

March 26, 2013

COPY SENT TO BOARD MEMBERS FOR THEIR INFORMATION

ATE 3-27-

To:

Defend Rural America™ mailing list¹

cc:

El Dorado, Placer, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba county commissioners and sheriffs

A copy of this letter can be found here

This is a response to a December 4, 2012 draft proposal entitled the <u>Next Economy: Capital Region Prosperity Plan</u> (the "Proposal").

The Proposal has been submitted to El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba county boards for their blessing. In short, county commissioners and supervisors cannot constitutionally or legally bless this proposal for the simple reason they do not have the authority to do so.

In the United States, government was created by the declaration of The People, who delegated (not transferred) a portion of their sovereignty to government to perform certain specified and limited functions. In return, The People were guaranteed a Republican form of government and a full voice in the decisions to be made.

The People did not delegate to government the power to redefine itself, which is exactly what the Proposal asks local government to do.

Government performs two functions: policy-making and enforcement. The proposal would transfer policy-making away from the democratically elected, accountable, transparent, local governments to an unknown, unelected, unaccountable, non-transparent, and distant regional governance structure controlled by stakeholders largely based in Sacramento. Were this to happen, The People would no longer have a voice in the most important decisions that affect their lives and their communities. There would be taxation without representation. This would be especially true for the mostly rural El Dorado, Placer, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties, which would become little more than satellites of the higher-populated Sacramento County.

City and county representatives may not and must not vote to approve the Proposal. If already approved, those resolutions must be suspended or revoked, at least until this analysis has been considered by The People of the affected counties and their representatives.

¹ Defend Rural America is the trademark of Kirk F. MacKenzie.

THE PROPOSAL

The Proposal is to transition the so-called *Capital Region* from the *Current Economy* to what is termed the *Next Economy*.

The word *cluster* appears in the report 69 times, and is used to describe the *core business clusters* around which the Next Economy will be built: advanced manufacturing, agriculture & food, clean energy technology, education & knowledge creation, information & communications technology, and life sciences & health services.

The general theme is technology, not surprising that the driving force behind the Proposal is the Morgan Family Foundation. James Morgan is a former CEO and Chairman of Applied Materials, a semiconductor equipment manufacturer. His wife, Becky Morgan, is President and CEO of *Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network*, a nonprofit organization that works on the Silicon Valley region's economic growth.

Although agriculture & food is mentioned as one of the clusters, the Proposal says little about it and makes no mention of farming, ranching, dairy, forestry—the mainstays of the Current Economy. One surmises the Current Economy is to be superseded by the *Next Economy*.

THE PROPOSAL IS NOT JUST A BUSINESS PLAN

The Proposal contains much of what one might expect of a business plan: an assessment of assets, a plan, and a strategy. Were this all the Proposal contained, there would be no concern. It would be a pure venture capital play.

The Proposal, however, requires an alliance between business and government, in what is called a public-private partnership (PPP)², also known as fascism or corporatism. In such a relationship, the interests of a few corporate directors and officers typically replace the voice of The People. It is this involvement of government that demands our attention.

REGIONAL GOVERNANCE

Regionalism

The Proposal is all about merging several counties into a single region. Indeed, the word *region* in various forms appears no less than 275 times in this 41-page report, an average of about 7 times per page. Here is a sufficient sampling of its use to understand the true scope of the Proposal:

regional leaders, business, competitiveness, cooperation, cultural opportunities, diversity, economic agenda, education, employment, goals, health services, investment, service providers, stakeholders, suppliers, training, and regional transportation.

Sacramento Count will inevitably be the hub of this region, as the names of the Proposal's sponsors, leadership group, Steering Committee, and Project Team³ make clear.

Regionalism is the basis of the emerging new world order. The United Nations has divided the world into 10 regions, for example, much as the federal government organized its activities by

² Referred to in pages 7 and 29 of the Proposal.

³ See page 39 of the Proposal for the individual and organizational names.

regions, rather than by states. As the people of Alaska, Arizona, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington found out, the regionalized 9th District Circuit Court meant their rights, interests, and values were subordinated to the more populous state of California, which they resent. Regionalism always moves the power and benefits to one area at cost to the others. The disastrous and inevitable consequences of the European Union provide another example.

Governance

The Proposal is also all about *governance*, as compared to *government*. Governance is the term used by globalists to describe the centralization of planning and policy making that are pushed down to local communities to implement and enforce.

Governance is the antithesis of *representation*. It is also the antithesis of *capitalism*, which is based on the proven proposition that prosperity comes the cumulative individual decisions of a free People, who are highly motivated to make their decisions and labors pay off.

Agenda 21 is an example of global governance. Other words used in the Proposal that come from Agenda 21 include: vision, (central) planning, regions, clean energy, transportation, and diversity.

Here is a more complete discussion of governance.

Regional Governance

Combining these two concepts, the Proposal is to create *regional governance* under the control of *stakeholders* (another Agenda 21 term).

Regional governance simply means taking policy-making out of the hands of The People and their representative governments, and moving it into central planning bodies of unknown, unelected, unaccountable, and non-transparent planners, who generally suffer no consequences of their decisions. The non-productive dictate to the productive. Central planning bodies are also known as *soviets*, hence the name the United Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR).

WHAT'S THE ROLE OF CITY AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT?

What is the role of city and county governments in the proposed global governance scheme? Apparently very little. The Proposal mentions local government in three contexts:

Endorsements The Proposal wants local governments to bless regional governance⁴.

Enforcement The Proposal wants local government to implement whatever the Stakeholders decide by reducing local regulatory barriers⁵ (get out of the way), and implementing the state and federal regulatory requirements that the Stakeholders will lobby for⁶. In other words, local governments are asked to give up something that is not theirs to give—the right of The People to actively participate in the decisions that affect their lives and community. In that event, why not abolish local governments altogether? Since the details are not specified, local government is asked to buy a pig in a poke.

⁴ Pages 9 and 34.

⁵ Page 8.

⁶ Page 8.

Debt The only other mention of local government is debt: *new forms of debt*⁷, *public equity and debt capital*⁸, *bonds*⁹, *government financing programs*¹⁰, and *loan guarantees*¹¹. In other words, the Proposal wants the people of the Current Economy to finance the Next Economy, with no specified benefit to themselves.

Who's In Control?

Sacramento Central Planning Committee, LLC

The Proposal does not give a name to the centralized-planning entity that it seeks to create. For reference purposes, it will be called the Sacramento Central Planning Committee, LLC (SACPLAN for short).

Stakeholders

SACPLAN decisions will be made by so-called *stakeholders*, a term used no less than 9 times, and one that is commonly used by Agenda 21. Stakeholders in the Next Economy apparently substitute for *constituents* and *shareholders*. The mostly distant stakeholders are divided into the following groups:

- Becky and James Morgan (the Morgan Family Foundation). They are the driving force behind the Proposal.¹²
- Five Sacramento-based organizations: Valley Vision, Center for Strategic Economic Research, Sacramento Area Commerce and Trade Organization, Sacramento Regional Technology Alliance, and the Sacramento Metro Chamber that prepared the Proposal.¹³
- A group of investors, including foreign governments, corporations, and investors.
- A leadership group.¹⁵
- A steering committee.¹⁶

⁷ Page 5.

⁸ Page 23.

⁹ Page 24.

¹⁰ Page 24.

²⁰⁰⁰⁷

¹¹ Page 24.

¹² Page 38.

¹³ Page 40.

¹⁴ Page 38.

¹⁵ Page 39.

¹⁶ Page 39.

The People Are Dealt Out

Notably absent from the stakeholders list are the residents, voters, organizations, and representatives of El Dorado, Placer, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties.

Powers

SACPLAN will take unto itself many of the roles currently associated with government, namely:

- Regional governance and all that entails (see prior discussion).
- Interfacing to State and Federal governments: 17 advocate for public policy at the state and local levels, influence state policymakers, lobby at state and federal levels, pursue state and federal regulatory requirements, pursue opportunities with state agencies & departments, influence state policymakers, and influence state and federal governments.
- Interfacing to external groups, including foreign corporations, investors, and governments.18
- Advocating for public policy 19.
- Mobilizing the community²⁰.
- Creating its own regional service provider network.²¹

GLOBALISM

Another prevalent theme is globalism. The word foreign is used 26 times, global 24 times, international 16 times, and export 13 times. Here are samples of the wording used:

foreign companies, countries, governments and government agencies, investors and investment, foreign trade and trade missions, foreign trade zone (aka free trade zone)

global communications, connections, economy, information-age economy, goods movement, markets, passenger travel, purchasing power, recession, recognition, technology trends.

The foreign governments are not named. A Foreign Trade Zone designation²² is mentioned, but only once, and not in the body of the text. However, given the recent creation of a free trade zone in Boise, Idaho, the Proposal likely calls for the participation of Communist China. That would establish Communist Chinese free trade zones and presence in the capitals of two western states.

¹⁷ Pages 8, 9 and 33.

¹⁸ Numerous pages.

¹⁹ Page 7.

²⁰ Page 8.

²¹ Page 5.

²² Page 26.

TRANSPORTATION

The Proposal also folds transportation into SACPLAN's authority. The phrase *regional* transportation infrastructure is mentioned twice²³. The Proposal apparently envisions an expansion of the current transportation system, but does not say how. However, it brings to mind the battle over high speed rail, which pits central planners against the people, businesses, and communities that are actually in the San Joaquin Valley.

CLEAN ENERGY

The Proposal also calls for *clean energy technology*²⁴, a term that brings to mind efforts to reduce highly-reliable and low-cost hydroelectric and fuel-based energy sources, in favor of 10X more expensive and less reliable solar and wind energy sources.

TWO VISIONS: WHICH WILL PREVAIL?

According to a recent article, 30% of America's counties—largely rural counties—are on the brink of failure, despite recent estimates that put the value of our natural resources in the Western States alone at \$130 trillion. Clearly, we are at a crossroads.

We are, in fact, in a struggle between two visions of the future.

VISION 1: COMMUNISM

One vision for Rural America is the path we are being driven towards, often but incorrectly described as *environmentalism*.

The so-called "environmental" movement and related legislation is behind the decline of our rural counties. The leaders of this movement are anti-choice, anti-family, anti-people, anti-capitalist, anti-property rights, anti-Constitution, pro-central planning, pro-wealth redistribution, and pro-social justice. In short, these leaders have infused the environmental movement with Communist ideologies. Eric Ellington, one of the founders of Greenpeace, called them watermelons—green on the outside and red on the inside.

"[Lord] Monckton told Liberty News Network that he first learned of a Marxist agenda behind environmentalism—using a 'green' scare to create an international, socialist, ruling body to force capitalist nations into compliance-when he befriended Eric Ellington, one of the founders of Greenpeace.

Monckton says Ellington was forced out of Greenpeace because the organization had been overrun with Marxists, 'who, he said, had taken over the organization for purposes that clearly had nothing to do with the environmental everything to do with destroying the economies of the West as fast as possible from within.'

Monckton says Ellington called the new breed of Marxist environmentalists 'watermelons': 'Green on the outside and red on the inside."²⁵

²³ Pages 6 and 27.

²⁴ Page 6.

²⁵ Spies at U.N. 'Green' Confab Expose Red Agenda, by Drew Zahn, published in WND June 25, 2012.

According to the view of the "environmental" leaders—generally unknown to their supporters—environmental legislation trumps the Constitution, private property, property rights, representative government, and The People.

If we do not fight back, we will be driven into Vision 2. The United States will continue to lose its prosperity, independence, sovereignty, security, and political and military influence. The People will lose their free will, unalienable rights, property and property rights, prosperity, security, healthcare, and possibly their lives. City and county governments will vanish as regional, but non-democratic governments are established.

VISION 2: THE RESTORATION

The other vision for Rural America is *The Restoration*; a restoration of the values, rights, and limited government that created the greatest prosperity for the greatest number in the history of mankind.

To accomplish The Restoration, The People and their representatives must be informed, educated, and fight back using every constitutional means, power, and right that are rightfully ours. The Defend Rural America website is full of such materials and ideas.

The environment need not suffer in this vision. To the contrary, most rural Americans are environmentalists. They love the land, rivers, open space, and their animals. You cannot become a fourth or fifth-generation rancher or farmer without being a good steward of the land. They are just not Communists.

Likewise, there is a role for government. When I grew up in Southern California, the smog was so thick somedays it was impossible to see more than 100 feet. People unconsciously developed a shallow-breathing technique because full breaths caused problems. I lost my sense of smell, and my father's rubber fishing waders rotted out in just 3-4 years. Government intervention was necessary and positive. Our air is now cleaner that it has ever been.

IN SUMMARY

THE PROPOSAL

- Changes government by diminishing, or eliminating altogether, the voice of The People. It
 replaces the Republican form of government we guaranteed unto ourselves—to insure the
 protection of our rights and interests—with an unnamed, unknown, unelected,
 unaccountable, and non-transparent central planning body referred to in this analysis as
 the Sacramento Central Planning Committee, LLC (SACPLAN for short).
- SACPLAN would take unto itself extensive powers, including many that properly belong to government.
- Asks local city and county governments to approve of these changes, hand over their policy-making powers, and become mere implementers of the central plans and regulations handed down.
- Power would be centralized in Sacramento County. El Dorado, Placer, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties would become mere satellites of Sacramento County.
- The Next Economy would largely be high-tech.
- The Current Economy (agriculture, forestry, mining, etc.) would be required to take on increased taxation and debt to build the Next Economy, but derive no clear benefit from it.

- Demand that science be based on actual measurements of actual subject areas, and that all data be openly available to open peer-review prior to reliance on the conclusions. Hold legally accountable all individuals whose data and conclusions decisions are to be relied upon.
- 2. The Next Economy takes second priority. Let venture capital determine its success and direction. Government will be an observer, not a participant. Resist foreign colonization of American soil.
- 3. Hold any and all regional discussions in open forum, well-publicized in advance, only for the purpose of information dissemination and discussion. All decisions to remain with the existing local government entities and only for the benefit of the county's residents. Focus discussions on the needs of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, Yuba, and other rural counties. Do not become mere satellites of Sacramento County.
- 4. Invite the full participation of public input by having major decisions put to the vote of the county's voters.
- 5. Create and maintain a Constitutional County.

J. War Tomi

6. County representatives and government to actively intercede in lawsuits and other actions to protect the lawful property rights of the county's residents against arbitrary, capricious, unjustified, or just plain unlawful state or federal actions, dictates or regulations.

Here is an example of one county's natural resource policy designed to fulfill the health, safety, and welfare needs of its residents; protect Constitutional rights; and provide for environmentallysound natural resource management practices.

Regards,

Kirk F. MacKenzie

Founder, Defend Rural America

Kirk@DefendRuralAmerica.com

- Demand that science be based on actual measurements of actual subject areas, and that all data be openly available to open peer-review prior to reliance on the conclusions. Hold legally accountable all individuals whose data and conclusions decisions are to be relied upon.
- The Next Economy takes second priority. Let venture capital determine its success and direction. Government will be an observer, not a participant. Resist foreign colonization of American soil.
- 3. Hold any and all regional discussions in open forum, well-publicized in advance, only for the purpose of information dissemination and discussion. All decisions to remain with the existing local government entities and only for the benefit of the county's residents. Focus discussions on the needs of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, Yuba, and other rural counties. Do not become mere satellites of Sacramento County.
- 4. Invite the full participation of public input by having major decisions put to the vote of the county's voters.
- 5. Create and maintain a Constitutional County.

J. War Tomis

6. County representatives and government to actively intercede in lawsuits and other actions to protect the lawful property rights of the county's residents against arbitrary, capricious, unjustified, or just plain unlawful state or federal actions, dictates or regulations.

Here is an example of one county's natural resource policy designed to fulfill the health, safety, and welfare needs of its residents; protect Constitutional rights; and provide for environmentally-sound natural resource management practices.

Regards,

Kirk F. MacKenzie

Founder, Defend Rural America Kirk@DefendRuralAmerica.com