

The Power Shift: From Citizens To The Metrocrats

FEDERAL NON-LAW IMPOSES REGIONALISM UNDER DICTATORSHIP

A mythical salt mill, fallen overboard and still grinding, is blamed by an old folk tale for the ocean's saltiness. A political syndicate — no myth — is grinding away within your government, turning out laws that are spoiling the American way of life, and will continue to spoil until restrained from so doing.

The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 is one such law — of 1313, by 1313, for 1313's syndicated self-interest army of Metrocrats.

Intergovernmental is interchangeable with "regional."

The federal intergovernmental measure of 1968 established regionalism as a national way of life. The master is comprehensive planning. The law orders compliance to "our total national community" with regionalism applied to almost every facet of human activity. That includes housing, transportation, economic development, natural and human resources development, community facilities (construction of buildings, public places), improvement of living environments, etc.

The law provides a loophole for bureaucracy (the federal Administrator of federal property) by land acquisition, to take big tax-exempt bites out of local tax bases *without prior notice*, telling the hapless city or county *after the robbery* (Sec. 804). Regarding land use changes or seizures of land, the law's Sec. 805 can *cancel opposition* to such practices during "any period of national emergency." In 1972, that meant *now* since President Nixon declared a national emergency in 1971.

The disastrous regional legislation had been quietly planned by political Syndicate 1313, the worldwide aggregate of special interest groups that propel *Metro governance* against Americans and their Government.¹ The same law repeatedly, since 1965 had been passed by the U.S. Senate but died in the House of Representatives. Then on October 16, 1968, Congress and the President combining, it was signed into law as PL 90-577.

The following 1313 groups urged its enactment: Council of State Governments (CSG), National Governors Conference (GC), National Assn. of Counties (NACo), National League of Cities (NLC), U.S. Conference of Mayors (USCM). Those organizations control their cell within federal government called the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR).

ACIR sowed the first seed for regional PL 90-577 in 1964. Part of ACIR's transmission belt includes "recommendations." ACIR published its infamous *Number Six* recommendation in its publication M-17 of Aug. 1, 1964

1. S.698, *Congressional Record* 7/29/68, p. 9696, and Report No. 1845, U.S. House of Representatives 8/2/68.

page 25: "The Commission recommends that . . . Legislation be enacted by the Congress to establish the principle of Federal interagency coordination, and this principle be implemented by preparing and adopting a unified urban development policy within the Executive Branch."

The next issue of M-17 in May 1967 page 28 repeated No. 6.

The August 1968 issue of M-17 page 28 again carried No. 6. Two months later the recommendation became the regional law PL 90-577. The No. 6 on page 19 of ACIR's M-46 October 1969 carried the news: "Implemented by PL 90-577."

This, then, was the bleak picture in 1968. The syndicate had made repeated thrusts with its regional sample law via ACIR which was manipulated by the syndicate. 1313 sent those same ACIR-controlling groups plus others of its membership to lobby for passage of the bill. 1313's activists in the U.S. Senate and House ran herd on the law to see that it passed. And it did — PL 90-577. Senator Edmund Muskie was its devoted legman. He is on the ACIR board as the appointee of the President of the U.S. Senate.

The regional law destroys the separation of powers principle of U.S. Constitutional Government by its Title IV where Congress yields legislative power to the U.S. President. He, in turn, was authorized to yield that law-making power to his appointees (Sec. 403). Out of that arrangement has grown the controversial A-95 regional clearinghouse review system designed by the executive OMB. The system straps regionalism over all America, by *non-laws* (rules and regulations) which are not backed by statutes (true law).

Congress having legislated in an area (regionalism) not permitted by the U.S. Constitution, PL 90-577 should be declared *void*.

The unprecedented regional law attacks American federalism (states' union under the U.S. Constitution). Regions are abolishing the 50 States.

Regionalism comes into the U.S.A. via the UN *concept* of regionalism found in the UN Charter, Chapter VIII *et al.* Not self-executing, UN concepts need to be executed (enacted) by legislative bodies. Congress so accommodated the UN by enacting PL 90-577. The UN concept can be construed as an *international non-law within the United States*.

By nurturing the regional seed through the years in its series of "recommendations," by its active drafting, promoting and implementing the regional law to its maturity, 1313's ACIR cell reveals miserably that it also is an *United Nations cell* within federal government.

One-world government advocates protest that the UN is not meant to interfere in the governments of its nation states. The UN not only is interfering in American Government, *the UN is destroying the United States of America!* And ACIR and the Syndicate 1313 parent are the agents of destruction.

STATE "GOVERNANCE" HAMSTRINGS CITIZEN POWER

Perhaps the most aggravated case of Metro, to date, has appeared in the State of Minnesota, now divided into eleven regions by the State Governor's Executive Order No. 37 (1969). Disease-like, the experiment is contagious to other states.

Region 11 is the topic — a seven-county Twin Cities region that includes an

area where public officials insulted the citizenry in 1968 by proclaiming the people — American Minnesotans — as “Citizens of the World.”

A year earlier, the Minnesota Legislature had abdicated its trust by creating a radical administrative agency to cover Region 11’s geography (Minn. Laws 1967, Chap. 896). Metropolitan Council, as the agency is known, was endowed with taxing² and other sweeping powers that constitutionally belong under legislative action, the citizen’s power by representation.

Actions of administrative governance, like the Minnesota experiment, are beyond the control of citizens. Administrative rules, citizens are told, are untouchable by the referendum. Persons who have tried to stop bulldozing urban renewal agencies/authorities when created by Resolution (administrative action) suffer from that bitter experience.

The unconstitutional inspections of urban renewal, the confiscation of firearms by Treasury Department men, the indignities heaped on citizens by IRS (income tax agents) are but a few of the troubles that apparently have overtaken the American nation due to the stealthy substitution of *administrative governance in place of constitutional laws*.

Discussing the chance that U.S.A. citizens might someday insist on electing regional officers (which would obstruct Metro somewhat), a 1313 Metro publication stated enigmatically, “The Twin Cities region is an exception since a referendum probably would not be required.”³

“Could not be required” may be a more accurate phraseology.

Including counties Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott and Washington, the Twin Cities Metropolitan Council in 1970 consisted of 14 members appointed by the Governor plus a fifteenth appointee, the executive director, required by law to be a trained “expert.” Syndicate 1313, promoter of Metro governance, grooms its managers for such jobs.

All cities, towns, villages and boroughs within the Twin Cities region (including Minneapolis-St. Paul) must risk veto of their affairs by first submitting their local plans to the Council; the agency makes its own rules under the state’s *administrative procedure* provisions.

Anyone having watched the gargoyle twists of Metro government readily recognizes Metro as the “new governance.” In fact, Metrocrats are beginning to refer openly to their scheme as “governance.”

According to Webster’s New International Dictionary, “governance” is a system of regulation. To regulate Americans, Metro first tried to consolidate governments and to head them with appointed managers. Finding the method slow, Metro devised COG’s (councils of governments), hoping to invest the multi-unit regions with governmental powers. Failing, Metro now is experimenting with undiluted administrative power — the stuff dictatorships are made from.

Minnesota’s radical Metropolitan Council can absorb the remaining ten regions and abolish their commissions. The Governor-State Planner, two positions vested in one person, can combine the regions at will.

Apparently, it can all be done over the heads of Minnesotans, due to the almost untouchable *administrative* nature of the Metropolitan Council.

2. Minnesota Statutes Annotated Vol. 26A, Chap. 473B.

3. National Civic Review magazine, March 1970, p. 132, published by 1313’s National Municipal League, New York.

PARKING AUTHORITIES: POLITICAL PIZZA

The astronomical profits that can be reaped from parking lots may be doubled or greatly multiplied at taxpayer expense when the business is cemented under the administrative dictatorship now being exposed throughout the United States. The free hand given to *authority-type* functions of Metro government are used to turn the trick.

The Mantia family, leasing two parking lots from the Boston Redevelopment *Authority* may have grossed as much as \$1,400,000 in ten years while paying a fantastically low rent — \$14,000 more or less annually, as reported by a newspaper investigating team.⁴

Generally, “authorities” are revenue producing operations of government at any level and include services furnished by airports, seaports, turnpikes, public housing, transportation, urban renewal, etc. and the subject parking authorities.

The Mantia family leased open-air parking concessions occupying land no longer on the tax rolls, seized from private owners and cleared by urban renewal bulldozers. Serving the Government Center, Beacon Hill and the North Station area, the lease was a month-to-month arrangement on a non-bid basis blessed by the *appointed urban renewal authority*. The bizarre situation, obviously underwritten by tax dollars, gathered steam in Boston and could have resulted in another grand jury investigation for which the state of Massachusetts is noted.

The laws of California offer another bash, a *two-headed parking authority*. A city or county *legislative* body can *declare itself* to be an *administrative* five-member parking authority.⁵ By merely “changing caps” at a city council meeting, the councilmen can conduct a parking authority meeting that, administrative by nature, is beyond voter and citizen control.

That strange teaming of lawmaking with moneymaking constitutes a threat both to taxpayers whose money and property are taxed and condemned, and to private parties who may be in the parking lot business.

A parking authority steered by a two-headed body enjoys unfair advantages and immunities. Its eyes point in all directions. Its administrative hands cannot be controlled by voters.

The public corporation so created can acquire property by eminent domain; can hire and fire, buy, lease, sell, construct, operate or sublease parking facilities as concessions; invest, borrow, issue bonds.

Santa Monica (Cal.) completed six downtown parking garages under the change-cap system: the city council levied the assessments, then signed a lease between the city and the Authority (themselves).

Tax dollars guarantee the instant profiteering possible under the system where an authority controls not only the deck of cards but all hands dealt.

The “Top of the Pier” investigation⁶ conducted by the California Senate Local Government Committee in 1970 at Huntington Beach was notably peppered by references to a parking authority’s plans to raze an existing

4. The Globe (Boston), Mass. 9/27/70.

5. Annotated California Code, Sec. 32661.1.

6. Chairman, State Senator John G. Schmitz, 1972 U.S. Presidential candidate. (elected to Congress 1970).

business district to make room for parking sites. According to a capitol spokesman, the reporter's transcript of the hearings has been lost and the printed version is not available. The matter, taken to court by a citizen, had the project stalled in 1972.

It is a sad day in America when a parasitic administrative "authority" can plop itself upon private property, provide public office holders with an "instant" business to run, where tax-subsidized profits are divided as spoil among the politicians.

APPOINTED AUTHORITIES DICTATE TO CITIZENS

Public housing authorities sported black eyes after the scandals of the fifties but they are looming big on the scene again.

Investigating HACLA (Housing Authority of Los Angeles) disclosed as a shelter for Reds and fellow travelers of the fifties, a federal Government Operations Committee pondered an Authority's strange political flesh — neither beast or fish, but certainly *foul*.

Authority types include Seaports, Airports, Turnpike, Transportation Authorities, etc. Current hot spots report trouble with the Housing type.

From Wellington (Kan.), "We circulated petitions last July with signatures of over 40% of the voters in the last city election, to leave these (public housing) projects all to the vote of the people. Our city council simply ignored the petitions on a technicality that our state attorney general had ruled that this was an administrative matter — not legislative, and therefore not subject to referendum."

Glendale (Cal.) citizens were brushed aside with a similar excuse but resorted to a referendum anyway.

*The Massachusetts Crime Commission took a look at the total picture of Authorities and found a "relatively new and alarming potential for corruption."*⁷

Authorities, a feature of Metro (Metropolitan) Governance, are created to construct, operate and maintain income-producing public facilities. Although the state has power to exercise control over an authority, actually only limited, if any, control is exercised. Note the scot free wording in a joint Building Authority agreement drawn up between Los Angeles County and the City of Lawndale: "Said Authority shall be a public entity separate and apart from the City and the County."

What are the reasons for creating such irresponsible Authorities? The Crime Commission listed three, 1) the state is not legally liable for the indebtedness of an Authority; 2) an Authority is free from limitations to which the facility would be subjected if it were constructed and operated by a department of state government; 3) an Authority's free-wheeling advantages lay it open to corruption and exploitation.

Citizens in Maryland opposed a state Housing and Community Development authority, social legislation backed by the Governor and approved by the legislature in early 1969. The monumental job of securing 57,900 signatures (only 27,800 were needed) crested by June 1970 under the leadership of

7. Massachusetts Crime Commission Report (5th), 1965.

Dessa Leister, then chairman of Maryland Lobby, a civic group, and Mrs. Barbara Morris who helped defeat Metro's Maryland Constitution in 1968.⁸

Maryland Lobby pointed out, "Under the 'Great Land Grab' (provisions in the law that created the housing Authority) any person's home, business or land can be condemned. Millions of dollars would be used to condemn private property, and to build subsidized housing — money that would come from us, the taxpayers, in greatly increased taxes."

Volunteers printed, folded, stuffed mailings, tended telephones, gave money, plodded door to door or plied shopping centers to secure the signatures. The issue went to statewide referendum in November 1970 and defeated the housing authority by a wide margin.

The referendum was challenged by a committee consisting of a coalition of reform groups, including the League of Women Voters; a Baltimore county circuit court judge on March 22, 1971 ruled the referendum invalid.

According to the Morning Sun (Baltimore), "Governor Mandel said . . . that he would hold to his earlier position of 'not doing anything to circumvent the will of the voters.'"

ADMINISTRATIVE POWER DENIES CITIZEN VOTE

One of the most insidious of all developments in creeping Metro governance is the Metrocrat abolishment of the citizens' right to vote. Arbitrary zoning and region forming without plebiscite during the fifties and the sixties are notorious examples.

Now in the seventies, mushrooming Metro "Authorities," also called Agencies, offer another menace — the public is denied its right to vote on public *money matters*. The Authorities operate revenue-producing functions — housing, transportation, parking, etc.

Take urban renewal (UR). During the sixties, UR had suffered setbacks when the issue was put to a people's vote. From Florida, California, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Ohio, Massachusetts, came reports that urban renewal was losing at the polls.

Suddenly, the balloting stopped. In the meantime, voices began saying that the citizens had no right to vote. Many of the issues had become "administrative matters." That led to the discovery that the public's business had been moved from control by elected representatives to a new breed of "managers" — appointees clustered under an Authority, vaguely referred to as a state body.

Under fire from disenfranchised voters, the system took a more dangerous twist. Instead of appointing boards to run the Authorities, local city and county governing bodies began operating the Authorities, themselves. A mere "change of caps" under certain state laws now transforms a city councilman or a county commissioner from an elected officer into an authority's administrative member.

Instead of approving ordinances (legislative), the councilmen acting as an Authority or Agency approve resolutions (administrative) which activate matters untouchable by the voters. Denied referendum, the citizens are barred from having a voice in the spending of their tax money.

8. The Barbara M. MORRIS Report, P.O. Box 412, Ellicott City, Md. 21043.

It didn't take long for Americans to see through that. In States where Constitutions so provide, citizens began using the *initiative* Petition against the "untouchable matters." When approved by the voters, the initiative nullifies the power arrogated by the governing body.

In Huntington Beach (Cal.), a determined citizenry penetrated the city council's disguise to circumvent the voters. A petition campaign got underway to block the financing of the "Top of the Pier Plan" which called for a shopping center, etc. sponsored by the council calling itself a parking authority. If approved by the voters, another election would be necessary before the council could spend money on the plan.

The Seal Beach (Cal.) city council disbanded the controversial Riverfront Redevelopment Agency (RRA), an appointive committee with plans to "improve" vacant land. But instead of abolishing the RRA, the councilmen invested themselves with its powers — bond issuance and tax collection (on Agency property) which bypasses the city's general fund. Critics attacked, charging that it is not good government for the council to create an agency, then to arrogate the agency's administrative powers.

POPA, Inc. (Property Owners Protective Assn.), P.O. Box 351, Yakima (Wa.) sponsored an initiative ordinance to decide how much power the voters wished to retain over public money matters. Involved were issues like public housing, urban renewal, etc. The ordinance would not prohibit any of the federal/city projects; it would require the city to place those matters on the ballot.

Unaccountably the initiative failed to pass.

OMBUDSMAN, 1313'S IMPORTED MONSTROSITY

The appointed Ombudsman idea imported from the Old World fits a major goal of 1313 which is to abolish representative government for appointed administrators rule.

An Ombudsman, supposed to handle citizen peeves, is described as a "defender of people abused by government."

Those who would create Ombudsmen need to be reminded that Americans *are* the government in the U.S.A. and further, that elected representatives are entrusted to do what Om is said to do in European monarchies and oligarchies.

It is unthinkable to ask Americans to shun their Congressmen, city or county commissioners, and run to an appointed Ombudsman. Like any mortal, Om could ignore grievances just as elected representatives sometimes do. But, whereas you can vote out lazy representatives, you could never vote an Ombudsman out of office nor have him hauled into court for review of his decisions.

Syndicate 1313 launched the Ombudsman idea in the United States in the '60's through state and federal legmen such as California Assemblyman Jesse Unruh and U.S. Senator Edward V. Long (Mo.), but the foreign concept was snubbed by the 89th Congress and the California Legislature.

Then tax-exempt Ford Foundation (with its untaxed dollars), Columbia University and its propaganda arm, The American Assembly, got into the act to help along 1313's political bias.

Columbia's law professor, Walter Gellhorn, drafted an Om law,⁹ then went on the road hawking it. In early 1967, he was reported speaking before a joint House-Senate session in the Illinois Legislature. He also delivered the formal address on the (W. Averell) Harriman campus of Columbia U. in a propaganda center called Arden House. There, Oct. 1967, Columbia's American Assembly on The Ombudsman talked for three days and on the fourth declared its work good by voting its approval.

AA's participants were weighted heavily with political Syndicate 1313's agents dispatched from 1313's Council of State Governments, American Society for Public Administration and National Municipal League. The NML also mailed out Gellhorn's Om law, upon request.

The American Assembly's skinny four-page report on The Ombudsman plugged Gellhorn's law. Under Columbia University's postage permit, The Assembly mailed its report to 1313's NML members and dumped copies on newspaper editors throughout the country.

On the federal front, Sen. Long had again introduced another Om bill (S. 1195 of 3/7/67). It provided for a federal Om to handle citizen gripes against the Social Security, Veterans Admn., Bureau of Prisons and the Internal Revenue Service. A Feb. 1968 amendment added Selective Service as another Om target.

The Gellhorn draft and Long's S. 1195 read alike, especially the section that opened a way¹⁰ for the federal Om to employ Syndicate 1313 advisors to rewrite "trouble spots" in American government.

A close look at Om's powers, Om's immunities, Om's privileges and sweeping one-man power set forth in the Gellhorn pattern and its copy, the federal bill S. 1195 revealed Ombudsman to be an unchained monstrosity that could squelch citizens at will.

Worse, there's no end to the mass production of Om's, once started. In Sweden, Om's incubator, an Om was proposed for dogs and cats; the ombudsman for animals would be called Foersoeksdjuris-ombudsman!

EXECUTIVE ORDER DESTROYS CITIZEN POWER

After the warning by the late U.S. Rep. Mendel Rivers, Congress voted \$19.9 billions for military procurement in 1971 for purchases of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, etc. Down \$4 billions from 1969, the figure plummeted a downward defense trend at a time when our ammo and soldier-power are squandered on interminable United Nations' regional wars. Not restricted to the defense of the U.S.A., military spending pays for wars around the world, yet in the budget it's called "national defense."

The late Congressman described the U.S.S.R. as being on a dread prowl around the planet, flexing warlike muscles at many global points.

Citing figures showing that the Communists have outstripped the U.S.A. in building and maintaining a stronger military capability, Rep. Rivers deplored the shocking deterioration of American defenses.

Among various points, the legislator urged that the U.S. should "beef up our military capability in the Caribbean." He told of the Soviets' stockpile of

9. Gellhorn Draft 2, 1/23/67, Columbia U. School of Law, N.Y.

10. Gellhorn Ombudsman Sec. 9 (e); Long's S. 1195, Sec. 5(b), 2nd sentence.

megatonnage warheads, too large to pass off as merely for defense, but rather a weapon which the Communists can use to "blackmail us into the fear of the destruction of our cities."

Only a few Washington legislators are concerned about evidence showing that the Soviets are trying to build a submarine base in Cuba. One solon has commented that there are relatively few persons in Wash., D.C. who seem concerned. Many take our military invulnerability for granted. Others think that national *defense* (not total military spending) is an outmoded concept in the so-called "changing world."

It is the latter type, the One-Worlders among us, who pose one of the greatest of domestic threats. Our national budget is glutted with their peculiar social, economic, educational and other programs that waste our substance and keep us in debt. The *interest* on the public debt alone in 1970 almost equalled the 1971 military procurement tab.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the peak of One-World lunacy, is an example. Supporting ACDA in the present peril is as suicidal as applying the brakes while racing the motor to pull away from danger.

Coupled with U.S.A.'s defense decline is another menace: Executive Order No. 11490.¹¹ In it, The President assigned to federal agencies a web of emergency functions. Going far beyond any previous war-based powers, the 32 page directive slaps *administrative controls* over every facet of ordinary human life — water, food, housing, electric power, fuel, etc., including things as disparate as the coinage of money and credit unions. No dictatorship in history can match it. Rule-making power delegated by Congress to The President is to be redelegated and successively redelegated (Sec. 3012) to bureaucrats.

Citizens have no control over such administrative rules. To buck the situation is like coping with commissars and hitlers. The federal Office of Emergency Preparedness caps the E.O. 11490 structure. Even decisions on "sharing war losses" would be decided by the OEP. Congress stepped out of the picture.

Since the United Nations does not "permit" war, and nations are not "allowed to fight each other," should any nation attack the United States, international semantics could call it anything but a war. Witness Korean and Vietnam "police actions."

But an attack could supply the state of emergency necessary to trigger E.O. 11490's sleeping dictatorship.

Lacking a war threat, Congress could pass a law granting authority to *effectuate* E.O. 11490.

If both that congressional action and a war threat were lacking, the U.S. President as a last resort could issue a non-war emergency order that could "effectuate" the E.O. 11490's administrative colossus. All that is needed is an incident defineable as "a national emergency."

That condition was contrived and supplied by Nixon's Proclamation No. 4074 of August 15, 1971.¹² In it the President declared a *national emergency*

11. Federal Register Part II, Oct. 30, 1969, (copy is in *Congressional Record* 9/27/71 p. E 10106.)

12. Proclamation No. 4074, August 15, 1971, (copy of *Ibid.*, 9/27/71, p. E 10105.

related to “the international economy.” Current events illustrate that the dictatorship is in full swing in 1974.

METRO’S EXECUTIVE DICTATORSHIP

Rallying gullible Americans into a sham “fight against inflation,” President Richard Nixon October 7, 1971, launched phase 2 of a revolutionary socio-economic upheaval for the United States of America. Phase 1 was his earlier wage-price freeze (E.O. 11615, FR 8/17/71) invoked under a statute.¹³

Nixon’s extension of wage-price controls beyond the November deadline came as no surprise; the elaborate Cost of Living Council, an interlocking policing group of federal agency heads answerable to The President, was never intended to expire as a 90-day wonder.

Creation of two new control groups on prices and wages prior to the expiration date emerged as chilling proof that *Nixon is implementing a plan* the “dictatorship” lying cocked in his Executive Order No. 11490 of Oct. 28, 1969, a 20,000 word 30-part Order which cancelled 21 existing Orders, then linking by reference to a host of other executive orders, assigned far-reaching emergency preparedness functions to federal departments and agencies with *totally new guidelines* set at “emergency.”

Nixon’s money and credit stabilization handed to the chairman of the private Federal Reserve banking system and the two new sub-groups on wages and prices relate to Secs. 1701(1), 1001, and 3006 respectively of all-encompassing E.O. No. 11490 signed by Nixon Oct. 28, 1969. Only a few presidential words were needed to trigger that Order. See Secs. 105, 3011.

On Aug. 15, 1971 in Proclamation No. 4074 Nixon uttered those words, “*I hereby declare a national emergency.*” He effectuated the mechanism that can bring totalitarian controls to bear upon every American man, woman and child. Each violation of a control carries a \$5000 fine.

By continuing his series of “phases,” The President can phase out America as we now know it and bring all Americans under one-man control.

Note a few highlights of the hidden plan (E.O. No. 11490): Part 8 gives the Sec. of Agriculture control over plans and economic programs covering all food resources. That means everything “capable of being eaten or drunk by either human beings or animals.” Sec. 802(1) excerpt.

Sec. 1107 gives HEW (Health, Education, Welfare) power to close schools and colleges, to confiscate the buildings in the name of “emergency.” The emergency preparedness aims to stay.

Sec. 301(1-16) Money. After our dollar has been mangled by global playboys, The Treasury Dept. (not Congress as specified in our now ignored U.S. Constitution) is charged with adjusting the dollar to satisfy foreign currencies, American citizens to take the losses. *The dollar was devalued in 1972.*

Aviation, ships, housing, industry, censorship, weights and measures — name it; it’s covered under E.O. No. 11490’s sweeping reach.

This can’t happen in the United States, you say.

But we no longer live in the U.S.A., but in an embryonic world substate, perhaps known as CONUS (continental U.S. — to use a word from a Pentagon

13. Stabilization Act of 1950 as amended.

report). Global law delivered through the United Nations Organization and its Charter rules over us. Nixon is an implementing tool.

Nixon's Proclamation and its companion wage-price fix in E.O. No. 11615 and his earlier E.O. No. 11490 are printed in the Congressional Record of 9/27/71, pages E10105-18, inserted by Congressman John R. Rarick as a public service. Each responsible American must acquire that issue from his Congressman — read and see what lies ahead.

The takeover system has been years in the making. Nothing less than a complete rollback is acceptable. Under existing provisions of law, Pres. Nixon can terminate his Proclamation No. 4074, E.O. No. 11490 and E.O. No. 11615. Do tyrants voluntarily give up power?

War Tightens World Dictatorship

REGIONAL ROAD TO GLOBAL WAR

The faults and pitfalls of regional governance have been pointed out and protested by the citizenry. Why, then, do elected officials vote Americans into regions and regionalism?

Obviously, because the setup offers officials a way to get money — region-marked *debt* from Wash., D.C. — without going to the local voters for approval.

In exchange, private property goes under bureaucratic control. Regions must conform to the U.S.A. Masterplan — or *no money (debt) is returned from D.C.* (where the woefully inadequate tax dollars were sent in the first place).

A national masterplan exists either on paper secretly, or in the head of the Metrocrats. The Hearings on *Regional Planning Issues* begun in Wash., D.C. in 1970 represented an attempt to get a national plan officially drawn, to be enacted later.¹

In Region SCAG, Los Angeles City in early March 1966 had not joined up. What sort of situation did that create? This: The federal bureaucrats refused to send money to the City of *San Bernardino*, a SCAG member, to buy a fleet of buses and a new park — all because Los Angeles left a big hole in the regional masterplan. Smaller cities, led by San Bernardino, launched a massive “hate campaign” against the City of Los Angeles.²

Beyond *multi-county* regions are Metro’s *multi-state* mergings. The bi-state Tahoe region over parts of California and Nevada, the tri-state transportation region of New York-Connecticut-New Jersey being examples.

International regionalization exists on a hemispheric scale. Organization of American States (OAS) is the western hemisphere region as set up by the United Nations Organization.

You will find regionalization of the World outlined in the United Nations Charter, Chapters VIII through XI, complete with the lexicon — “regional arrangements, intergovernmental agreements, metropolitan areas.”

The UN Organization controls through regional bodies. NATO is one, covering an ocean and 14 nations. Yearly, a group has asked Congress to approve an U.S. delegation to meet with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization groups for the express purpose of declaring that the eventual goal of the NATO alliance is a federal union government of nations. That’s World

1. “Regional Planning Issues” Hearings Parts 1-4 by Subcommittee on Urban Affairs, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, 91st Congress, 2d session, and 92d Congress, 1st session, Oct. 1970-May 1971.

2. *Los Angeles Times* 2/25/66 “L.A. Threatened for SCAG Boycott (San Bernardino Mayor Warns of Road Fund Loss).

Government they are talking about (S.Con.Res.64, Congressional Record 3/2/66, p. 4395; S.J.Res. 217, 10/4/72, CR p.16767; H.J.Res.900, House Committee on Rules — Hearing denied granting a rule (10/11/72).

Letters supporting that shocking move toward World Government were signed by Richard Nixon, Governors George Romney, Wm. Scranton, Mark Hatfield, also Barry Goldwater and Nelson Rockefeller in earlier years.

NATO is a multi-nation region on a hemispheric scale and it fits into World Government. SCAG and ABAG regions are, by comparison, multi-county regions in the American scene, scaled down, but cut to the world pattern.

Regionalization of the planet *Earth* is a *control device* for world dictatorship.

Take a simple toy — the nest of boxes which children play with. Small boxes fitting into larger boxes which, in turn, are all contained by the largest box of all.

The smallest boxes are cities fitting into county-size regions. Larger county-size regions fit into multi-county regions which fit into bi-, tri-state regions. Then multi-state regions will fit into multi-region *regions*. HUD Secretary George Romney delivered a veiled reference to the latter in 1972 when making a speech in Detroit. He predicted that certain big cities in portions of the existing 10-regions would become “metro-centers” in a vast “multiple-centered” Metro region.

ACIR has published a book, “Multistate Regionalism,”³ a position paper intended to ease all existing regional “fragmentation” in the United States into the 10-region U.S.A. system.

The hemispheric UN regions — NATO, SEATO, OAS — already exist.

The largest region containing all would be the UN’s world region headed by a dictator or an oligarchy of Metrocrats backing the dictator.

On March 11, 1966 France served a tentative withdrawal notice on NATO and angered England. Does that remind you of San Bernardino city trying to stir up the small cities against Los Angeles which had not joined SCAG? Regional government causes quarreling. Eventually, global *war* would result as the UN exerted police force on nations unwilling to bow under One-World Law.

Claims and counter claims were hinted to arise from the contracts France signed while under NATO. It is asserted that cities/counties may withdraw from local regions at any time. The entanglement of regional debt would continue after withdrawal of any city or county from a domestic debt-ridden region. As of Feb. 1966, Huntington Park was the first city to quit SCAG which was created Oct. 1965.

The “changing world” type of troubles appeared *after* World War II when the UN and its Charter were created. The United States signed the Charter, and world governance concepts — regions, urban renewal, etc. — were placed on your doorstep.

LET’S DROP THE HEMISPHERIC WORLD REGION — NATO

As originally formed and now, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a

3. “Multistate Regionalism” A-39, April 1972, by ACIR, Wash., D.C. 20575.

sprawling hemispheric region, is a next-to-final step to the plunge of its member nations, including the U.S.A., into the totality of One World Government.

NATO's military apparatus was stressed at first to hide its One World political purpose. Today, NATO's heretofore soft-pedaled economic, social and political intentions are being moved to the fore.

Globalists continue their striving to get the NATO Region group gathered from the far corners of the Atlantic basin and beyond. In 1966 they failed to gain the 89th Congress' permission for an American delegation to an Atlantic Union convention abroad. Nor in ensuing years.

In 1967, the first assault on the 90th Congress was launched by H.Con.Res.48 on January 10. The idea was to send 18 appointees headed by co-chairmen Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower to meet with foreigners, the motley group to whip up a timetable for the transition of their homelands into a communal regional government of The One World. Economic, social, cultural and political goals would be unified.

The NATO concept was given body and upholstery by the U.S. Senate in June 1948. The chassis was supplied by the five-nation Brussels Treaty, signed 3/17/48 for mutual defense⁴ by United Kingdom, France and the three Benelux nations (Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg).

Adoption of former Sen. Vandenberg's June 1948 Resolution authorized the U.S.A. to associate in the foreign defense pact. The action completely reversed the traditional no-political-foreign-ties policy of the U.S.A.

Twelve nations signed the North Atlantic Treaty in Wash., D.C. effective Aug. 24, 1949, but the Treaty is open to all comers. Fifteen, minus France, were on record as NATO members in 1966 — the Benelux three, Canada, Denmark, West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, Britain and the United States.

Illborn NATO gestated from a bigger mistake — the United Nations Organization into which NATO meshes through its Article One and the UN Charter's provisions for "regional arrangements."

To see how your American independence is being disarmed and turned into global *INTER*dependence without your consent, behold the words of Arthur Ross, American appointee, addressing the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference — Working Party Committee on the Reform of NATO at Paris on Nov. 15, 1966. Ross proposed: "That NATO begin to de-emphasize its primary military and defensive aspects, assume a more active and purposeful role in the political arena . . . and reduce somewhat its military expenditures."⁵

NATO's Article 13 spells out provisions for dissolution: "After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation."

In 1969, the twenty years were up. But NATO lives on in the seventies.

4. The NATO Handbook, 12th edition, 8/65, NATO Information Service, Paris (XVI).

5. "NATO — What Next?" — Congressional Record, 1/10/67, p. H52.

ONRUSHING WORLD GOVERNANCE ABETTED BY STATE-LOCALS

Conferences on government problems attended by international delegates were scheduled in Canada, the United States, Switzerland and Germany in 1971.

Meanwhile two cities, one county, and one state in the United States published world citizenship proclamations that declare their citizens to be "Citizens of the World." In Germany, a like event took place in the city of Wolfach, several years ago which, with Interlaken (Switz.) co-hosted the first Peoples World Parliament (PWP).

The second PWP, scheduled for 1971, was envisioned by the "American" branch of the one-world peoples group, the World Constitution and Parliament Assn., 8800 W. 14th Ave., Denver, Colorado 80215.

The "mundialization proclamations" of Richfield (Ohio), Minneapolis and Hennepin County (Minn.), and the State of Minnesota reveal a common source which may be tied to the Denver group. The group promotes the "mundialization" of communities, including towns, cities, university campuses, economic entities, churches, etc. and says that "mundialization means action by a community to declare itself a world community or part of world territory or a segment of world society . . . Mundialized communities generally support world government." (Section VIII, Adopted program of World Constitution & Parliament Assn.)

Richard G. Lugar, mayor of UNIGOV (Ind.) issued worldwide invitations to the global Conference on Cities, May 25-28, 1971, held in Indianapolis. The event brought together for the first time mayors and other leading local government officials of the North Atlantic Community (NATO) to find solutions "on problems shared by cities on both sides of the Atlantic."

Lugar's tentative program read like a world government roster: Albin Chalandon, Minister for Public Works and Housing (France), Dr. Lauritz Lauritzen, Minister of Urban Housing, Federal Republic of Germany; Peter Walker, Secretary of State for the Environment (Great Britain), Collette Flesch, Mayor Luxemborg City (Lux.), Dr. Gunnar Randers, Deputy Secretary General of NATO, etc.

NATO headquarters in Norfolk (Va.) disclaimed sponsorship in Lugar's NATO Conference on Cities.

A Syndicate Metro-1313 international adjunct promised to send a delegate to the so-called NATO meet — J. G. Van Putten, Secretary General, International Union of Local Authorities (IULA).

Also reported going were Hubert Humphrey, John V. Lindsay, N.Y. mayor; Daniel Patrick Moynihan, former Presidential counselor on the 10-region U.S.A. partitioning, Governor Edgar D. Whitcomb of Indiana, Carl B. Stokes, Cleveland (Ohio) mayor, and George Romney, HUD Secretary. Those were but a few of the American-based conferees.

Syndicate Metro-1313 groups were sponsors of the world gathering: National Assn. of Counties, National League of Cities, Conference of Mayors — all composed of local officials who collaborate with the international *Committee on the Challenges of a Modern Society of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*.

In April, IULA at 45 Wassenaarseweg, The Hague 2018, Netherlands, mailed a four-language invitation: English, French, German, Spanish, advertising its 1971 World Congress. Metropolitan Toronto (Canada), the first regional government in the western hemisphere, was to play host.

The IULA's advance publicity gave lip service to local government while declaring that "it is the higher levels of government which now have the main responsibilities." Sessions featured *regional government*, destroyer of local governments.

"THIRD DIMENSION" GRAFTS U.S. INTO WORLD SOCIETY

Richard G. Lugar, "the mayor of UNIGOV" (Indianapolis merged with Marion County), goofed when his publicity announced the May 25-28, 1971 meeting at Indianapolis as the "NATO Conference on Cities." NATO was the wrong word to use, according to the U.S. Department of State.

The Office of NATO and Atlantic Political Military Affairs also protested: "Through an administrative error the (press) application form sent from Indianapolis was wrongly labeled, as was the meeting itself. . . . While the overwhelming majority of participants and delegates at the Conference on Cities will come from NATO member countries, NATO's role is not that of a sponsoring organization."⁶

The question doubting Lugar's action, was first sent to NATO headquarters, Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, at Norfolk (Va.) but was passed along to the Bureau of European Affairs. That's how the Dept. of State got into the act.

The facts form a devious circle. It started when Pres. Nixon gave a 20-year commemorative talk at NATO's Ministerial meet in Wash., D.C. April 10, 1969. He said NATO (a United Nations governance) needed a "Third Dimension" and urged forming of "*a committee on the challenges of modern society.*"

NATO's Council (Brussels, Belgium) obligingly created the *Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society* as provided under Art. II, NATO Treaty. CCMS met (Apr. 1970) where Lugar, appointed delegate by Nixon, proposed a worldwide Conference of Cities. The NATO Council agreed that its CCMS committee could only participate "in collaboration."

So, Syndicate Metro-1313's city/county/mayor groups "sponsored" the Conference "in collaboration with CCMS." Oblique, but NATO-like.

Nixon's proposed "Third Dimension" is curious, somewhat reminiscent of the hippie chorus about the "Third World." NATO's role, enlarged by word from The U.S. President, no longer is based on NATO's traditional two functions, 1) collective military security and 2) political consultation. The new third task gave NATO a "social dimension," a 3-D world governance.

Nixon remarked that on his European trip to meet world leaders, "Our discussions were not limited to military or political matters. . . . We (in NATO) are not allies because we are bound by treaty; we bind ourselves by treaty because we are allied in meeting common concerns."

Signing treaties to swap ideas is intemperate — as uncalled for and foolish as marrying the cook to get a recipe.

6. Dept. of State, Wash., D.C. 20520 5/3/71.

"We in the United States," continued The President, "have much to learn from the experiences of our Atlantic allies in their handling of internal matters . . . the 'new towns' policy of Great Britain; the development of depressed areas programs in Italy; the great skill of the Dutch in dealing with high-density areas; the effectiveness of urban planning by local governments in Norway; and the experience of the French in Metropolitan planning."⁷

Those are the words of The President. Need you wonder any longer how urban renewal, "Model Cities," new communities, regional planning, anti-poverty and other costly tax-eating laws get into the United States?

Nixon went on to say that the then-proposed CCMS could handle the international cooperation on such matters globally, "recognizing that these problems have no national or regional boundaries." (Metro cliché)

It would be amusing to run across such stereotyped phrasing in a speech before a world regional council if it weren't so tragic.

One-Worlders expect that the results of 1313's Conference on Cities will be useful to NATO's CCMS in considering urban affairs projects. The U.S. delegation Nov. 1971 to CCMS was slated to tell about the Conference on Cities and suggest topics for CCMS (NATO) activity.

Did 1313's World Gathering Break The Law?

Aside from the fact that many Americans were irritated by the International Conference on Cities, attended by foreign luminaries bid by Richard Lugar, UNIGOV mayor (Indianapolis-Marion County, Indiana, merged), the global bash raised some questions, one of them overshadowed by the federal Logan Act (18 U.S.C. 953).

The law in the U.S. Criminal Code prohibits unauthorized contacts between citizens of the United States and officers or agents of foreign governments under certain circumstances and conditions.

The Conference publicity claimed, perhaps groundlessly, that the U.S. Government jointly sponsored the meet, along with four Syndicate 1313 groups, the National League of Cities, National Assn. of Counties, Conference of Mayors and International City Management (formerly Managers) Assn. The syndicate promotes world government's regionalism. NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) was bandied as a co-sponsor. The U.S. State Dept., contradicting, said NATO's role was not that of a sponsoring group (5/3/71 letter). NATO's high command at Norfolk (Va.) had bounced the matter to Wash., D.C.

Speaking of CCMS, a NATO committee, the State Dept. wrote that Lugar "had joined the U.S. delegation at the *invitation* of President Nixon" where the mayor broached the possibility of an international conference on cities. Boiled down, it appears that Lugar may have spearheaded the world meet on his own decision outside U.S. government authority.

At that stage protocol seems to have gone underground, while the conference sprang forth. In May 1971, transoceanic planes unloaded foreign delegates in Indianapolis, for the four-day meeting, May 25-28.

7. White House, Wash., D.C. 4/10/69 release.

Suddenly Nixon chilled the affair. He cancelled his appearance, sent no official greeting, the United States was resoundingly absent from the opening ceremony's agenda. But United Nations representation was listed to be present.

Government publications like the Congressional Record indexes show no trace of an authorized international conference of cities. The Nixon-centered Republican organ "Monday" failed to record the happening. HUD's Weekly announced that Romney and Hyde addressed the Conference but grossly misrepresented it as "sponsored by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Art Museum, Indianapolis, Ind."

Article 2 of the International Conference Objectives charged participants with offering "recommendations on future activities and cooperation for consideration by the CCMS and other organizations." The CCMS (Committee on Challenges of Modern Society) is a "social dimension" group created by NATO's European crowd at the suggestion of Pres. Nixon. In turn, NATO is a regional device of the controversial United Nations.

Actions forbidden to U.S. citizens by the Logan Act include carrying on without government authorization any verbal or written correspondence with any foreign government or officer with an intent to influence the conduct thereof, or to defeat the measures of the U.S. Government.

The global objectives of the international meeting's Article 2 would ultimately defeat the independent sovereignty of the U.S.A., already eroded by the UN's other global principles and projects.

From the viewpoint of American sovereignty, international conferences are intolerable when built on the UN pattern, without being duly authorized or as sketchily defined as Lugar's Conference was.

If Nixon "backed it" as Lugar's staff of ebullient "youth images" claimed, then the President should have come forth with a proper announcement. He never did. The White House has never clarified the episode.

U.S. PANAMA CANAL TRAPPED BY WORLD METRO

In the stealthy politics closing in on the Panama Canal in mid-1967 the Canal had been all but declared obsolescent as to shipping, and a fright as to military defense. A set of three new treaties, written by two faceless teams was said to be ready for signatures of U.S. President Johnson and President Marco Robles of Panama.⁸

Anti-Panama Canal interests want to dig a new sea-level canal and to cede/expropriate the Canal Zone, hard-earned by American money and ingenuity, to return the facility to the Republic of Panama as a gift.

As to defense, no better plan and perhaps a worse was proposed by anti-Canal interests. To satisfy shipping needs, the feasible solution exists in a proposed lake-lock plan that is being blandly ignored.

Why, then, the strange secrecy, many irregularities and hurried pressure to sign the proposed set of 1967 treaties?

The charge of betrayal surfaced in the long standing issue. "Such lack of forthrightness in a matter so grave . . . constitutes a betrayal of our own and

8. Congressional Record 7/10/67, p. S9266.

Western Hemispheric interests," Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, U.S.N.R. declared in one of his many public warnings. The retired officer has been interested in canal problems since early youth and throughout his distinguished naval career.⁹

Stating it bluntly here, the new treaty advocates are merely expressing loyalty to their principles — a world under One Government. The United States is supposed to submerge American well-being to favor the global concept and in the present instance, the Panama Canal is to be taken from Americans, to be divided and shared by the rest of the world.

The global concept, of course, is Metropolitan governance brought on by the United Nations Charter. We Americans are merely making it hard for ourselves by ignoring that fact and by not cutting loose from the UN Organization. *From local to international levels, Metro-UN strategy is the same — masterplanning, destruction of the status quo, forcing wild spending on Metro works*, such as the proposed sea-level canal.

An outspoken Canal Zone newspaper openly equated Panama's *masterplan* with the *Metropolitan reform*, but in the United States which is riddled with Metro reforms, the fact is ignored by all but a few individuals.

Under the 1967 treaty package, the present Canal Zone, 10 miles wide and 50 miles long, would be abolished.¹⁰ Compare that with the Republic of Panama's long-range *economic masterplan* drawn under the U.S.-Latin American Alliance for Progress program: *Elimination of the Canal Zone and acquisition of the Canal by Panama is part of that plan*.¹¹ To clinch it, the Organization of American States found Panama's master plan to be a highly acceptable study. OAS operates as the "manager of the Western Hemisphere" by authority of the United Nations Charter.

How could the wretched global picture be made more clear?

On the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Flood warned on June 27, 1967, "The proposed treaty is all set. The Panamanians are home with a copy in Spanish. The American copy in English is on the President's desk. . . . I appeal to the Members of this House, who constitutionally cannot act on the treaty, that you can write letters. I appeal to you, for heaven's sake. If every Member of this House would write a letter to the President and send a copy to the Secretary of State — I do not know what effect it will have, for it has never been done in history. . . . The Panama Canal is the jugular vein of Northern Hemispheric defense."

In 1972, five years later, the sea level canal construction had not been started, but pressure continued, urging the United States to relinquish sovereign control over the present canal (p. H7207 Congressional Record 8/3/72).

Congressman Flood, still on the job, criticized the U.S. Department of State, "Without the authorization of the Congress and in violation of Article IV, Sec. 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution [the Dept.] is now engaged in negotiations with the Panamanian Government for a new Panama Canal

9. CR 6/26/67 p. H8023.

10. CR 7/10/67 p. S9267.

11. Star and Herald, Panama, R.P. 4/18/63, 7/16/63.

treaty or treaties that would surrender U.S. sovereignty over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone territory to Panama.”

GLOBAL GAG RULE AT WORK

Tactics employed by a roving United Nations panel in 1970-71 exposed the type of pressure being exerted to promote internationalism instead of Americanism in the United States.

The President's Commission For The Observance of the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations conducted its first hearing at Atlanta (Ga.). Branded by citizens as stacked, that meeting was followed by others at St. Louis, Des Moines, Rochester (N.Y.), and San Francisco (Cal.) January 1971.

Chaired by U.S. Sen. Robert Taft, Jr., the Portland (Ore.) daylong Nov. 18, 1970 hearing exposed the Commission's methodology of bias. Press releases invited public officials, private citizens and representatives of organizations to testify, but obviously the purpose of the series was to collect feedback from the UN's own propaganda. The slanted findings were used as a base in preparing for The President a report designed to prop the sagging UN.

An observer sent by UN from San Francisco stated enigmatically that she came to learn “how to avoid the errors” made at the Portland meet.

Welcomed affably by the UN panel at Portland were witnesses who proposed: that Communist Red China be granted UN membership and anti-Communist Nationalist China expelled from the UN. That did happen later in 1971. Also requested was repeal of the U.S.-protecting Connally Amendment; ratification of the Genocide Treaty; and mandatory UN membership, to be “not an option but an obligation upon every nation,” and so forth.

Panel members plucked eagerly at witness proposals that fell in line with the UN agenda at the Stockholm proceedings slated for 1972, such as coastal estuaries “which will be a prominent item of business,” also United Nations control of the sea and seabeds.

The Portland audience was swelled by numerous rejected witnesses, notably individuals with local reputations for promoting U.S.A. Constitutional Government rather than observance of the UN's global rule. One who applied early when an abundance of hearing time was available, observed that although she was shut out, due allegedly to lack of time, another witness, pro-UN, claimed to have been summoned by a phone call from the arrangements committee to testify.

Procedure required 1) witness to identify self in writing with request to be heard, 2) written copies of remarks.

Two presentations in the morning session critical of the UN proceeded from witnesses who filed their written briefs after, not prior to oral delivery of their remarks. UN panel members made no attempt to conceal suspicion and hostility toward these viewpoints which had slipped through the screening set up by the local arrangements committee.

The National United Nations Research Assn., — perhaps given time due to the words “United Nations” in its title — proved astonishingly critical of world government. NUNRA blasted UN's Katanga military war in the Congo, UN's economic war against Rhodesia; cited as dangerous the weighted vote conceded to the Soviets and the Communist control of UN

military operations. NUNRA urged the UN Commission to support a complete review and legislative correction of the United Nations organization.

Recommendations of the second witness who also pierced the UN screening net, called for *abrogation* of the United Nations Charter and *eviction* of the UN headquarters from the United States of America.

MICRO-VOTING, OR LAW OF THE REGIONAL PACK

An editor of a monthly periodical showed two files of correspondence relating to Metro regional governance. The letterwriters had challenged a Governor in the East regarding his pro-regional stance; also a newsman in the mid-West for plugging regionalism without the true facts.

The governor and the newsman, parroting the Nixon Administration propaganda, had written back in so many words, "You're wrong!"

The governor didn't need to think, for his motive. After all, Metro is administrative government. That's why he, and the U.S. President and so many other governors and mayors (all administrators) promote Metro; it increases their power over people and the public's money.

The newsman, of course, was disgorging the stuff fed out by Metro publicists, notably The White House, the administrative sector made even stronger by Metro governance which is putting us under a system of world law.

Each rank-and-file American, by investigation and disciplined thinking must become an authority on Metro where he chooses to take a stand — national, international, state or local. Each person must dig out the sleazy features and puncture false claims such as "regions move the government closer to the people."

Metro is a rank raw experiment, not a completed fact; the Metro catastrophe should be regarded as a moving picture, not as a snapshot. "Governance" or monolithic one-system control is working to gather all government under the administrative sector's power. Nixon's 10-region setup over all political, economic and social "needs" is one chilling example. The same Metro technique is repeated on down the line wherever regionalism takes hold. First, the geographic regional grid; next, the staffing with Metrocrats.

Nixon aimed for ten coordinators (managers) all answerable to the Presidency. How will state citizenry retain sovereignty and veto power on state and local affairs under a situation like that?

Regional arrangements at any level of government *dilute* the regional pool of jurisdictional votes by *micro-memberships*, each of which has a vote equal to any other. That is a Metro principle as based on the "law of the pack" by which a strong member can be outvoted by the rest of the pack.

Right there, regionalism reveals its one-world parentage from the United Nations. Released by the U.S. State Dept., dated 4/26/71, the "Report of the President's Commission for the observance of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations" *described the very same situation but on a world scale.*

Within the United Nations organization, each micro-nation (called a state) has a vote. *One tiny nation* has a population of only 90,000, yet *has a vote equal to the entire United States* with cities populated by millions of inhabitants. The UN's one-world is one global region.

Quoting a Californian who always does his homework, "There is absolutely no provision in the Constitution for regionalization. The entire program should be scuttled and the hairbrained idiot that dreamed it up should be returned to the asylum."

THE CHINA VOTE: BETWEEN GOD AND COMMUNISM

Television programs were interrupted the night of October 25, 1971 with a shocking announcement concerning the voting at the United Nations in New York. The Red Chinese Communists were in. Anti-Communist Nationalist China was out, expelled by nations of the "world community."

Seventy-six nations voted for the Communists, 35 against, and 15 countries abstained. Prior to the vote on the gruesome Resolution to admit Red China, the United States lost its motion which would have required a two-third majority to expel Nationalist China from its seat.

With the world turned against them, the members of the anti-Communist Chinese delegation proudly walked out of the UN General Assembly.

Unseemly preparations were begun to welcome the Communist delegation from Peking to fill the China seat so forcibly vacated.

If anything should jolt the American people to realize their peril, this China vote preferring Communists to the U.S.A.'s friend should do it. But greed causes some Americans to say, "It's good for world trade."

The American delegation to the UN was *surprised* when the vote went against it. How naive can grown men be?

To be held accountable are those American fellow-travelers (one cannot call them leaders) who have been fence-walking to attract and encourage the Red Communists to press their case for entry into the UN body. Also accountable are pink individuals and organizations such as the monolithic League of Women Voters which has held its pro-Red Communist stance for years on end.

The China vote has sharply identified the Metrocrats, soft on Communism.

No loyal American would vote to have his country pigmied under world governance. No rational American would vote to have a Communist made his partner. Yet it has been done. A system did it. The UN world system. Over the heads of the people. And the Metrocrats condone the trickery.

Notable among the pro-Communist UN votes, reportedly, were those cast by Canada and France. Anti-Communist demonstrations erupted in those nations against Communist leaders who were touring there at the time — Kosygin in Canada, Brezhnev in France. The situation is the same there as here. The French and Canadian public officials are pro-Communist, as Communist-soft Nixon, Herr Kissinger and others, here. The rank-and-file American is steadfastly against Communists and their deadly atheistic creed.

The China Vote will polarize America, the citizens arrayed against false leaders.

A few stalwart leaders still remain in Congress, but they need peer votes to reverse the fate that is overtaking our homeland. Lukewarm and spineless legislators must be re-steeled to match the strong ones.

THE "MUNDIALS" LAY SHOCKING PLANS FOR US

Years ago, a popular writer authored a series that dealt with ethnic groups, the Irish, the French, the Italian, etc., depicting their contributions to their adopted United States.

Today in the U.S.A., a group of outcasts, dubbed "mundials" portray a new twist: They hope to do away with their allegiance to the United States.

In Latin, "mundus" means world.

During the period Aug. 27-Sept. 12, 1968, mundials¹² from the United States joined with mundials from other parts of the globe to hold a world convention in Europe. They expected to draft a World Constitution, put their heads together on how to bring the most powerful national governments under the control of World Government, and debate topics including "How to Enforce World Law: By Civil Administration or Military-Police Power?"

Wolfach, Germany, a world-minded town in the Black Forest near the Swiss border was to host the *Peoples World Parliament*, second part of the global double header. The *World Constitutional Convention*, first part, scheduled at Interlaken, Switzerland, was expected to have the World Constitution ready for unveiling after a mere one week workshop.

It is said that at Wolfach, the WCC-PWP was heartily welcomed and promised 100% cooperation by the Mayor. Mundials were to register at the city hall on a list reading like a little United Nations. The welcome for the WCC-PWP at Wolfach followed the format of public ceremonies of December 1967, during which the city declared itself a United Nations City, symbolized by hoisting the UN flag on all appropriate occasions. With dubious distinction, Wolfach reportedly is the *first city in the world* to declare itself a United Nations City.

The entire district surrounding mundialized Wolfach reportedly made enthusiastic preparations. All other meetings were cancelled including that of the *German World Federalist* organization which decided to cooperate fully in the WCC-PWP world political gathering.

Stating that world government *only* can bring "peace," the World Committee, propelling the WCC-PWP, issued a "Call" in 1963. One thousand gullible dupes from 50 countries signed the thing. The people and the national governments of each country were invited to send delegates.

The World Committee has failed to define its kind of "peace."

WCC-PWP's 1968 working sessions reportedly drew Peoples Delegates from thirty countries. The WCC is instructed to prepare a constitution for federal world government and the PWP promises fantastically to provide representation for all likeminded people at the world level!

Temporary "*substructures*" to world government was one proposal. Among the specifics for that substructure is a "Peoples Peace Pact" to provide (per The Committee's publication) "the first break in the present death grip of sovereign governments."

In 1970, the *substructures* were advocated before the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress by Dean Alan K. Campbell, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University,

12. World Committee for a World Constitutional Convention, 8800 W. 14th Ave., Denver, Colo. 80215.

N.Y., and CED member.¹³ And *sub-regions* were widely proposed by Metrocrats in 1972.

In an act leading toward ultimate civil disobedience and treason, Mundials pledged allegiance to *The Pact* — and to the heck with allegiance to one's own Country and Flag!

VIETNAM MUNDIALIZED FOR ONE-WORLD

Military age Americans look blank when asked "what caused the Vietnam war?" They don't know about the SEATO Treaty (the United Nations' Southeast Asia collective defense treaty) signed by the United States in the fifties. The treaty is used occasionally but not conspicuously to justify American military intervention in Asian affairs.

The true facts surrounding Vietnam have been withheld. A few facts escape now and then to be only half-believed by a generation made cynical by officialdom's trickery and promises that didn't track.

Chance words spoken unofficially but caught by some newsman, afford about all that rank and file Americans can find to piece into the truth about the Vietnam "action." But now that reparations talk begins after the "peace," perhaps events will line up into the truth.

Past and present events suggest that the SEATO paper was signed (1954) with at least two objectives in mind: 1) to insure corporate investors with long-trend opportunities in Indochina, 2) to further the merchant-oriented One-World economy.

It is a fact that to bring about the SEATO thrust, Pres. Kennedy in 1961 sent "jungle fighters" to South Vietnam against Communist leakage from North Vietnam. It is a fact that American firms were reported in South Vietnam as early as 1962,¹⁴ there to stay, building ports, roads, structures and facilities. It is a fact that offshore oil deposits are reported on Vietnam's continental shelf,¹⁵ known for how long and by whom is anyone's guess.

After the SEATO signing, Ngo Dinh Diem was named Prime Minister of South Vietnam. Despite Communist troubling, Diem succeeded too well (from the view of jealous interests), for Diem was promoting Vietnam for the Vietnamese.

In 1963, Diem and his brother were murdered under mysterious circumstances. Madame Diem while in the United States on a suppliant's visit was politically snubbed. A period followed in which Vietnam was tossed by political jugglers.

American tax funds and lifeblood were poured into the SEATO-Vietnam undeclared war. To prepare it for the postwar reconstruction period, the nation was uprooted, plowed by bombs, and leveled.

Now, Vietnam has completed the re-run, first tried on Korea, of the mundializing steps that are shaping the One-World: First, a treaty divides a victim nation into two parts (as did the Geneva agreement for Vietnam). One

13. "Regional Planning Issues" Hearings, Subcommittee on Urban Affairs, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, 91st Congress 2d session, Oct. 13-15, 1970 Part I, p. 35.

14. Herald-Examiner, Los Angeles (Calif.) Jan. 20, 1966.

15. Oregonian, Portland (Ore.) May 1, 1971.

part goes to the Communists to use as a base for attack on the other half. Under a United Nations "defense" treaty, a stronger nation "helps," thereby accelerating the war. A peace treaty places a world commission in charge of the mundialized territory. The intervenor nations offers to rebuild what it knocked down. International investors get the concessions — in Vietnam, ranging from a rumored taxicab franchise in Saigon to the offshore petroleum pools ready for the oil drills.

The thorny problem of the Viet Cong tortures the "fragile peace." Trained for one thing only — to make war — the Reds can't be wound down by mere talk. The merchants, bankers, and investors regret it, of course. But they are not hurting. The people hurt. Young men went to be killed and maimed. Taxpayers idiotically pay taxes for bullets and reparations.

But the war making machine still remains. Which nation will be mundialized next?

AMERICANS CHANGED INTO WORLD CITIZENS

With a sprinkling of ink, traitorous officials changed a whole countyful of Americans into "World Citizens."

Unprecedented in the United States and matched perhaps only by one self-declared "United Nations City" in Germany, the Minnesota action was embodied in a document known as "A Declaration of World Citizenship."

By signing that Joint Resolution of the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners/Mayor and City Council of Minneapolis, on March 5, 1968, American-based public officials pledged their "efforts *as world citizens* to the establishment of permanent peace based on just world law."

Three main signers — a county chairman, mayor, council president — promised to "proudly display" the United Nations flag above the Minneapolis city hall and the then new county building.

Declaring that the citizenship responsibilities of their constituents in county and city "extend beyond city and nation," the changecoat trustees then betrayed into political limbo about 1½ million Americans by proclaiming "our citizens are . . . *Citizens of the World*."

A dozen other signatures on the document commended the disgraceful sellout from American citizenship to world government fealty.

Chief Justice Oscar R. Knutson, Minnesota Supreme Court, admitted signing to commend the joint resolution, but he remained silent on the question: "*What effect is made on U.S. Citizenship of individuals by the Declaration of World Citizenship?*"

Queried about his signature on the world citizenship paper, Dan Cohen, President, Minneapolis City Council, flatly dodged the question. His letter of reply consisted of eight words: "I believe our sister city is Santiago, Chile."

Robert F. Janes, county board chairman replied lamely, "The chief officer of a governmental body must sign all documents, contracts, and letters, etc., in the name of the governing body. Therefore, my signature which appears on the resolution was signed by myself as was duly authorized by resolution of the County Board." Chairman Janes neither voiced disapproval nor did he invent an excuse to avoid signing the alien document. The board vote, including his own, was unanimous.

A Declaration of World Citizenship

A Joint Resolution of the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners, Mayor and City Council of Minneapolis

WHEREAS, in recognition of the greatly increased interdependence of the world in this nuclear age, and

WHEREAS, realizing that the common interests of man can only be met through world cooperation, and

WHEREAS, seeking to free mankind from the curse of war and to harness all available sources of energy and knowledge to the service of men's needs, and

WHEREAS, aware that we can best serve our city, county, state and nation when we also think and act as world citizens,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the Mayor, City Council of Minneapolis, and Hennepin County Board of Commissioners recognize the sovereign right of our citizens to declare that their citizenship responsibilities extend beyond our city and nation. We hereby join with other concerned people of the world in a declaration that we share in this world responsibility and that our citizens are in this sense citizens of the world. We pledge our efforts as world citizens to the establishment of permanent peace based on just world law, and to the use of world resources in the service of man and not for his destruction.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that as a symbol of our obligations as world citizens we request the Municipal Building Commission to proudly display the United Nations flag on suitable occasions at the main entrance to the City Hall and the main entrance to the new county building.

The question was on the adoption of the resolution and it was unanimously passed on March 5, 1968.


Chairman, Henn. Co.
Board of Commissioners


Mayor, Minneapolis


President,
City Council

We, the undersigned, commend the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners, the Mayor and City Council of Minneapolis, for the above splendid World Citizenship Resolution. This is the first American community that we know of to take such action. We hope that many other cities and counties will follow this example which is a valuable step in building a world community and world peace.


Governor, State of Minnesota


Member of Congress


President, Minn. Council of Churches


President, Minn. United World Federalists


Chief Justice, Minnesota Supreme Court



Chairman, Minnesota Republican Party


Chairman, Minnesota D.F.L. Party


President, Minnesota State Bar Ass'n


President, Minnesota Rabbinical Ass'n


Aux. Bishop, Twin Cities Archdiocese


President, League of Women Voters of Minn.


President, United Nations Ass'n of Minn.

The Jo Hindman Copyright does not apply to this "Declaration of World Citizenship" which is posted here as Public Information

A telephone call from Wash., D.C. admitted that Congressman Donald M. Fraser had authorized the use of his signature on the proclamation.

The Governor of Minnesota, Harold LeVander, failed to reply at all regarding his signing the World Citizenship paper.

Other endorsers whose signatures demonstrate willingness to muddy U.S. Citizenship with world government allegiance include the Minnesota heads of the Rabbinical Association, Republican Party, Council of Churches, D.F.L. Party, League of Women Voters, United World Federalists, State Bar Association, United Nations Association, and the Aux. Bishop of Twin Cities Archdiocese.

A citizen of St. Paul (Minn.), resentful of the tainting-by-decree, has reported that not only was the treacherous action taken without consulting the citizenry, the news of it was kept from the people. "The only item we could find in the papers stated that a resolution 'passed by a Hennepin County Board committee asked that the UN flag be flown outside the City Hall-Courthouse on suitable occasions.'"¹⁶

Three years later almost to the day came the electrifying news, "*World Citizenship has been declared over the whole State of Minnesota.*"

State officials gathered at St. Paul to sign The Declaration of World Citizenship of the State of Minnesota, March 25, 1971. Verified by Governor Wendell Anderson's office, these signed: The Governor, Lt. Gov. Perpich, state senators Holmquist, majority leader; Coleman, minority leader; state representatives Lindstrom, majority; Sabo, minority; Speaker Aubrey Dirham.

This is the second world unity paper signed in the state; a former governor and various officials inked the Hennepin County-Minneapolis world citizenship pact, which is almost identical with the new state document.

Governor Anderson was unavailable for comment on what the action implies.

The same question put to the chairman of the Concerned Taxpayers of Minnesota, Mrs. Joan Van Poperin, drew this: "The Declaration indicates take-over right now . . . we are in the position of citizens against World Government."

Mrs. Van Poperin sketched prior events of the week. Rep. John Bares, Jr. introduced a bill to repeal Minnesota's Regionalization Act of 1969, a radical piece of the world regionalization movement. The subcommittee hearings on March 23 were jammed with pro-repeal citizens, many of them farmers coming from all points of the state.

A Minnesota lawmaker said that he "believes in World Government." Asked why, by a constituent, the official reportedly replied that he "got new streets and new sidewalks through urban renewal."

The point is significant. It verifies as common knowledge among the Metrocrats that controversial urban renewal laws — attacked by loyal Americans on the premise that they are unconstitutional are indeed world "non-laws" coming into the United States through the UN Charter.

16. Americans for America, 628 Stryker Ave., St. Paul, Minn. 55107. Mrs. Joan van Poperin.

A pro-One World, pro-United Nations court of law in the United States has declared that the UN global treaty is the supreme law of the land preempting the United States Constitution!¹⁷

17. Fujii vs. State (California) 242 Pacific Reporter 2d Series 617.

World Citizenship

EX-U.S.A.

The 20th century is drawing to a close with Americans confronted by Declarations of World Citizenship drawn and signed by public officials in the United States without the consent and sometimes without the knowledge of the citizens.

The documents are signed by grown men and women violating their oaths of office as elected officials or their oaths of loyalty and allegiance as citizens of the United States of America.

After the appearance of the first world citizenship document in the United States in 1968, other declarations followed, each bolder than the last.

American citizens have nothing to gain from being world citizens. But they have much to lose.

The preceding chapters have demonstrated the death formula in action: $R + nL = x(\text{U.S.A.})$ *Regions plus non-Laws equal ex-U.S.A.*

1945 — The UN Charter conferred the international General Power Grant (GPG) upon Congress (Articles 55 and 56, UN Charter/treaty) and mandated concepts upon the United States as Charter obligations to be fulfilled;

1946 — The U.S. Congress, empowered with the international General Power Grant, transferred the law-making power to the executive sector of American Government via the Administrative Procedure Act (Title 5, U.S.C.).

Situation: UN's mandated *regionalism attacks American federalism* (states). The administrative regulations *power grant transfer* from Congress to the executive sector *violates the Constitutional separation of powers principle* (legislative, judicial, executive, balanced tri-partite division of political power).

1959 — The UN cell ACIR-1313 was planted within federal government to process and, through collaborators, to implement the international UN non-laws within the United States.

1966 — The UN's unprecedented social mandates were executed by enactment of the so-called Model Cities Act.

1968 — The UN's regionalism mandate was executed by PL 90-577, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act.

Situation: The UN system's Charter mandates, enacted by Congress goad the citizens who flee to the courts for redress. Looking to the UN Charter as the supreme law of the land,¹ world-minded judges ignore the U.S. Constitution as a whole, but pluck out one of its parts, the 14th Amendment, to force the States to comply and to implement the UN non-laws.

1970 — A ranking Metrocrat, Victor Jones, professor of political science at

1. Fujii vs. State, 217 Pacific Reporter 2d Series 481 (1950).

Berkeley (Calif.) had this to say: "We do have metropolitan government in the United States. The question is no longer whether we should have it or should not have it [but] . . . are we getting the kind . . . we want?"²

The peculiar operation of the ACIR-1313 cell serves to ready the UN's international mandate-concepts for congressional and state execution (enactment). The UN non-laws are not self-executing. They are manufactured into "laws" by legislative action in the nations which espouse the UN Charter.

The U.S. Congress is performing that service for the UN.

The Congress has enacted those strange new laws, empowering the federal government to take over strange duties in constitutionally-closed areas — housing, urban renewal, regional governance, social laws, socialistic planning laws, the no-prayer-in-school law, busing of pupils for racial percentages, etc.

Those are the execution/enactment of some of the mandates of the United Nations. When the UN Charter was ratified by the U.S. Senate, the UN concepts became commitments to be carried out in this nation under the UN Charter. Enactment/execution is not possible legally under the U.S. Constitution, but abused, the 14th Amendment forces the States to comply.

When citizens take their UN-inspired grievances to court, or when Metrocrats take a test case to court to see if the concept is firmly rooted in the U.S.A., the Metrocrat judges use the 14th Amendment to force the States to comply by enforcing within their borders the international non-laws remade into domestic laws. Those are the "class cases" moving through the courts and never heard of before the advent of the UN and its Charter.

With the exception of one case (Anita Valtierra, Housing Authority of the City of San Jose 1970) which upholds citizens' voting rights of referendum on public housing construction, the court decisions in the class cases are striking down constitutional state laws. The Metrocratic judges ignore the whole U.S. Constitution, but do not hesitate to mal-administer one of its parts (the 14th Amendment) to achieve their UN purposes.

AN ORIENTAL FIRST TO GET ONE-WORLD PRIVILEGE

One of the alien land ownership controversies, *Fujii vs. State of California*, 1950-52³ became a landmark victory for the one-worlders. The case recognized the treaty law of the UN and its Charter as the Supreme Law of the Land. Above the U.S. Constitution and those of the States.

The 14th Amendment was involved.

The case decision gave a Japanese inhabitant of California the right to own real estate even though he was not a U.S. citizen. He was given so-called "equal protection of the law" by the 14th Amendment.

One judge who dissented vigorously charged, "This case is remarkable and regrettable in judicial annals (because) a majority of the justices of this court join in an opinion which recognizes the law *as it is* (emphasis added) but refuses to follow it."⁴ The majority of the judges decided the *Fujii* case on

2. "Regional Planning Issues" Hearings Part I, p. 43 *loc. cit.*

3. *Fujii vs. State* (1950) *loc. cit.*

4. *Fujii vs. State* (1952) 242 Pacific Reporter 2d Series 617.

conjecture, anticipating the UN global supremacy and ignoring the existing domestic law.

The Fujii suit and cases like it bear out the tragic prophecy by U.S. Senator Patrick McCarran when he spoke against the United Nations and warned that judges would make their decisions⁵ relying on the UN Charter rather than on the U.S. Constitution.

The majority of the California judges on the Fujii case ignored the state law that prohibited land ownership by an alien; they felt that the *trend* of decisions issued by the U.S. Supreme Court (as it followed the UN Charter) would uphold their majority decision if the question reached the U.S. Supreme Court. As far as can be ascertained, the Fujii case did not reach the Supreme Court of the United States.

On an earlier occasion, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Holmes expressed anxiety about the ever increasing scope given to the 14th Amendment in cutting down the constitutional rights of the States. He said, "I cannot believe that the Amendment was intended to give us *carte blanche* to embody our economic or moral beliefs in its prohibitions."⁶

The 14th Amendment, misconstrued, has been tying the hands of state sovereignty. The Amendment orders the States to desist from *denying* the equal protection of the "national" laws which, in the troubles cited, are UN non-laws enacted by Congress.

The 14th Amendment has been abused by Metrocrat judges in the U.S. court system to validate the repugnant UN world non-laws that are reaching into our states, cities and homes.

In a move that could abolish local control of American school systems, the California Supreme Court ruled, reportedly, that the state's system of financing schools through local property taxes violates the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. As of October 1972, the U.S. Supreme Court had promised to review the decision.⁷

The 14th Amendment was invoked in the school busing case *Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education*; also in Syndicate 1313's legislative reapportionment cases (one-man-one-vote); and the Congress assertedly cited the 14th Amendment to justify the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, also the voting rights laws.⁸ Perhaps you know of others.

Repeal of the 14th Amendment has been voiced. The validity of its ratification has been questioned. However, not until exploited by the Metrocrats to further their one-world ambition, did the 14th Amendment emerge as a threat. It is the UN Charter which is turning the law into a one-world weapon against Americans and their States.

The 14th Amendment cases, called "class cases" so far, have involved so-called discriminatory actions as based on race, creed, color, nationality

5. *Congressional Record*, Jan. 28, 1954 p. 934. Also, GPG is identified therein.

6. *Fujii vs. State* (1952) *loc. cit.*

7. *The Daily Record*, Little Rock, Ark., May 27, 1972, and *American Counties Today* (NACo) June 16, 1972.

8. *American Challenge* Vol. XIV, No. 17, Sept. 1, 1972. Also views re: 14th Amendment are available from Merrit Newby, Editor, 1149-14th Place, S.W., Birmingham, Alabama 35211.

and citizenship. The scope may broaden to include public health, welfare, etc.

Oriental is subject to low immigration quotas (a federal matter) in the United States. Yet an alien oriental under the 14th Amendment's *order* issued to the States, generally speaking, enjoys the same property rights in the States as do citizens.

The Fujii case brief, however, calls attention to the contradictory fact that *federal* legislation does *not* secure to aliens any right to acquire real property. Yet the 14th Amendment is construed, discriminatorially, by *biased judges*, to *require state law to do that very thing!*

U.S. citizenship, not attainable by Orientals under some conditions, might be construed by one-worlders to be a bar to aliens' enjoyment of American rights and privileges, including aliens who are Communists.

The Fujii case introduced many arguments, some bound up in the immigration and naturalization laws over which the U.S. Congress has sole jurisdiction.

If an enemy alien or a political alien (Communist) desired entrance, residence, and property ownership in the United States, what situation would best accommodate his interests?

World Citizenship, of course.

A global condition of World Citizenship would destroy the status of *alienship*. There would be no aliens anywhere in the world. All *persons* would be world citizens. Observe the word "person" as used broadly in the 14th Amendment. In the United States, U.S. citizenship would confer upon Americans no particular advantage in property rights and so-called civil rights because World Citizenship would puncture national protective laws and level all "barriers" holding alien invaders at bay.

Just as our U.S. Constitution has been bypassed and ignored and superseded by the UN Charter mandates uttered by a Metrocratic judicature, so is our U.S. citizenship being superseded by World Citizenship which now, executed by the traitorous Declarations of World Citizenship, has progressed from concept to quasi-reality.

World Citizenship declarations by public bodies have deflected from American citizens their right to decide whether or not they want a *third* citizenship and its unlimited obligations.

You may have observed that the five-sectioned 14th Amendment sets up dual citizenship for Americans: a) U.S. citizenship, b) citizenship of the State wherein they reside:

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. — 14th Amendment, Section 1, U.S. Constitution.

Where public officials have signed declarations of World Citizenship des-

ignating American citizens as "citizens of the world," a third *de facto* citizenship is added to the other two.

A curious Metrocratic concept is involved: *homogeneity*. Metro attains its ends as silently as possible, without a clash. Metro encompasses, envelops, ingests its opposition by *adding* overriding Metro principles to its measurements and mixes while ignoring existing traditions, laws and time-tested standards (morés) of society.

Metro measures.

Using its bootlegged measurements, Metrocrats condemn that which they choose to destroy, claiming the target does not measure up. Example: "horse-and-buggy-charters," the name Metro applies to 10th Amendment type, reserved powers American constitutions and charters which Metro has marked for replacement by its power-hogging substitutes.

World Citizenship is another UN concept brought into the United States. Under the draft copy of the Beverly Hills (Calif.) World Citizenship Declaration, American citizens were required to dedicate allegiance to the UN, to pay a UN one percent (1%) annual income tax, make additional contributions to UN's galaxy of fiscal treasuries, to display the UN banner, to observe UN Day, to support a world citizenship committee in Beverly Hills. On October 3, 1972, Richard A. Stone, the mayor, signed a revised, watered-down version of the document.⁹

The City of Los Angeles adopted World City status and citizenship of the World for its "people," by Resolution May 22, 1972.

Other cities, betrayed by mayors and city councils, likewise are following suit.

Under World Citizenship what occurs? There would be no such thing as an "alien." Members of ethnic groups could enter and reside at will in the United States and enjoy all of its benefits as long as they lasted. Federal immigration and naturalization laws would become obsolete. Just as the California alien land law was ignored. Just as our U.S. Constitution is ignored.

A legal maxim holds that "when the reason for the rule ceases, the rule itself ceases." Is that dangerous maxim being chiseled into a grave marker for our Republic?

Under World Citizenship, land ownership in the United States would be open to all. What land? About half the acreage in many of the western States of the U.S.A. now belongs to the federal ("national") government. Public confiscation of private land, control and outright public ownership of private land under the urban renewal laws must have added millions of additional acres to the public holdings in the big cities of the east and midwest.

To provide *international worldwide construction firms* with building sites on American soil, it would be an easy matter under present conditions, to separate private owners from their land.

Private property goes into deeper foreclosure jeopardy every time our federal debt ceiling is raised to allow for more national debt to finance the UN's social, economic and cultural mandates at home and around the world.

9. Resolution No. 72-R-4724, Council of the City of Beverly Hills (Calif.) re: UN. See Appendix C for copy of the proposed sample draft.

Our gold is gone. Our dollar is devalued. The only thing we have left which has not been dispersed, dissipated or cheapened is our American soil — the real estate. And our nation's credit rating in the world market place is backed by the full faith and credit and the *assets* of the American people, of which land is one of the most valuable.

World Citizenship would make foreclosure upon the United States and its citizens utterly simple. The United States would be outvoted by the other member nations in the UN. Outvoting has happened on other occasions, notably UN's infamous pro-Communist China Vote of 10/25/71 which brought the Communist Chinese into the UN and expelled the anti-Communist Chinese.

Who owns that national-debt-paper which is drawing billions-of-dollars interest annually? Paid by the American tax payers.

What if our nation's creditors do foreclose? The risk and credit of the American nation consists of the holdings of millions of private citizens to be forfeited under foreclosure.

Here is how a notorious one-worlder envisioned the final invasion and takeover in the U.S.A., "The great hotels, apartments, city palaces, country homes, country clubs, etc., of the rich will be taken over and utilized by the workers for dwellings, rest homes, children's clubs, sanatoria, etc. The best of the skyscrapers, emptied of their thousand and one brands of parasites, will be used to house the new government institutions, the trade unions, cooperatives, Communist Party, etc. The fleets of automobiles and steam yachts of the rich will be placed at the disposition of the workers' organizations. . . ." (page 281 "United Soviet States of America," last chapter of *Toward Soviet America* by William Z. Foster, May 1, 1932, New York City.)

The only new note added is that the terrible Metrocrats are racing the old card-carrying Communists, like W.Z. Foster, in the hope of snatching the prize.

The Metrocratic mundialization process via world citizenship declarations can be made instantaneously over the 10-soviet U.S.A. by a Presidential Executive Order. World citizenship could be made worldwide by a UN Resolution. World citizenship would not deny Americans their U.S. citizenship; World citizenship would engulf and overpower their "national allegiance." See Beverly Hills draft declaration of world citizenship in the Appendix C.

After the Hennepin County-Minneapolis (Minn.) World Citizenship was proclaimed, I made a guess editorially in my booklet, "Metro Governance and What's Behind It" (1970) asking, "Does the Declaration mean that Minnesotans will be the first to pay the World Tax?"

That went close to the truth. The Beverly Hills (Calif.) draft document in 1972 called upon the government of the United States to "conform substantially with all measures duly adopted by organs of the United Nations, particularly the recommendation that at least 1% of all income be contributed yearly to the UN."

What will universal World Citizenship mean to the *races of the world*, especially if they own our debt-paper and can foreclose?

Members of those races won't need to learn to speak English nor to reside in the United States as is presently required before U.S. citizenship can be

attained by naturalization. Conceivably every inch of land in the United States could be owned by world citizens in other parts of the planet Earth. Absentee ownership on a world scale.

Ignored immigration and quota laws couldn't keep out other world citizens arriving to take up residence in *urban America*. Have you not heard that phrase repeatedly, of late? Urban America! The global masterplanners seemingly have decided to concentrate all "culture and art" in America. The growing of vegetables and raising of livestock probably have been assigned to the "underdeveloped countries" of the imminent world dictatorship. One reason why small family-owned farms are being wiped out these days, here in the United States.

Soviet Communists bought 45 acres, including two large mansions, for a Russian retreat near Centreville, Queen Annes county, Maryland, according to Christian Beacon 8/24/72. Quoted as to source was syndicated columnist Tom Tiede's column, "Part of . . . U.S.A. Is Now Russia." The land purchase was verified as a true fact by Mr. Bartow Van Ness of Centreville, Md., during a long distance call placed to him by the author on October 21, 1972.

It's all too fantastic, you shrug.

No more fantastic than American citizens signing world citizenship declarations. *Which is proved fact.*

Most Americans humbly go about their daily work, meet personal problems and do the best that they can as citizens. This aggregate energy has, and still can keep the United States of America the shining hope of the world.

We have no choice but to resist evil Metro. Americans can take a stand at local, state, federal or international levels.

The following pertains to the federal level:

Metro governance, being a violation of the Constitutional separation of powers, the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, Committee on the Judiciary, was requested 9/12/72 to review the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 as amended (PL 90-577). No action reported as yet.

Reevaluation of that UN non-law's *Section 403* could open up review of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 as amended and recodified (Title 5 U.S.C.)

Section 603 of the law could open up a review of ACIR (PL 86-380 and PL 89-733) and would lead to the much-needed airing of the entire Syndicate 1313, promoter of world governance. See the updated (1972) version of the MetroChart at the front of this book. The UN cell ACIR and its Metro masters have been exposed where they sit — inside 1313; and 1313 sits inside government — local, state, federal, international.

The Model Cities law (PL 89-754) needs similar prophylaxis.

Further, a way must be found for the Congress to remove the UN treaty's intolerable burden upon the lives and future of the American people.

Congress has that power.

According to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, District Judge Aubrey Robinson, Jr. speaking —

*Congress has the Constitutional authority to abrogate in whole or in part, the treaty obligations of the United States.*¹⁰

10. Congressional Record 7/27/72, p. S11972.