$10,000 would be paying \$61 more in property taxes than he did previously providing the assessment remained the same.

As reported by Wayne Whitt of the Nashville-Tennessean, Councilman John A. Wilson said, "I frankly don't know how some of the people in my district are going to be able to pay their taxes unless they take food and clothes away from their children."

The newspaper editorialized (8/4/71) "Since 1962 (year before the Metro consolidation, Ed.) the tax take has gone from \$65 million to \$152 million — an increase of 134%! And tax assessments have gone from \$730 million to \$1.2 billion, an increase of 57%."

NO MATTER HOW IT'S SLICED

A political trick that has been forcefed to voters for years in presidential elections was established at states' level in the 1972 campaign. The idea embodies the Metro principle of multiple-choice with the outcome predetermined regardless of which choice is taken.

The controlled result is brought about merely by having the basic product identical in any or all alternatives offered. At the federal level, the Party trickery was easy to see: Republican and Democratic candidates both one-worlders. Just wearing differing party tags.

In other examples, voters were asked to approve state constitutional measures that permit local governments a choice between "alternate forms of government." The catch lies in the fact that all forms offered end up being Metro governance.

Metro stands for metropolitan regional administrative governance: rule by executive order and administrative decree in vast regions, not 50 states.

South Carolina specified five alternatives in its proposed constitutional amendment in 1972. Utah and Pennsylvania (the latter in 1968) provided unlimited options. But in all cases, the all-Metro "guidelines" were to be furnished by the legislatures after the constitutional approval had been wrung from the voters.

In Utah, a knowledgeable editor pointed out that Utah's proposed amendment would lead to Metro. His correct analysis cannot be tossed aside as a mere accusation. The proof of his remarks are found in documentary evidence supplied by the Metrocrats themselves. Metrocrats are individuals who promote Metro governance.

Historically the "alternate form" method was tried out in New Jersey at city level with a given three alternate forms subdivided into 15 options. *All were exactly the same form of government.*

The Metrocrats published a book on the matter, "New Jersey's Optional Municipal Charter Law," published by political Syndicate 1313's National Municipal League (NML) 47 E. 68 St., N.Y. 10021 in 1964.

The basic all-important feature, *the source of the governing power* — a Metro governing body — was the same in all the options offered.

The Metro charters accomplish the deed. Their General Power Grant (GPG) takes all governing power from American citizens, bestows the power on a manager, or a council, or other agencies. Speaking of the GPG (“home rule” in Metro parlance) the above book says on page 8, “The basic form is the same regardless of the lettered options.” The remark aptly describes the several instances at state level.

Compare the sorry situation with the true American principle, this: A governing body can have no powers except those conferred on it by the citizens.

When citizens vote away that power by approving Metro GPG “home rule” charters, they scuttle their ship of state.

A last ditch alternative does exist for citizens in Pennsylvania, Utah, South Carolina and any place where citizens have disenfranchised themselves. They can storm their legislatures, insist that one of the optional forms shall be the traditional limited form of representative government which vests the governing power in the citizenry. Call it the 10th Amendment type of charter, if you wish.

Charters drawn under the *reserved power concept* of the U.S. Constitution’s 10th Amendment reserve all non-delegated governing power to the citizenry who can assign, delegate, but limit their representative governing bodies to those powers listed or enumerated in the charter.

HOG WILD IN HELENA

Trapped in the constitution revision craze, Montana’s Constitution of 1889 was unseated by a Metro constitution that was put on the ballot June 6, 1972. Measured by one formula, the new constitution was considered approved. By another, it had failed to pass.

Reportedly, constitutional changes in the state are required to be “approved by a majority of the electors voting at the election.” According to the Secretary of State, a certified 237,600 electors voted. A majority would be half of that figure plus one or 118,801. Yet the Governor proclaimed passage of the constitution because 116,415 voted for it; 113,883 against it.²⁰ And the Montana Supreme Court upheld.

In deep anger, Montanans have formed into committees to protect themselves from the legislative whiplash that has followed.

One citizen recalled the biased role played by the press. He said, “None of us opposing the (Metro) constitution could get a word in against this document of the National Municipal League of New York.”

NML is the parent body of the Metro-1313 syndicate which promotes regional governance. Revised constitutions are being patterned after NML’s Metro constitution. In early Jan. 1972, Wm. N. Cassella, Jr., executive director of NML reportedly appeared in Helena (state capital) dispensing Metro propaganda.

A citizen’s analytical letter was presented to a newspaper for publication

20. AP, Capitol Writer 7/18 and 8/19/72.

criticizing the syndicate's intervention in Montana affairs. Let his words tell it:²¹ "Our Butte paper is the *Montana Standard* and it runs a 'Readers Speak' column. I sent this letter pertaining to the constitution and a couple of sections of Montana state law which allows Metro government to sit alongside our Constitutional government. . . . The *Standard* would not print the letter but offered to run it as an ad for \$54.80. When I offered them the money, they would not accept it and consequently refused to run the letter. . . . The (Metro) constitution involves the lives of all Montanans, (yet) only one side of the story was given to the people."

At the Butte newspaper, there has been a change of editors and the present editor says he recalls nothing about the case.

Legislative Report No. 1,²² analyzing nine (9) Metro bills, exposed H.B. 37 which appropriates \$32,320 as Montana's dues to 1313's Council of State Governments. CSG is a bellwether organization in the Metro-1313 syndicate along with NML. All 50 state treasuries, paying more or less, likewise buy Metro propaganda from CSG's extensive apparatus that subverts state legislatures through numerous means and devices.

The culprit feature of a Metro constitution is the GPG (General Power Grant) which provides *all power* to the governing body (reserving little or no control by the citizens) so that a state legislature can do anything it chooses except what is expressly forbidden to it.

Citizens For Responsible Legislation, P.O. Box 1547, has exposed some of the "haste and waste" legislation pouring through the loopholes of the Metro constitution in 1973. On a full page in *The Messenger* 2/7/73 (Missoula), CFRL pointed that out, noting that the devastating work of constitutional revision continues today in Helena in the sense that many areas formerly restricted by the 1889 Constitution are now left open to the legislature.

"One visitor," according to CFRL, "came away from the legislative proceedings with the comment, 'They are going hog wild in Helena.'"

21. Mr. John Finnegan, Butte.

22. Legislative Report No. 1 Missoula, Montana.

New Measurements to Condemn America

NEW MEASURING DEVICES

Show an American a four foot "yardstick" and he'll tell you someone goofed. A yard is three feet in length. Then he'll rub his chin and wonder if one-world politics has already moved-in European metrics to outmode our U.S. measurement system. He will be correct, although it hasn't yet been determined if the 4-foot "yardstick" is something more than a tradesman's novelty.

But a new system of measurements has indeed moved in: Metro measurements and mixes, plus disabling and enforcement tactics. The delivery mechanism — Metro — bringing global law into the United States attacks every facet of the free American's way of life.

Identify the new system by 1) its false yardsticks and 2) the battles that wage as the Metrocrats enforce their off-beat standards.

Red China invented a new yardstick years ago. Calibrated by China's Red ruler, Mao Tse-tung, landowners were classified as "land lords" and convicted of "exploitation." They were shot. Their land was redistributed. Their only "crime" was that they owned real estate, one peasant just one-third of an acre, as reported by LIFE magazine Jan. 19, 1953.

In the U.S.A., the measuring strategy appeared early in the urban renewal movement. Minimum housing codes (Metro measurements) were applied against private structures which were condemned (disabled) and destroyed. Bureaucrats took the "landlord's" property, turned it to others.

Ratified by the United States, the United Nations Charter brought in another key Metro measurement, world government's "general grant of power" to governing bodies, none to the citizenry.

Measured by it, all American constitutions and charters were condemned as "horse-and-buggy" types. Wholesale revision attempts followed trying to implant the new measurement while striking down the American 10th Amendment principle which reserves power to the citizens.

Metro educational measurements were applied by a state official against privately owned Shelton College, Cape May, New Jersey, and early in 1971 closed it down (disabling tactic).

In public schools the attack shifted to the pupils and the teachers. As reported by Maureen Heaton in *Appeal*, published by National Families United, at Camino (Calif.) the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System appears to be part of the goofy yardstick. For instance, applied to education, PFBS electronic data retrieval can speed the "measuring" of teachers and pupils. Personal and socio-academic data stored in computers (secret cum

files gone electronic) can be summoned quickly to be measured by Metro standards programmed into the machine. "Recycling" would follow until teacher and pupil attitudes conform, or teachers fired or pupils flunked.

When "social factors" were added to the Metro mix, the situation blazed. The U.S. court system was called in for enforcement, mis-using the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution to validate the new norms. Consider the U.S. Supreme Court decision forcing busing of pupils.

When there are not enough black pupils to be mixed into white classrooms, then will black geographic areas be forcibly merged with the white? It's been done to Pleasant Grove (Ala.) by a court order zoning non-city black pupils into the all-white city schools.¹

Busing provides a *transient social mix* after Metro's yardstick finds school populations "imbalanced." Urban renewal provides a *total social mix* by moving black families into white neighborhoods and vice versa.

If the devil had set out to destroy the United States of America, his main act would be to establish his own set of values, bringing in his measurements and mixes, followed by disabling and enforcement rules.

But remember. Even the U.S. Supreme Court has been known to reverse itself. It does so when public opinion will not back it up.

IS A CATALYST CROWDING YOU?

In the late 1950's, an almost unbelievable strategy made its appearance: Rather than correct problems, public officials began to encourage malfunctioning, allowing public nuisances to drift from bad to worse.

In 1957, citizens reported to Los Angeles' Building & Safety Dept. on decaying conditions in the Chavez Ravine neighborhood. No corrective action was taken. The rotting dwellings later showed up as photographs in a survey which recommended condemnation clearance for the area.

In the early 1960's, unkempt buildings in the North Harvard neighborhood of Boston (Mass.) brought urban renewal in and wiped out an otherwise decent residential section. Harvard University was reported owning the eyesore properties.

In late 1967, another such *catalyst* was protested by a councilman² in the Metropolitan Government of Nashville-Davidson County (Tenn.) as follows: "In a meeting at the Nashville Housing Authority . . . The Chancellor of Vanderbilt University stated to me that in response to instructions from the Housing Authority and in cooperation with them, Vanderbilt University has been deliberately allowing *sub-standard houses* to stand in order to maintain the substandard character of the area and thus insure its eligibility (for an urban renewal project). . . . It is interesting to note that Vanderbilt owned 51% of all the sub-standard buildings in the area proposed for the extension of its campus."

It has taken almost ten years for such dishonest "fixes" to become recognized as catalysts — factors that force a reaction. Also, several other types of catalysts have emerged, including federal dollars and engrafted troubles.

1. AP, Birmingham, Ala. Sept. 1971.

2. Reprinted remarks of Hon. James A. Hamilton, Jr., 26th Dist., Nashville-Davidson County Council (Tenn.) 8/15/67.