

“Before entering on so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its memories, its benefits, its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain WHY we do it? Will you hazard SO DESPERATE A STEP, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly TO are greater than the ills you fly FROM? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?”

.....A. Lincoln¹

So Desperate a Step

Maureen Heaton

Regional government is also termed Regional Authority, and was formerly known as Metropolitan Government, or Metro.

It could be called Technocracy.

It could be called autocracy, and that, too, would be fitting.

It could be called dictatorship, and that would not be far wrong.

It cannot be called democratic.

It certainly cannot be called republican.

Call it what you will, just so you understand it, for you must understand what it is or you will have it, and soon. Once you have it, you will understand, but if you find out then that it is not what you want, it will be too late.

Technocracy is government by an elite. Metro is government by experts. These are one and the same.

Autocracy is a form of government where the same officials make the laws and administer and enforce them. Metro is this, too. Our American system was built on a balance of powers, with separate departments for administrative, legislative and legal matters, so arranged as to be checks, each on the other.

Dictatorship exists where official edicts cannot be reversed by the citizens. Metro is this, too.

In a democracy, the people exercise their sovereignty directly, through town-hall type activity. In a republic, through representatives. In a democratic republic, both these procedures are used. None of these is possible under regional government, for the officials are appointed, and are not answerable to the people, because they do not represent them. They cannot be reached through election or recall. Those who set up such a government can be removed by the people who elected them, but not the thing they created.²

These are facts. This being so, who would knowingly accept this change in our form of government? What elected official would consent to such a usurpation? Certainly there cannot be many such, but a bill was passed in the California legislature in 1967 which did just that, and it was signed into law by the governor. HOW? The answer to that seems to be that those few in this country who wish to make a revolution, by peaceful means if possible, by force and violence if necessary, have used every deceit to put over this strange concept. They have succeeded in this case by misdirection, by coercion, and by outright lies.

It is impossible, when as many as five or six thousand bills are put in the hopper, for those in office to read all of them, much less know all the ramifications relating to them. They must rely on others to tell them what the bills do. Unfortunately those who would point out the dangers of this program have been labeled ‘aginnners’ and as a result often find it difficult to get their message through. It should be recognized that to be FOR our historic system of government, one must, of necessity be AGAINST encroachments on it, and attempts to undermine it. Those who promote such programs are the REAL ‘aginnners’ for they are opposed to government as we have known it, and against LEGAL methods of changing it as well. They know that open debate could result in defeat for their revolution.

Part of the problem as surely lies in the situation which has developed whereby political discussions have become ‘controversial’. Businessmen are afraid to take part in political activity, lest it ‘hurt business’. Friends won’t discuss the issues, lest friendship be lost in heated argument. Even the political parties silence debate, in the name of ‘unity’. Citizen participation is the lifeblood of representative government. With widespread, general political discussion, and involvement, it would have been impossible for this program to have made such inroads that it now threatens to remove the necessity for citizens to concern themselves with government. With general economic planning, most of us will only be required to do what we are told, and to pay the bills. If we don’t like it, we can tell it to the ombudsman!

In a republic, it is not enough just to vote. A good citizen must know what the issues are, and make a decision as to whether or not they are desirable. He must also hold those he elects responsible for their actions. Our elected officials are now involved in a desperate game, with the stakes higher than any of us can afford. Winner takes all, and the pot is our historic form of government. Now, even a rigid Constitutionalist can see that from time to time changes may be necessary in our basic law. That is not at issue. The vital point is whether those changes are made by Constitutional means, through the sovereign will of the people, or whether they will be made illegally, through usurpation, without the consent of the electorate.

In 1968, revisions of the state Constitution were presented to the California Legislature, before being placed on the ballot for approval.³ If the revision had been submitted to the electorate, as written by the Revisions Commission, the people of this state would have had the opportunity to vote away their heritage. But how many would have known that? Apparently, even some in the Legislature did not. In the Assembly hearings, two members of the committee shocked by the overt attempt to allow local governing bodies to contract with other government bodies for “transfer of powers and performance of functions”, submitted a resolution to delete the most obvious attacks on representative government, 8a and 8c of Art XI.⁴ Less obvious than these two sections is the philosophy which runs through the background study, which did not have general distribution, and therefore would not be known by the public. This philosophy negates the fundamental concept of the sovereignty of the people. Constantly, the background study refers to the “inherent power” of the legislature, ignoring the principle of ‘the consent of the governed’, which was set forth in the Declaration of our Independence, and which breathed life into the United States Constitution. There is an increasing attempt to remove responsibility from elected bodies through the device of ‘transferring powers and functions’. Of such a provision in the Maryland proposed revisions, the Advisory Commission on Inter-governmental Affairs said this section “permits experimentation with additional forms of regional government”.⁵

There is little general knowledge of either the meaning and purpose of, or the activity which prepares an area for, regional government. Had it been otherwise, it never could have reached its present proportions. The average person finds it difficult to believe that there are those who call themselves American who would be willing to turn their backs on their birthright, and voluntarily give up the boon of self-government. It is even more difficult to believe that there are those among us who would be willing, OR ABLE, to steal the birthright of the rest of us, and that in order to do this, they would lie, cheat and betray the public trust. It is equally difficult, however, to accept that so much could have been done already in promoting this movement, unless it had been planned that way. So this is being written in the hope of initiating public discussion, so the people may know what the future holds, if this movement follows its proposed course.

Here, then, are some of the background and history of the regional movement, economic development, and the revisions of state constitutions. This is by no means comprehensive. Whole books have been written, pro and con. But a sincere effort has been made to convey the INTENT of the sources, even though it is necessary, of course, to 'take it out of context'. How could it be otherwise, unless we reprinted the whole of all the books, which would make this a tome larger than the Encyclopedia Britannica? And then who would read it? Weigh the following against what you see happening around you. If in doubt, check the sources cited. But above all, know this movement for what it is, before you succumb to the surface appeal. Resistance is far easier than attempts to reverse an existing program, though that must be done, too, where a foothold has been achieved.

One of the amazing things about the advance of regional planning, is that the basic reason for it has been completely ignored. The Planners have made no secret of the fact that this is ECONOMIC PLANNING. Those words are used openly to promote any part of the program, yet the implication in the phrase is completely overlooked. Talk of beauty, preservation, conservation, simplification, which covers the true intent and purpose are the smokescreen, by which private citizen and public official alike are blinded. Those who attempt to point out that we have arrived where we are through the efforts of a comparative few, and over an extraordinarily long period of time, are accused of having 'a conspiratorial view of history'. Let the chips fall where they may, the facts are the facts and we ignore at our peril the fact that there are, and have been, those both in government and out, who will leave no stone unturned to implement this revolution. The theory behind it is as old as history.

Always there have been those who dreamed of Utopia, and from time to time men have tried to form 'ideal' societies. It is easy to point out inequities which exist in any given society, and to view with alarm man's cruelty to man. It is even easier to envisage a dream world, where these things do not exist, and where everyone lives happily ever after. But to compare the two—the untried dream and the sordid reality—is not only unfair, it is deceitful, for comparison implies that the dream will work, where reality fails. To be honest, the comparison must be between what exists presently, and the times the dream has been tried before. Whenever this particular dream has been tried, it has failed—miserably. Whenever economic planning has been attempted, it has brought suffering, discouragement, unhappiness, and HAS FAILED TO ACHIEVE ITS STATED GOALS. Russia, after the Soviet takeover, Italy in the 20s, Germany in the 30s, England in the 40s and 50s; each have had this experiment, to their sorrow. Now the

unmistakable signs of impending trouble are again visible here, even as they were in Massachusetts colony, when the Pilgrims learned the futility of this method.

Always, since time began, there have been those who felt they were more competent than 'average' people, and that therefore they should 'run things', and it will probably always be so, as long as man exists. Only in America has this desire been directed into constructive channels, and only here have the benefits which can accrue from it been realized. For when such people go into public service, they NEED the checkrein of being answerable to their fellow citizens which has been provided only in America, under the 'chains' of the Constitution. Under other systems, unchecked except by their own desires, their programs have brought pleasure, wealth and power to the few, at the expense of the many. Only in America has the power remained in the hands of the general populace, though the work of the government has been done for the most part by those who like to 'run things'. This has been possible because our officials could, and would, and in some cases, have been replaced if they 'got too big for their britches'. This was the only government so constructed, and thus the most progressive, for it gave opportunity for wealth and pleasure and freedom for all, not just the privileged few. But the privileged few have not liked this arrangement. THEY dream of a world where they will have control over the rest of us, and unlimited wealth and power to enjoy. So, over the years, they have striven ceaselessly to destroy the one system in the world, which held hope unlimited for all people, everywhere, and which, by example, showed the bankruptcy of all other forms of government. Over the years, they have used the trust the people gave them to institute changes in that system, which had worked so well. Unconstitutional changes. Illegal changes. Unnoticeable changes, at first, which were like too much sand in a concrete mixture, causing a tendency to crumble under pressure. To show how this came about, let us call for our first witness an eminent historian of the early part of this century, H.G Wells. Wells was a Fabian, and a prolific writer. In 1908, he wrote a book titled 'New Worlds for Old', in which he told what the program was, and exposed the machinery by which it was to be developed:

“It was left chiefly to the little group of English people who founded the Fabian Society to supply a third system of ideas to the amplifying conception of Socialism, to convert Revolutionary Socialism to Administrative Socialism...From saying that unorganized people cannot achieve Socialism, they passed to the implication that organization alone, without popular support, might achieve Socialism.

....Socialism ceased to be an open revolution, and BECAME A PLOT. Functions were to be shifted, quietly, unostentatiously, from the representative to the official he appointed....they worked like a ferment in municipal politics...The reconstruction of our legislative and local government machinery is a necessary preliminary to Socialization in many directions...Scientific reconstruction of our methods of government constitutes a necessary part of the Socialist scheme...It supplies us with a conception of the methods of transition, and with a vision of a great and disciplined organization of officials, a scientific bureaucracy, appointed by representative bodies of diminishing activity and importance and coming at

last to be the real working control of the Socialist state...the replacement of individual action by public organization..."⁶

As Wells so boldly stated, functions HAVE been shifted, gradually, without fanfare, from elected officials to their *appointees*. The people have grown accustomed to 'city managers', 'County administrators', 'county counsels', and *appointed* administrators of special districts, without stopping to think what they do, or who formerly executed these functions, or why it was that way, and now is this way. The city manager now fulfills the duties formerly the responsibility of the elected representatives of the people, who now only act on the recommendation of their *appointed* successor. So, too, with the county administrator, who has become the *appointed* supervisor of the elected supervisors. The *appointed* county counsel has usurped the position once held by the elected district attorney, who is now reduced to little more than a prosecutor. This is also true in the schools, where *appointed* superintendents have been permitted to whittle away the functions of the elected boards. 'Experts' *appointed* by the *appointed* superintendent really make the decisions, which are then 'rubber stamped' by the "representatives of the people". All of these have come piecemeal, and have conditioned us to accept the concept of government by *appointed* officials, so that many who once would have resisted bitterly now seem indifferent to it all.

Regional Government is always sold under the guise of civic improvement. The people are told that existing government is not flexible enough to handle the growing urban problems. That rapid transit must be handled on a regional basis; that refuse, fires, and public health; natural resources, air pollution, and transportation; minority problems, federal-city relations, and public works—all demand a regional approach. That "proliferating government" makes it necessary...that there are so many overlapping areas of government which could be simplified under Metro. This last is true...government WOULD be simplified. Compared to a totalitarian state, our system is quite complicated. But do we want to pay that price for simplicity? It is deeply disturbing to find an 'expert' called by the California Constitution Revision Commission to do the background study for the section on local government state:

"Perhaps the most obvious omission from the present constitution...is the lack of clear authority...for the Legislature to ABOLISH EXISTING PUBLIC ENTITIES, OR REPLACE THEM WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTAL FORMS....."⁷

The man who said this is a professor of law at UCLA, and he was talking about local elected government. He also urged relaxation of present constitutional provisions because ingenious techniques have been devised to bypass them!⁷ He categorically stated that "voter apathy, inadequate understanding, or well organized opposition by a relatively small minority of the local citizenry" presently are responsible for the defeat of "desirable programs."⁷ He apparently finds it inconceivable that what he considers desirable may not seem so to the rest of us, and the limiting provisions were placed in the Constitution for a purpose, and if that purpose is being defeated by "ingenious" means, enforcement of the law should be the answer not emasculation.

Regional government as we know it today was an outgrowth of the Socialist plan described by H.G. Wells. The shadow of the coming events thus was visible early in this century. The first major breakthrough, however, came in the early 1930s, when

“A plague of young lawyers settled on Washington...these prattlers were for the most part employees of the government, and had taken the oath of allegiance. But they took the position that their high purposes gave them a super-morality that could not be confused with the morality the nation HAD been using. They were quite above such old-fogy Tory, reactionary stuff as oaths of office or other religious antiquities. They owed allegiance – not to the United States – patriotism was for the non-thinking...THEY had an allegiance to a higher cause. The end justified the means.....”⁸

So said George N. Peek, first administrator of the Agricultural Administration, who soon realized that strange things were going on in his department. His own allegiance to this country caused him to resist this group, and he was relieved of his duties. Even then, the strength of the clique he described was that strong, that they could remove from high office a man who posed a threat to their plans.

One of the ‘braintrusters’ who swarmed into Washington at that time, was a professor from Columbia University, named Rexford Guy Tugwell, who became Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. He also wrote books, and made speeches. He is on record as having stated:

“We have a century and more of development to undo. It is, in other words, a logical impossibility to have a planned economy, and to have business operating its industries, just as it is also impossible to have one with our present Constitutional and statutory structure. Modifications in both, so serious as to mean destruction and rebeginning are required.”⁹

He publicly expressed the theory that a planned economy required three great changes; first, a breaking down of the existing statutes and constitutions of government; second, destroying private business; and third, destroying the sovereignty of the states. He was quoted as having categorically remarked:

“All three of these wholesale changes are required by even a limited acceptance of the planning idea.”⁹

Tugwell’s statements are basic to a full understanding of the subject here being considered, for actual experience of the planning operation verifies the premises he set forth. Today, this man, Rexford Guy Tugwell is with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, writing a draft of a new Constitution for America!

One of the amazing things about the advance of the socio-economic revolution is the fact that, although this information is not secret, in the usual sense, still the record that these things took place is ignored, or forgotten. Today, all three of Tugwell’s postulates are well on the way to accomplishment; the first, through such steps as the current pressure to rewrite constitutions; the

second, through the War on Poverty, (which was stated during the debates in Congress to be in truth a War on Private Enterprise); and the third, through the establishing of regional governments which cross state lines, such as that at Tahoe. (California)

Regional government was receiving promotion from another source at about this same time.

In 1934, a Congressional investigation was held to examine the charges made by Dr. William Wirt, a successful, progressive educator, superintendent of schools in Gary, Indiana. Dr. Wirt had been in Washington the previous fall, and had been invited to the home of a government official on a Sunday afternoon in September. Present, beside the host, were four other government officials and a seventh person. One of the officials was head of the Bureau of Economics in the Agriculture Dept; another, and educational expert in the Dept. of the Interior; a third was editor-in-chief of the publication of the Agriculture Adjustment Administration; the fourth was in a key position in the National Recovery Administration; and the fifth was a key official in the Public Works Administration. Dr. Wirt was the sixth, and the seventh, from the Committee report, was “one of the foremost propaganda agents of the Soviet Government in America”. From this strange association of people, Dr. Wirt heard an astounding set of proposals. Apparently the group took him for one of their own, for they were not at all reticent.

Dr. Wirt testified that these people felt the United States system of political, social and economic organization was no longer adequate to ensure the well being of the people. In its stead must be erected a planned economy, wherein the everyday activities of the people would be regimented and controlled by the government, functioning through bureaus such as some of them headed. They thought, said Dr. Wirt, that remuneration for work, and investment in property should be under government control, **EVEN IF THE TITLE TO THE PROPERTY** remained in private hands. Dr. Wirt charged that these persons were using their positions in the administration to further their ideas. He stated that they planned **IT SHOULD BE BELIEVED** generally that the measures they took were temporary, to facilitate recovery from the depression, but, in fact, it would further the regimented economy plan.¹⁰

All six of the people named by Dr. Wirt denied under oath that they had discussed these matters. The majority of the Committee of five members of the House of Representatives upheld the accused, but the minority reported that not only did they find Dr. Wirt accurate in those matters which could be checked, but that the majority members had **PARTICIPATED** in what “apparently was a determined effort to discredit Dr. Wirt, and to suppress the truth.” Later, one of the majority members publicly admitted his part in the impeachment of Dr. Wirt:

“On the sixth anniversary of the ‘purging’ of Dr. William Wirt, before a Congressional Committee, of which I was an active member, I desire to relieve my conscience of a matter which has long burdened it...Dr. Wirt (had) asserted that there was a deliberately conceived plan among the New Deal leftists to overthrow the established order, and substitute a planned economy in our country.....Some of his informants had boasted that President Roosevelt would be the ‘Kerensky’ of the coming revolution...While he named names, and quoted his informants, I took a leading part as ‘prosecutor and inquisitor’....The pack got the smell of blood

and tracked down the prey! A great job was done!.....Little did we know that most of the happenings which Dr. Wirt said the plotters had predicted would come to pass...Many times privately I have apologized for my part in turning the thumbscrews, and I take this occasion to do it publicly. May Dr. Wirt's honest patriotic soul rest in peace. His was the 'voice of one crying in the wilderness'." ¹¹

These remarks are of extreme importance, not just because they document the plan, and admit the planners, but because they show that here was another case of lack of understanding, which permitted participation in the plot. He didn't know that there was any real danger, although he was aware that his part was wrong. What a tragedy for America, as well as for Dr. Wirt, that John J. O'Connor did not see fit to admit these facts about this criminal conspiracy sooner. For his vote would have made the minority the majority, and Dr. Wirt would not have died a broken man, discredited, disgraced, for having tried to warn of the enemy within the citadel of freedom. And the covert, collectivist plan which could have been easily checked then, would not have spread its shadow over the length and breadth of America, as well as over every country in the world.

Regional government has many facets. Beside the political, social and economic implications, which are overt, it is revolution WITHIN THE FORM of government as we have known it. Beyond this, it is not provincial, but is intended to embrace the world. What else could Lyndon Johnson have meant, when he went before the United Nations less than a month after he took the oath of office as President, and told that body:

“When I entered the Congress of the United States 27 years ago, it was my very great privilege to work closely with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt...As a member of Congress, I worked with him to bring about a profound but peaceful revolution.....Now, on the world scale, the time has come, as it came to America, thirty years ago.....” ¹²

So now let us look at some of the high spots of this revolution, keeping in mind that these are really only policy pronouncements, and the covert machinery building, consolidation of forces, and indoctrination, were continuous throughout the years, using these matters as guidelines and reinforcement, for both legislative action and administrative cooperation, as well as for propaganda direction.

In 1935, Roosevelt set up a National Resources Committee, as a successor to the defunct National Planning Board of the Federal Emergency Administration. The Committee immediately set itself the task of deciding on the role our cities would play in the national economic scene. In 1937, they issued a comprehensive report that set the guidelines for the program Dr. Wirt had exposed.¹³ Among other recommendations, the Committee urged the federal government to lead the way in setting a minimum standard of living for the inhabitants of the cities, “consistent with the expanding American standard of living”; it called for regional police; for abolition of slums by rigid zoning and building codes and amending state constitutions to do this; public housing; federal handouts conditioned on comprehensive planning; redistribution of industrial centers; establishment of a national transportation system

for a “socially more desirable distribution” of wealth of this country; they urged Congress to “continue and extend encouragement and support to State, regional and local planning agencies”; they called for blanket consent by the Congress to interstate compacts, to deal with “health, sanitation, industrial waste regulation, control of public utilities, planning, *public safety* and welfare, education, and other governmental functions of regional scope”; they urged increased use of “State and National Associations of municipalities and of municipal officials”, and they specifically recommended the Public Administration Clearing House, and a host of other socialistic programs.¹⁴

This early blueprint for the destruction of the American system of government and economics was bolder than the current crop of bills, reports and amendments. *It made no bones about the fact that its purpose was to redistribute the wealth and to gain control of the lives and fortunes of the people of these United States, and that constitutional and statutory considerations were not to impede the plan.* Although some of today’s efforts are hidden behind noble sounding phrases such as ‘preserving the beauty of a lake’, and ‘homerule’ and ‘simplifying proliferating government’, this is still the motivating force, as is evidenced by a resolution under consideration in Congress in 1969, calling for a Commission for Balanced Economic Development.¹⁵

In 1941, the international aspects of this revolution were first publicly announced, but in such a way that only the initiate would understand. A ‘secret’ meeting, somewhere in the Atlantic, between the then ‘heads of state’ of Great Britain and the United States resulted in the proclamation of something called the Atlantic Charter.¹⁶ With much fanfare, it was stated that this was an agreement which united the two governments in determination to win the war, and to uphold certain ‘common principles’ of the two nations. This, despite the fact that the President had no authority to commit this nation to even the latter part of the agreement, and the surmounting fact that this nation was not then a participant in that war. The ‘Charter’ did much more than was generally understood, however, it bound the United States with Great Britain to ‘provide access, on equal terms, for all states, large and small...to the raw material of the world needed for *their economic prosperity.*’ (The planners have long ago stopped recognizing nations as such. For many years, their writings have referred to nations as ‘states’, thus paving the way for that international supergovernment.) The ‘Charter’ also promised improved labor standards, economic adjustment, and social security *for all the world.* *These could not be accomplished without control of the economic machinery. And regional government provides that machinery.*

1942, and the Federal Council of Churches gets into the act. At a meeting attended by some 30-odd Protestant denominations, the delegates called for a “duly constituted world government of delegated powers, an international legislative body, an international court...international administrative bodies...international police forces, and provision for enforcing its *economic authority.*” Speakers at the church conclave in Cleveland, Ohio, declared that “the natural wealth of the world is not evenly distributed,” and called for “A NEW ORDER OF ECONOMIC LIFE.” The delegates were told that “collectivism is coming, whether we like it or not”. The conference asserted that many duties then being performed by local and national governments would, in the future, have to be carried out by international authority.¹⁷ There is no record showing protest from any of the churchmen there assembled, NOR any evidence that the 40 million or so souls supposedly represented there had any part in formulating this policy, NOR in joining together later to implement it.

In 1943, a book was published by the 20th Century Fund, titled “The Postwar Plans of the United Nations”. Ostensibly compiled by one Lewis Lorwin, it purports to be proposals of the 32 nations who formed the United Nations in 1942.¹⁸ The picture it presents is of all these nations, individually, preparing for a planned economy, such as we now see developing through regional governments. Many of the ‘plans’ were submitted by private groups. In view of the fact that the first overt thrust in this country came from the Department of Agriculture, it is, perhaps, not surprising that Lorwin gave priority to the planning work of that department in the presentation for the United States. (Is it coincidence that the first and most penetrating Communist cell in this government was also in that department?)¹⁹ Or that the continuing work of that department emphasizes administrative controls?

It was during the war years, too, that the UAW-CIO issued a call for postwar planning,²⁰ which included all the features of these other programs...the “overall planned mobilization of our forces of production”...including a demand that Congress should again fund the National Resources Planning Board, which had succeeded the National Resources Committee under the Roosevelt Reorganization Plan No. 1, in 1939. Under its planning mandate, the Board had submitted to Congress an overall plan to redirect the whole economic and social system of America. Outraged by the audacity of the Board, the Congress, still the stalwart representatives of the will of the people, had abolished the Board.²¹ Yet, today, most of that program is now the law of the land, through Congressional action. In the middle forties, however, with American forces dying overseas to preserve freedom in the world, such a proposal was unthinkable to most Americans; although the UAW had Metropolitan Regional Planning at the top of their list for postwar priority—or at least the leaders of the union did...for again, it is a moot point how many members knew what was being done in their name.

Regional government is a far cry from the republican form of government guaranteed by our Constitution, and, as Tugwell acknowledged, the only solid bulwark in the path of the ‘new social order’ was the structure of our American system. This was protected by a solid wall of public opinion which resisted early attempts to undermine it. Yet, today, that system is eroded, and pockmarked with gaping holes, which are being repaired with collectivist methods, which gradually, steadily are changing the FORM of the structure. This could not have been accomplished, without penetrating that wall of resistance, in order to obtain the help of good people who would never knowingly contribute to such a plan. So it was necessary to get their help by other means.

Education, or more properly, MIS-education has been the largest single factor in changing the mainstream of American political, economic and social life. In addition to changing the textbooks, a positive program for redirecting the thought in the educational process was instituted. Columbia University has long been the fountainhead of education in this country, for it is at Columbia that the teachers are trained who teach the teachers who teach our children. And it was at Columbia that the tide was turned for education in America, and as education goes, so goes the nation. The dominant figure in American education in this century has been the Socialist, John Dewey, who joined the staff of Columbia in 1904 as a professor of philosophy, and there can be no question of his influence on educational thinking. Students of his have risen to high places in every branch of education. As a result, the Dewey philosophy has permeated not only the academic world, but educational associations, and through the influence of the

National Education Association and its affiliates, almost every phase of American life has felt the impact.

In 1932, the NEA set up an ex-officio organization known as the Educational Policies Commission, which turned its hand to changing the goals for American education. During the 30s, it printed numbers of position papers, on the function of education, and in 1944 prepared a volume of extreme importance, titled 'Education for ALL American Youth'. (Their emphasis). The Commission assumed full responsibility for this document, while giving credit to the individuals who participated in its creation. The acknowledgement states that it went through many 'careful' revisions, so it must be assumed that it says what it was meant to say. The widest possible distribution was obtained for it, and it went through three editions, as well as being printed in abbreviated form. Told in fictional form, and as though it were fait accompli, it tells how the Planners solved all the problems, not just of youth, but of two imaginary communities, a village and a city, through INVOLVING THE CITIZENS in cooperating for the goals of the Planners. Here is the outline for Headstart, for unification, for HEW, for teacher participation in curriculum decisions, for 'federal funds without federal control', for youth services in the schools through the 'poverty' program, for removal of local control without seeming to do so, for replacing elected state officers with appointees of appointed boards, and all the other programs which seem to have 'just growed' like Topsy. Presenting the usual either-or concept of one highly undesirable development, versus one less obnoxious, this volume is the blueprint for the participation of education in promoting the Planned Society, though pains were taken to deny this several times in the text. The proof lies in the fact that, through the years, the program here laid out has been implemented. As the book says,

“...Our planning reaches down into the neighborhoods, and out into the surrounding region. You will find many neighborhood planning groups...We are trying to have one for each elementary school...if this seems far removed from education, wait until you get into the schools. There you will find that community planning occupies a foremost place in the program of citizenship education.....”²²

And so it has been. No wonder it is difficult to get people to understand that there once was another—a better way! So it was established that education had a definite function in the implementation of the Socialist plan. It then comes as no surprise that the recent Secretary of HEW, John Gardner, on resigning that post stated:

“When I return to the Carnegie Foundation...I will be directly involved in the problems of the cities...in a position to help solve urban problems...the reasons for my departure are not to be found in any issues or incidents, but are simply a judgment on where I can be most useful in the future...”²³

Can it be doubted that more than half a century of using the educational process to prepare the American citizen for the *New Social Order* is now bearing bitter fruit? It may seem that with all the tentacles here described, there is a general movement toward this concept. But notice, in all these instances, there are only a few AT THE TOP who are making this revolution...in NO case

has there been a groundswell of support. Quite the opposite. Wherever the wheels are put in motion, the people resist.

Regional government received its greatest thrust, internationally, with the formal ceremonies of the United Nations in San Francisco, in 1945, and the signing of the Treaty by the United States Senate. The evidence suggests that those who would argue that the UN is responsible for regional government have the cart before the horse. It is more likely that the socialist plan required the United Nations, or similar body, to finalize it.

In 1951, the Association for World Peace set up a committee to prepare a report on the 'problem' of world development. Two years later, the chairman of that committee used the material they had compiled to write a book, 'The War on World Poverty'. In his book, he promoted a World Development Authority, whose functions would include decisions for, and administration of, grants-in-aid for countries all over the world; preparation and coordination of plans for economic development; improvement of public works, and other similar activities. All these are part of regional government. They were also part of Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. They are also dependent on economic control. When President Johnson told the old folks that his administration was going to "take all the money which we think is being unnecessarily spent, and take it from the 'haves' and give it to the 'have nots' who need it so much", he was talking about economic control, and that is what the War on Poverty really is. The author of the book, 'The War on World Poverty' was Harold Wilson, then a Member of Parliament, now Her Majesty's Prime Minister. In it, Wilson made clear that he expected the United States to fund the greater part of that War, just as we are doing, in fact.²⁴

During the 50s, the public thrust for federal economic control was relatively quiescent, but though not so obvious, indeed, almost unnoticed, the ground which had been gained in the war on our economic system was consolidated and secured. There was no instance of policy being reversed. Actually, it was during those years that major efforts were put forth in local areas, thus laying the groundwork for eventual total effort. It was during those years that the first beachhead for regional government was established in Florida, and Miami thus had the dubious honor of being the first community in America to lose its identity under the regional umbrella. It was at Miami that the involvement of the group which calls itself 1313 first became evident.

It was during the 50s also, that the California Commission on Inter-state Cooperation began quietly moving toward an interstate compact for the Tahoe basin.²⁵ State machinery was being set up to convert our constitutional government into the bureaucratic autocracy which is now being implemented through the legislative process. Agencies were brought into being to help expedite the change.

Then, in 1961, the first bill in California to provide a legal façade for Metro, was introduced in the Assembly on the 11th of January. AB 267 was titled Metropolitan Area Multipurpose Districts, and its one virtue was that it provided for an election to authorize the creation of such districts, with the decision left to the people.²⁵ In hearings leading up to this bill, it became evident that there was a powerful, organized, concerted effort to "destroy traditional County government." Sheridan Hegland, a member of the legislature at that time said:

“We were told that County government was old-fashioned, hopelessly inefficient....They wanted the Committee to recommend changing the rules so that nearly all county officers would be appointed. It was obvious that this will be one of the major issues of the 1961 legislature.”²⁶

Even in 1961, this was so radical a departure, that it shocked members of the state government, and AB 267 was defeated.²⁷

Then, in 1963, the Dept. of Agriculture, still as in 1933 and in 1940, the dependable arm of economic planning, presented the administration with the blueprint for finalizing the Plan. The annual report of the Department, titled ‘A Place to Live’, detailed full battle plans, including the propaganda which was needed to blind those who were needed to serve as quislings in the coming betrayal of the American system.

Under the previous administration here in California, an ‘Intergovernmental Council on Urban Growth’ was set up, and given the responsibility of ‘resolving the problems’ of the cities. Their solution....? Regional government. Under the banner of another party, the present administration allows the Council to continue to function. The names of the participants have been changed, but it continues to recommend the same solution.²⁸

And the pace of ‘progress’ continues ever more rapid. In 1965, the Congress passed the Administration’s Public Works and Economic Development Act, which is the enabling legislation for the Federal implementation of ‘A Place to Live’. During the Christmas holidays, 1967, the President issued an executive order, setting up the Secretary of Commerce as the federal regional czar, which was required under PWEDA. The Demonstration Cities Act, the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, (which sets up the regional police called for in 1937) one after another, treading on each others heels, so fast they follow—all requiring regional bodies to approve requests for grants.

Interstate compacts by the dozen; constitutional revisions being promoted in over half the states—while some states have already succumbed to the pressure. Now, in 1969, more bills, all requiring the regional concept...HR 2519, the State and Local Government Modernization Act of 1969, which requires every state to adopt a progressive income tax; promotes interstate compacts; authorized the ‘transfer of functions’ which was rejected in the California revisions by the legislature; and requires a regional coordinating committee—in the case of the far west, there are to be 13 states in the region. And, of course, the Commission for Balanced Economic Development.

Truly, the future is here. There has been no mandate from the people to redirect the historic path laid out by ‘the greatest document ever struck off by the hand of man.’ But this is what is happening.

Regional government DOES deny a representative form of government.

It IS economic control, whatever specious reason may be given to gain the goal.

The reasons put forth to promote it MUST be false, unless they state that the intent is as the record shows it to be....A NEW POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ORDER FOR AMERICA.

There is no question but that this situation CAN be reversed, though the time is indeed short. With full understanding of our LEGAL government, the Constitution, and the laws made pursuant to it, and equal understanding of the Plan and how it is being implemented, the citizens who do care can stop this usurpation. It will take extreme dedication...as extreme as that shown by those who would “destroy our national fabric”. It will take constant vigilance. But eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It will take courage...but this IS the home of the brave, isn't it?

Now what can one person do? Well, the sky's the limit. One person did this research. One person financed it. One person can study it. One person can tell another. One person can go to their elected representatives, and see that they understand. Those elected officials took an oath when they accepted public office:

“I...do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution...against ALL enemies, foreign AND domestic.....”²⁹

Individuals can oppose any further acceptance at the local level of ‘federal’ funds for innovative programs. They can offer strength to their local governments in resisting the pressures for this program. Individuals can wire or write to congressmen, senators, friends. They can petition their supervisors, their state, their congress. They can withhold support from any party or candidate who will not go on record against it. Why, bless your heard, INDIVIDUALS are responsible for this whole program, and ONLY individuals can change it!

¹ First Inaugural, Abraham Lincoln. ‘Messages and Papers of the Presidents’ Vol. VII, p 8.

² All refs. to our gov't and intent of Const., see “The Federalist”, Mentor, 1961.

³ ACA 30, Prop. 1, 1968.

⁴ ACA 30, ‘Proposed Revisions’

⁵ Congressional Record, 20 Feb. 1968, p E 983.

⁶ ‘New Worlds for Old’ HG Wells, MacMillian Co., 1908, ps 251ff.

⁷ CRC, Background Study, ArvoVanAlstyne, ps 30, 46, 249, 37.

⁸ Report, U.S. Senate Subcom. Int. Security, 30Jul53, ‘Interlocking Subversion in Gov't. Depts.’

⁹ House Report # 1439-73rd Cong., 2nd sess., ps 9, 10.

¹⁰ Ibid, toto.

¹¹ Martin Dies Story, Martin Dies, Bookmailer, 1963, p 32.

-
- ¹² Cong. Rec., 20 Dec 63, p A7779.
- ¹³ Our Cities, Their Role in the National Economy, US Gov't. P O 1937.
- ¹⁴ PACH, 1313 E 60th St, Chicago see 'Terrible 1313', Hindman, Jo, Caxton Printers, 1963.
- ¹⁵ Cong Rec., 28 Feb 69, SJ60, ps 2144.
- ¹⁶ World Almanac, esp NYW / T, 1943.
- ¹⁷ TIME Mag., 16 MAR 42, 'Religion'.
- ¹⁸ 'Postwar Plans of the United Nations' 20th Cent. Fund, 1943.
- ¹⁹ Report, 'Interlocking Subversion in Gov't. Depts., 1953, p 5.
- ²⁰ Pamphlet, 'The UAW-CIO Postwar Plan' union bug #22, Detroit publ. #23.
- ²¹ 'As We Go Marching', John T. Flynn Doubleday, Doran, 1944 p 183.
- ²² 'Education for ALL American Youth' Ed. Pol. Comm., NEA, 1944, p 185 f.
- ²³ Newsclip., Not ident. or dated, circa early Feb 68.
- ²⁴ 'The War on World Poverty' Victor Gallancz, Ltd., London, 1953.
- ²⁵ Annual Reports, Calif. Comm. on Interstate Cooperation, esp. 1963.
- ²⁶ "Terrible 1313" Jo Hindman.
- ²⁷ Authors: Rees, DeLotto, Hicks, Petris, SUMNER, Waldie, ZBERG.
- ²⁸ 'Recommended Roles for Calif. State Gov't. in Fed.Urban Programs' Report of ICUG, Sept 67.
- ²⁹ Mandatory oath of office, Cal St.