

# Mountain Democrat

Wednesday, September 5, 2012

Placerville, CA

CALIFORNIA'S OLDEST NEWSPAPER - EST. 1851

Volume 161 · Issue 107 | 99¢

## Agenda 21: Central planning on steroids: Global warming believers unmasked by Climategate

By Dawn Hodson

### Analysis

*Editor's note — Agenda 21 is a topic of conversation at Tea Party meetings and coffee shops. This begins a four-part analysis series examining and explaining the issues associated with Agenda 21.*

*“In searching for a common enemy against whom we can unite, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill .... All these dangers are caused by human intervention in natural processes, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself.” (The First Global Revolution, the Club of Rome.)*

In 1968, a global think tank called the Club of Rome issued a report called “*Limits to Growth*.” Composed of heads of state, U.N. bureaucrats, business leaders, scientists and others, the group called for resource conservation, population reduction and global governance.

The Club of Rome was not the first group to develop this thesis, but in the modern era it was one of the most influential when it came to laying out an overall plan for governing humanity.

Other think tanks and researchers followed, issuing reports documenting environmental degradation due to industrialization and overpopulation. The culmination of these concerns was a U.N. sponsored conference held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. At the end of the conference a plan was released called Agenda 21 which was signed by 178 governments.

Primarily the brainchild of central planners in developed countries, Agenda 21 found fans on both sides of the aisle in Washington, D.C. In 1992 Congress ratified, and President George H. Bush signed, the Framework Convention on Climate Change. The purpose of the nonbinding treaty was to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations alleged to be due to manmade activities.

This was followed by President Clinton signing an Executive Order establishing a Council on Sustainable Development that employed different federal agencies to implement parts of Agenda 21. Clinton also signed the Kyoto Protocol, which was an international environmental treaty designed to prevent

“dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.” However the Senate refused to ratify the treaty and President George W. Bush later withdrew the U.S. from the treaty.

President Barack Obama brought Agenda 21 back to center stage once again by signing an Executive Order to establish a White House Rural Council to coordinate federal management of rural America, including family farms. Recent examples of their activities include a proposal by the Department of Transportation that would require everyone on a farm to obtain a Commercial Driver’s License to operate farming equipment. Also proposed was a ban on children under 18 from working on family farms, although that proposal was withdrawn after a firestorm of protests. And a continued war by the FDA on dairies that sell raw milk.

The use of Executive Orders and the federal bureaucracy to pursue actions related to Agenda 21 has resulted in the enactment of laws not supported by the public and not passed by Congress. For example, one of the most important environmental programs tied to Agenda 21 was cap-and-trade legislation.

The “cap” in cap-and-trade being the legal limit on the quantity of greenhouse gases a region could emit each year and “trade” meaning that companies could swap emission permits among themselves. When cap-and-trade legislation failed to pass in the Senate, the EPA took it upon itself to regulate greenhouse gases, in effect usurping the role of Congress.

According to critics, at the heart of Agenda 21 are a number of goals that are contrary to American values, including: redistribution of wealth; abolishment of private property; population control and reduction; government-sanctioned monopolies through private-public partnerships; implementation of “sustainable development” policies at the local level; elimination of the middle class; collective instead of individual rights; and elimination of unsustainable uses of the environment, such as single-family homes, private cars, air conditioning, paved roads, dams and reservoirs, power lines, ski runs, fences, hunting, logging, industrial activity, livestock grazing and farming.

In effect, a form of neo-feudalism, but with a high-tech, “we are the world” look to it. Call it “1984” meets “*Brave New World*.”

Americans remain largely in the dark about these developments because they are not widely covered in the mainstream media and because the plans have been put into effect gradually over the past 20 years. Indeed what is covered by the national media is little more than tub thumping by the global warming crowd. The most recent example of this being an editorial in *Scientific American* stating that “Effective World Government Will be Needed to Stave Off Climate Catastrophe.”

To make its case for Agenda 21, proponents have relied on “research” coming from governments, universities, think tanks and other nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Critics have accused some of these groups of altering their findings to fit a particular political agenda. One example of this being the claim that industrialization has resulted in climate change or manmade global warming.

### **Anthropogenic global warming: science or politics?**

One of the major tenets of Agenda 21 is the need to control human development because of the damage done to the Earth.

Energy use, and particularly the use of fossil fuels, is blamed for alleged changes in the climate worldwide and makes up what is called the Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) theory.

However, research and events over the last few years have raised doubts about the science behind AGW.

In 2009, for example, 61 megabytes of confidential e-mails between researchers at the University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit (UEACRU) were hacked and released to the public in a scandal later dubbed "Climategate."

The e-mails revealed that East Anglia researchers had conspired with other researchers to exaggerate the amount of global warming, had silenced dissent by making it difficult for scientists who disagreed to have their work published, had manipulated temperature data to fit their theory, and had destroyed evidence at odds with their theory.

Since it was East Anglia, along with other institutions, that was feeding research findings to the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), air began leaking out of the global warming balloon.

Following the Climategate scandal, additional research has cast even more doubt on the theory of AGW. The director of East Anglia, for example, finally admitted that the earth was actually warmer during the Medieval Warming Period than it is today.

Surveys of polar bear populations revealed their numbers were stable or growing, not declining. Claims of losses in the rainforests that were attributed to global warming were instead the result of logging. A new study established that the Himalayas have suffered no significant loss of ice over the past decade. Last, the most recent evidence is that world temperatures have risen less than two-tenths of 1 degree Fahrenheit in the last 20 years. Indeed some researchers now think it's more likely that we are entering a new mini Ice Age.

### **MIT scientist**

Scientists dissenting from the theory of AGW have also become more outspoken about the flaws in the science.

One of these is Dr. Richard Lindzen who is the Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology, Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences at MIT. He has written and spoken out against the AGW theory.

He said that over the last 150 years there have been temperature changes of only tenths of a degree, which calls into question the claim that industrialization has raised the Earth's mean temperature.

"There's no doubt that what we do will have some effect, but even the doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> would have a relatively small effect, only a change of 1 degree," he said. "Models created by AGW scientists increase CO<sub>2</sub> levels by a factor of 5 and everyone acknowledges that those are highly improbable."

Lindzen said that scientists who don't agree with the AGW proponents are often silenced. The Climategate e-mails included statements to the effect that any scientific journal editor who published

articles critical of AGW would be severely attacked or fired. He said that he has been subject to it himself in cases where he was written articles for publication. Once those articles were published, the editor was immediately fired.

“Moreover, journals like *Nature* and *Science* have publicly declared that they will not publish anything that questions global warming,” he said. “This is a political movement that co-ops a lot of things. Any time you hear anyone say, ‘Believe us because we have authority and you can’t check it yourself,’ you should be suspicious. And I think the public at large is.”

Lindzen is not alone in his skepticism. A petition was submitted to Congress in 2008 that was signed by over 31,000 American scientists, including 9,000 with Ph.D.s. Many of the signers currently work in climatological, meteorological, atmospheric, environmental, geophysical, astronomical and biological fields directly involved in the climate change controversy.

The petition states, “There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate ... Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.”

However, not much has changed as a result of these revelations, because ultimately AGW theory is not about science but about global governance and, to a lesser extent, about making money. It is more about a belief system.

In short, it’s bunk.

*Part II of the series can be found **here**, Part III **here**.*

# Agenda 21: The bioengineering of the planet

By Dawn Hodson

## Analysis

*Editor's note — Agenda 21 is a topic of conversation at Tea Party meetings and coffee shops. This is Part II of a four-part analysis series examining the issues associated with Agenda 21. Part I ran May 18.*

*“Gradually, by selective breeding, the congenital differences between rulers and ruled will increase until they become almost different species. A revolt of the plebs would become as unthinkable as an organized insurrection of sheep against the practice of eating mutton.” (Bertrand Russell – *The Impact of Science on Society*)*

Last October, the U.N. announced that the global population had reached 7 billion with nearly all of the increase occurring in sub-Saharan Africa. In developing countries in Asia and Latin America, the fertility rate now resembles that of the United States which is slightly above two children per woman.

One of the stated goals of Agenda 21 is population reduction to prevent a cataclysmic collapse of the ecosystem and changes to the climate that are claimed to be brought on by human activity.

Such alarmism is not new. Almost 250 years ago the Reverend Thomas Malthus warned that population growth would outstrip the earth's resources unless something was done to rid the earth of undesirables.

In the West, reductions in fertility have come as a result of greater educational and employment opportunities for women, the commonplace use of contraceptives and abortion, and changes in cultural norms. The government has facilitated these changes by mandating that women be included in affirmative action programs and by paying for abortions and contraceptives.

The recently passed health care mandate, i.e. Obamacare, furthered the population reduction agenda by requiring most employers with health care programs to provide contraceptive, sterilization and abortion services. President Obama also repealed the “global gag rule,” a policy that requires all nongovernmental organizations that receive federal funds to refrain from performing abortions or citing abortion services offered by others.

Obama's appointments are also telling. For example, his Science and Technology Adviser John Holdren admits to being a neo-Malthusian.

In 1977, Holdren wrote a book called “Ecoscience” in which he indicated support for forced abortions, putting sterilizing agents in the nation's drinking water, forcibly removing or aborting illegitimate children, and creating an armed international police force to control people's lives. All this in the name of protecting the planet and warding off global climate change.

Holdren later disavowed those views at his confirmation hearing, but he still takes the position that climate change skeptics are “dangerous” members of a “denier fringe.”

## **The green zealots**

The global climate change movement has attracted its share of those who can argue their position rationally as well as zealots who brook no disagreement.

For example, Dr. Kari Norgaard, an Oregon University professor recently compared skepticism of global warming to racism. She went so far as to suggest that “cultural resistance” to AGW “must be recognized and treated as an aberrant sociological behavior.”

Another zealot is Steve Zwick who is the Managing Editor of the Ecosystem Marketplace. In a recent Forbes Magazine article, he called for “denialists” to bear the price of their disbelief including allowing their homes to burn, taking their land away and making them pay for “breaking the climate.”

Others come up with even more extreme ideas. A new paper in the journal “Ethics, Policy and Environment” proposes biomedical modifications to humans as one way to reduce greenhouse gases. The lead author of the paper, S. Matthew Liao, is a professor of philosophy and bioethics at New York University. He claims that bioengineering is one solution to global climate change.

One proposal includes a pill or patch to make people sick if they eat meat since livestock farming is considered to account for as much as 51 percent of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions.

Another idea is for parents to use genetic engineering or hormone therapy in order to birth “smaller, less resource-intensive children.” One technique is called preimplantation genetic diagnosis which would select which embryos would be implanted based on height. Another would be to use hormone treatments to induce height reductions in children.

In an interview in The Atlantic Magazine, Liao said there should be a fixed allocation of greenhouse gas emissions per family. “If that’s the case, given certain fixed allocations of greenhouse gas emissions, human engineering could give families the choice between two medium-sized children, or three small-sized children ... A family might want a really good basketball player, and so they could use human engineering to have one really large child.”

He even threw out the possibility of giving people cat eyes. “We figured that if everyone had cat eyes, you wouldn’t need so much lighting, and so you could reduce global energy usage considerably.”

While it would be easy to dismiss such people as being on the lunatic fringe, their ideas are often taken seriously by those who design public policy at both the international, national and local level. Totalitarian control has always had great appeal to those who live in a world where ideas are real and people are just an abstraction.

## **Taxes and carbon credit indulgences**

For hundreds of years it was a common practice for sinners to gain relief by paying an indulgence to the Catholic Church. Today corporations pay an indulgence to the government to receive permission to pollute.

Indeed carbon and “greenhouse gas” trading has become such a big business worldwide that exchanges have been set up all over the globe.

Louis Redshaw, of Barclays Capital, has predicted that “Carbon will be the world’s biggest commodity market, and it could become the world’s biggest market overall.”

The world’s largest carbon offset market, the Kyoto Protocol’s clean development mechanism, is run by the U.N. and administered by the World Bank. Often accused of corruption and profiteering, the U.N. views the exchange as one way to fund itself as a global governing structure. Third-world countries also see carbon credits as a way to further their development by selling pollution credits to corporations and to first world countries.

However the U.N. is not limiting itself to just pollution credits to fund itself as a global governing structure. In the year 2000, the U.N. General Assembly passed the Millennium Goals which included different proposals to raise taxes for the organization.

These taxes would not only increase the number of mandarins at the U.N. but would also be a mechanism for shifting wealth from the West to less developed countries.

Schemes that were contemplated included an e-mail tax; a tax on fossil fuels like gasoline, coal, oil and natural gas; a tax on currency transactions which would have raised the cost of just about every good shipped or traded internationally; an international air transport tax; an aviation fuel tax; a tax on the international conventional arms trade; fines for ocean dumping; a tax on commercial fishing; a tax on Earth-orbiting satellites; a tax on the use of the electronic spectrum (television, radio, cell phones, etc.); a tax on the profits of international businesses; and even a tax on international advertising.

According to working documents for the upcoming U.N. Conference on “Sustainable Development” in Rio de Janeiro, plans are to “re-shape civilization, the global economy, and even people’s thoughts” in order to transition toward a so-called green economy.

Among the new proposals are imposing global carbon taxes, wealth distribution amounting to trillions of dollars per year and a barrage of new programs aimed at “global social engineering.”

A big part of this transition involves giving global institutions like the U.N. the power to print currency so it can fund a global governing structure. The other part is educating children about the danger of AGW so they believe that the U.N. is needed to solve the “problem.”

Since the “green program” anticipates that large numbers of people will become unemployed, built into the agenda is a global welfare program. So not only will people in America be subsidizing the poor in this country, they will be subsidizing them in Timbuktu as well.

### **Meet me in Cancun**

The fact that AGW has been discredited has not changed the minds of its proponents one iota. Instead U.N. officials and their cohorts continue to meet in luxurious resorts to discuss how awful people are and that something simply must be done about them.

At the Copenhagen climate summit in 2009, for example, over 140 private jets were used to fly in VIPs while 1,200 limos were used to squire them around. The top hotels in the area were all booked, at a cost \$1,000 a night, for the 11 day conference.

In attendance were 15,000 delegates and officials, 4,000 journalists and 98 world leaders along with the usual bevy of Hollywood celebrities who wolfed down scallops, foie gras and sculpted caviar wedges.

Luckily they were able to save on prostitution services. In a show of solidarity, the city's prostitutes offered free sex to anyone with a delegate's pass.

The conference, including travel, created a total of 41,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent. But nothing is too good for these globe-trotting, foie gras eating hypocrites whose conferences are held at the best resorts including Rio de Janeiro, Cancun, and Durban, South Africa.

Apparently being an AWG believer means never having to go without a tan.

*Part I of the series can be found **here**, Part III can be found **here**.*

# Agenda 21: Regional planning and sustainable development

By Dawn Hodson

## Analysis

*Editor's note — Agenda 21 is a topic of conversation at Tea Party meetings and coffee shops. This is Part III of a four-part analysis series examining the issues associated with Agenda 21. Part I ran May 18 and Part II ran Monday.*

*“Current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class — involving high meat consumption and large amounts of frozen and convenience foods, use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and workplace air-conditioning, and suburban housing are not sustainable. A shift is necessary which will require a vast strengthening of the multilateral system, including the United Nations.” (Maurice Strong, opening speech at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit)*

The phrase sustainable development is one of the catch phrases of the Agenda 21 crowd. It is defined as development that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

While it has a warm fuzzy sound to it, the devil is in the details and how it plays out in the way people live in the near future.

One can get a preview of what they have planned by looking at how it's being put into effect through new laws, taxes, regulations, executive orders, and bureaucratic fiat.

California, for example, was the first jurisdiction to adopt a full-scale cap-and-trade system for its carbon emissions. The program was a central element of California's Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32) which was signed into law in 2006.

In 2009, a follow-up bill — the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375) — was put into effect which required regional growth scenarios for land use and transportation improvements that took into account state-mandated goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Its intent was to control urban sprawl by confining new development to corridors located adjacent to transit centers.

The fact that AGW (anthropogenic global warming) has been revealed to be largely based on junk science hasn't resulted in the repeal of this legislation. If anything, revenue shortfalls at the state level have provided an incentive to use the bogeyman of global warming to impose even stricter regulations and assess additional taxes.

For example, Gov. Jerry Brown recently proposed filling the \$9 billion hole in the state budget by auctioning off credits that would allow California companies to emit additional greenhouse gases. He is also hinting at using the carbon tax to pay for the proposed high-speed railroad.

## **Stack'em and pack'em**

In the meantime, work proceeds on transforming how ordinary people live. Recently regional planning bodies in California adopted plans that would require most new housing to be built at much higher density levels.

The Association of Bay Area Governments, for example, is proposing that only 3 percent of new housing built by 2035 be allowed on or beyond the “urban fringe” — where current housing ends and countryside begins. Over two-thirds of the housing built for new residents living in San Francisco and San Jose would be multifamily and concentrated along major thoroughfares.

ABAG’s counterpart in the south, the Southern California Association of Governments, wants even denser housing with 30 or more unit per acre in Los Angeles County and five other Southern California counties.

According to an analysis by the Wall Street Journal, if these planners have their way, by the year 2035, 68 percent of all new housing built in Southern California would be condos and apartment complexes.

Unfortunately, this type of housing may be all that the average person living in California will be able to afford in the future. According to U.S. demographer Joel Kotkin, as hard as it is for a middle class family to afford a home in California now, “things will only get worse in the coming years as Democratic Gov. Jerry Brown and his green cadre implement their ‘smart growth’ plans to cram the proletariat into high density housing.”

Kotkin predicts that “... California is turning into a two-and-a-half-class society. On top are ‘entrenched incumbents’ who inherited their wealth or came to California early and made their money. Then there’s the shrunken middle class of public employees, and, miles below, a permanent welfare class. As it stands today, about 40 percent of Californians don’t pay any income tax and a quarter are on Medicaid ... In short, ‘the state is run for the very rich, the very poor, and the public employees.’”

## **Pushing people off the land**

Orlean Koehle, a resident of Sonoma County and author of the book “*By Stealth and Deception*,” is one of those tracking all these developments which she traces back to Agenda 21. She complains that the government is making it more and more difficult for people to own or use their own property in California.

She cites her own experience in Sonoma when the county rezoned rural properties to require a 100-foot setback from all creeks. “This took a lot of land out of productive use,” she stated. “They also tried to monitor, meter, and tax our well water but that effort failed.”

Another example noted by Koehle was when farmers in Central California had their irrigation water cut off for three years to protect the Delta smelt. That action came in response to a 2006 lawsuit filed by the Natural Resources Defense Council and other groups. Farmers ended up having to plow under their orchards as a result and unemployment in the area skyrocketed.

Koehle, who helped organize a conference on Agenda 21 in April of this year, said, “Agenda 21 is being implemented at the local level though changes to our general plans. Their ultimate goal is to put everyone

under regional governments and undercut local government. Even states that don't have laws like California are implementing these policies. That should tell people something."

Even more fundamental changes in land ownership are being considered. Recently a U.N. "investigator" demanded that the U.S. government return some of the land "stolen from Indian tribes." This was in addition to a \$1 billion settlement some tribes recently received because of commercial projects on their land. While no one from Congress would meet with this U.N. investigator, he said he received "exemplary cooperation" from the Obama administration.

## **Re-wilding America**

Another one of Agenda 21's goals is re-wilding American by removing all signs of human habitation from large portions of the country.

Called the Wildlands Project, its goal is to set aside approximately 50 percent of the North American continent as "wild land" to preserve the biological diversity of the continent and protect the migratory routes of animals.

One plan to accomplish this includes blocking huge portions of land from human use by linking up existing public lands, such as national forests and parks, with private land on which human use would be limited or disallowed. Human activity on the remaining land would be heavily controlled.

At present the federal government owns approximately 650 million acres or 30 percent of the land in the United States. In California, the federal government owns about 45 percent of the land.

In pursuit of this objective, the Wildlife Corridors Conservation Act of 2010 was introduced in Congress. The bill proposed coordinating efforts between the federal government, the states, and Indian tribes to identify fish and wildlife habitat and corridors. The information was to be used in planning and development decisions with grants available to preserve and protect these corridors.

While the bill never made it out of committee, efforts at re-wilding the country continue.

One of the biggest examples of this is in the Klamath River basin where there is a proposal to remove four dams in response to a drastic decline in the salmon population. If approved, it would be the biggest dam removal and restoration pact in U.S. history. However, the project is currently stalled in Congress and questions were raised after a whistleblower was fired for questioning the integrity of the dam removal study process.

Debbie Bacigalupi, a woman whose family owns land in the area, alleges that the goal of the dam removal is not to bring back the salmon but to enable the government, special interest groups, and certain tribes to take over the entire basin. She claims that Fish and Game was fining people if dead salmon were found on their land and Indians in the area were planting dead fish on people's property to push the project forward.

"This is all a land grab," she said. "They are trying to regulate people so they can't afford to live on the land. And if that doesn't work, they will try something more drastic."

Skirmishes of this sort are taking place all over the country as different nonprofit groups, working alone or in tandem with government agencies, propose different projects that tie into the Agenda 21 program.

Locally, there is ongoing litigation between miners and different environmental groups regarding allowable mining activities. More recently, the Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation, asked the court for a blanket closure of 42 roads in the Eldorado National Forest because the roads pass through small meadow areas. The court ordered the trails closed until a study is completed which the Forest Service estimates could take up to a year.

### **Incremental implementation**

The push to implement Maurice Strong's opening speech at the U.N. is already in process. The fact that he made the statement at the beginning of the conference indicates that the Agenda 21 plan did not result from the U.N. conference but rather was written long before the attendees arrived.

If Agenda 21 has largely been under the radar for a while, it's because much of what has been accomplished has been done incrementally. In addition, rarely is there a discussion of how disparate laws, regulations, lawsuit rulings, and planning efforts come together to form a pattern. To raise the topic usually gets one labeled a "conspiracy theorist."

However, Americans have every right to question what the central planners have in mind for us — as evidenced by all the laws and regulations being put into place — and whether what is being planned is really in our best interest or theirs.

*Contact Dawn Hodson at 530-344-5071 or [dhodson@mtdemocrat.net](mailto:dhodson@mtdemocrat.net). Follow @DHodsonMtDemo on Twitter.*

*Part I of the series can be found **here**, Part II can be found **here**.*

# Agenda 21: The 1% solution

By Dawn Hodson

***Editor's note — Agenda 21 is a topic of conversation at Tea Party meetings and coffee shops. This is Part IV of a four-part analysis series examining the issues associated with Agenda 21. Part I ran May 18, Part II ran Monday and Part III ran Wednesday.***

*“In the next century, nations as we know it will be obsolete; all states will recognize a single, global authority. National sovereignty wasn't such a great idea after all.”* (Strobe Talbot, President Clinton's deputy secretary of state, Time Magazine, July 20, 1992)

Gaining acceptance of Agenda 21, and with it global governance, has meant promoting it in TV programs, movies, books, advertising, magazine articles, conferences, in “green” products, at U.N. and NGO events, in school and college curriculums, and referencing it in just about every federal document.

This is all part of programming the population, especially the young, to accept the idea of living in a “global collective.”

In California, planting the Agenda 21 meme has been particularly intense given the state's reputation as a bulwark in the “green” movement. In 2008, the California Legislature went so far as to pass a bill that would have required global warming be taught as part of the public school curriculum. While Gov. Schwarzenegger vetoed the bill, advocates continue to try and work it into the school curriculum in other ways.

For example, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District developed a standards-based climate change curriculum for fourth and fifth grade levels. The Lawrence Hall of Science developed an earth science course for high-school students that includes climate change. The EPA developed a Toolkit for educators to teach middle school students about climate change and its impact on the environment and wildlife. And some teachers have taken it upon themselves to show the film “*An Inconvenient Truth*” starring former Vice President Al Gore.

In many ways Gore is the perfect symbol of the intersection of politics and money-making in America. Since the film came out in 2006, Gore has become a major spokesman for the Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) theory as he has jetted around the world in a private plane lecturing others on their carbon footprints while owning a home in Nashville that consumes more energy in a month than most Americans use in a year.

The film he touts also claims that sea levels will rise by up to 20 feet in some areas due to melting glaciers. However, that didn't stop Gore, in 2010, from purchasing a \$9 million getaway home in Montecito — an exclusive seaside community.

Business ventures that Gore is associated with also raise the suspicion that AGW is nothing more than a way for well-connected individuals to become carbon billionaires. For example, a venture capital firm he is a partner in loaned money to another company to develop energy-saving technologies for utilities. That loan paid off big time when the Energy Department later awarded more than \$560 million in smart grid grants to utilities that had contracts with the firm.

## **Green greed is good**

Gore, of course, is not the only one using AGW for personal benefit. It has come out that \$3.9 billion in federal grants and financing went to firms with connections to five different staffers and advisors in the Obama administration. Many of these “green” energy companies went bankrupt after taking out loans while at the same time paying out huge bonuses to their executives.

According to news reports in the Washington Post and at ABC News, Beacon Power Corp., for example, received \$43 million in energy loans. In March 2010, the company paid cash bonuses of \$259,285 to three executives. A year and a half later they filed for bankruptcy. EnerDel received \$118.5 million in energy loans. Their parent company paid \$725,000 in bonuses to three executives in 2011. In January of this year it declared bankruptcy. Solyndra, the California-based company, received more than a half billion dollars in government loans. At least 17 executives received two sets of payments ranging from \$37,000 to \$60,000 per payment just months before the company fired 1,100 workers and declared bankruptcy. SpectraWatt received a \$500,000 grant from the Energy Department. Between March and April of 2011, payouts of \$745,000 were made to five company executives while at the same time the company laid off its workforce and prepared to declare bankruptcy.

By no means are these the only “green companies” that have siphoned off billions of taxpayer dollars into failed ventures. Ventures that have benefited a few well-connected individuals while the cost was shifted to the public. Indeed they appear to be examples of what Agenda 21 calls for in the way of private-public partnerships where if a venture is successful, the company keeps the profits, and if it fails, the public absorbs the loss.

Environmental groups and university researchers have also leveraged AGW because it has become something of a cash cow in terms of fundraising and research grants. Nothing is trendier these days than saying that you produce a “green” product, are doing global warming research, or are fighting global warming.

The result has been “research” that would make for good satire if it weren’t being taken seriously by people in a position to impose taxes and regulations on the public.

For example, AGW has been described as causing, among other things: global cooling, global warming, dermatitis, drought, floods, anxiety, gender inequality, birds not singing, too much snow, not enough snow, coral reefs shrinking, coral reefs growing, fewer trees, more trees, boredom, maple syrup shortage, ozone rise, ozone loss, earth lopsided, earth melting, earth exploding, more avalanches, fewer avalanches, cholera, sex changes, world bankruptcy, income increases for lawyers, bubonic plague, ice sheet growth, ice sheet shrinkage and invasion of Scotland by spiders.

## **A vision of the radical left**

Supporters and opponents of Agenda 21 come from all parts of the political spectrum so it is not necessarily a partisan issue. Some people argue that it is needed for survival of the ecosystem while others see it as a conspiracy to bring about a dictatorial world government.

Congressman Tom McClintock said Agenda 21 has been brought to his attention many times but he doesn't believe it's a conspiracy. Instead he sees it as part of a great debate over what kind of society we want.

"It dates back to early English history when the Crown tried to restrict the use of the land by commoners," he stated. "The reaction was the Magna Carta. It appears the elite want to reverse that and reinstitute feudalism."

According to him, supporters of Agenda 21 want to return the earth to some earlier pristine condition through restrictive zoning, restrictions on dams and reservoirs, restrictions on the use of land, destruction of roads, and so on.

"It's really a lunatic vision that resonates with those on the radical left," he said. "Most people don't want to live in dense urban cores, don't want people telling them what kind of light bulbs to buy, or how high to set their thermostat."

"It's an age-old conflict between freedom and authoritarianism. The question being asked is whether the government is here to protect our rights or to force on people what those in government think is best for us."

"There is a large group of people who just want to be left alone to conduct their lives as they see fit. There is a smaller minority that wants to run everyone else's life. These people are attracted to government because that's where power is concentrated. We're reaching a boiling point where the silent majority is starting to engage and push back."

"The vision of the American founders was of a voluntary society," he said. "But that vision has been seriously eroded over the last century. This is an age-old question. Are men free souls or are they the property of the state?"

### **Conspiracy or fact?**

Whether one agrees with McClintock or not, clearly something is afoot.

Legislation establishing goals for carbon emissions is not the product of anyone's imagination. Neither is cap-and-trade legislation nor efforts by the EPA to enforce regulations based on AGW theory despite a lack of legislative authority or sound science.

The fact that America is being de-industrialized is also not debatable. Although the number of manufacturing jobs in America remains the same — around 17 million during the period 1969 to 2002 — the share of manufacturing jobs has continued to decline from 28 percent to only 9 percent in 2011.

At the same time, the American middle class has been progressively hollowed out. According to a report by the National Employment Law Project, while 60 percent of the jobs lost during the economic downturn were in mid-wage occupations, 73 percent of the jobs added since have been in lower-wage occupations such as cashier, stocking clerk or food preparation worker.

As a result, wage disparity and poverty have grown in America. A 2010 Pew study showed that the typical middle-class family lost 23 percent of its wealth since the recession began, versus just 12 percent among the upper class. And 45 million people are now on food stamps, a 70 percent increase from 2007.

The collapse in the housing market has also made the prospect of living in a single-family home less likely for many Americans. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the percentage of Americans who owned their own homes has seen its biggest decline since the Great Depression. The rate of home ownership fell to 65.1 percent in April 2010, 1.1 percentage points lower than it was in 2000. The decline was the biggest drop since the 1930s, when home ownership plunged 4.2 percent.

Our current president has also shown himself to be unusually dismissive of any constitutional limits on his authority, although he is just the latest in a long line of presidents to do so.

To date he has ordered the killing of U.S. citizens abroad without their being charged or tried in a court of law. He has continued indefinite detentions at Gitmo, but also brought the policy ashore by signing the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 which authorizes the military to arrest and indefinitely detain anyone without the benefit of due process. He has violated the Posse Comitatus Act banning domestic deployment of the military. He has expanded the surveillance state. And in March he signed an Executive Order that gives him the power to institute indefinite martial law in the United States because of a real or potential threat. The order allows him, or anyone else serving as president, to conscript all the resources in the country including forcing Americans into the military or into work details.

Obama has also shown himself to be inclined towards supporting global initiatives at the expense of this country and its citizens. He accepted the chairmanship of the U.N. Security Council even though it was unconstitutional for him to do so. He has publicly stated his support for the U.N. to take on the job of monitoring and controlling guns owned by Americans. And his most recent Executive Order internationalizes the laws that this country will operate under with its trading partners.

Individually, each of these actions would be troubling enough. But taken together, they form a pattern of actions that steer America away from a representational government and towards a corporate styled government that primarily benefits the wealthiest 1 percent of its citizens.

So if Agenda 21 is a conspiracy, it's one that is now out in the open.

*Contact Dawn Hodson at 530-344-5071 or [dhodson@mtdemocrat.net](mailto:dhodson@mtdemocrat.net). Follow @DHodsonMtDemo on Twitter.*

# Documenting Agenda 21's sustainable development

**By Letters to the Editor**

EDITOR: Several have commented that United Nations Agenda 21/Sustainable Development, not signed into law, simply is a set of unenforceable voluntary guidelines. True, it was not signed into law. However, Agenda 21 is implemented by Presidential Executive Order, bypassing the legislative process. For 20 years Agenda 21, via a series of Executive Orders, has been taking root throughout the country.

Shortly after taking office President Obama signed EO 13514 requiring each federal agency to have its own Senior Sustainability Officer (SSO). These officers are accountable for their respective agency's sustainable development conformance, including the preparation of targets for agency-wide greenhouse gas reductions, the submission of a Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan (SSPP), and the monitoring of agency performance and progress in meeting the goals of the executive order.

Each of the following federal agencies has an SSO accountable for ensuring conformance with the requirements of EO 13514:

1. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 2. CIA 3. Commodity Futures Trading Commission 4. Corporation for National and Community Service 5. Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency 6. Department of Commerce 7. Department of Defense 8. Department of Education 9. Department of Health and Human Services 10. Department of Homeland Security 11. Department of Housing and Urban Development 12. Department of the Interior 13. Department of Justice 14. Department of Labor 15. Department of State 16. Department of Transportation 17. Department of the Treasury 18. Department of Veterans Affairs 19. EPA 20. Export-Import Bank 21. Farm Credit Admin 22. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 23. Federal Housing finance Agency 24. Federal Labor Relations Authority 25. Federal Maritime Commission 26. Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission 27. Federal Trade Commission 28. General Services Admin 29. Institute of Museum and Library Services 30. Marine Mammal Commission 31. Millennium Challenge Corp. 32. National Aeronautics and Space Admin 33. National Archives and Records Admin 34. National Capital Planning Commission 35. National Endowment for the Arts 36. National Endowment for the Humanities 37. National Labor Relations Board 38. National Mediation Board 39. National Science Foundation 40. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 41. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Bd 42. Occupational Safety and Health Review Com 43. Office of Personnel Management 44. Overseas Private Investment Corp 45. Peace Corps 46. Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp. 47. Railroad Retirement Board 48. SEC 49. Selective Service System 50. SBA 51. Smithsonian Institute 52. Social Security Administration 53. TVA 54. U.S. Agency for International Development 55. Army Corps of Engineers 56. U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board 57. USDA 58. U.S. Inst of Peace 59. USPS 60. U.S. Trade and Development

The above list, together with the names and titles of the respective SSOs, can be found at <http://ofee.gov/sso.asp>

I've done a preliminary search for the 60 Strategic Sustainability Performance Plans (SSPPs). With the exception of the CIA, all SSPPs appear to be online, varying in length from 26 pages for the Department of

Education to 198 pages for the Department of Agriculture. For a program that some say is not being implemented, that's a lot of documentation.

EVELYN VEERKAMP

Placerville

# Residents to supes: Back off U.N.s Agenda 21

**By Chris Daley**

El Dorado County's Board of Supervisors Tuesday put off indefinitely further discussion of the controversial Agenda 21. Board Chairman John Knight had agendized a proposed board resolution to "endorse rejection of its radical policies and rejections of any grant monies attached to it."

Knight, however, exercising the chair's prerogative, pulled the item from the agenda and offered it "off calendar" for future consideration. Off-calendar means there is no date certain on which or by which the issue will return to the board's agenda.

Members of the audience and supervisors got testy with each other over the move to "continue" the matter. Several times Knight and Supervisor Jack Sweeney tried to clarify what the board action meant. That is, not to deny the public the opportunity to discuss the specifics of Agenda 21, but rather to hold those discussions at a future time.

Agenda 21 came out of the "United Nations Conference on Environment and Development" in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. It is commonly referred to as a blueprint or action plan for "sustainable development" worldwide and includes involvement at the global, national and local levels. In its simplest terms, it is predicated on the assumption that much human activity has a potentially deleterious effect on the environment. Agenda 21 (for the 21st century) states that by working together the international community can reduce environmental degradation while improving the lives and prospects of people in the developing world.

## **40 chapters**

A four-section, 40-chapter document, Agenda 21 emphasizes such issues as consumption patterns, use and availability of resources, demographics, financing, health, housing and development in general.

At the state and local level, such issues have informed California's transportation and housing future in the form of Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375. Both of these laws deal with policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by concentrating higher density housing developments in such a way as to significantly increase the use of public transportation.

Opposition to much of the philosophy embodied in Agenda 21 is based on concerns that its foundation rests on "taking from the haves and giving it to the have-nots." That is, subsuming if not confiscating private property to the interests and welfare of an ill-defined majority. In a word, socialism.

Several audience members described Agenda 21 as a threat to the local as well as the American way of life, liberty and the Constitution.

Steve Tyler, who has addressed the board in the past about gold mining and dredging issues said, “We’ve been remiss in avoiding Agenda 21 whose sole point is to destroy this country, destruction by the corruption of the EPA, department of Fish and Game” and similar agencies.

A number of speakers demanded that the board withdraw the county’s membership in the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), which is a regional planning and action group. Some planning and development issues such as housing and transportation are organized and administered through SACOG.

Kathleen Newell urged opposition to the U.N. and Agenda 21, which would otherwise impose socialism and “choke us with regulations” and pushed supervisors to “set a date to have this on the agenda.”

Candidate for District 3 supervisor, Sue Taylor, called the Agenda 21 “guide to sustainable development, a threat to our Constitution and a compromise of our independence.” She cautioned the board to be careful about acquiescing to “global policy.”

Jaimie Beutler had a different take on the matter. She said so much “fear and misunderstanding is sad” and advised that the whole issue should be considered incrementally as specific problems to be addressed. As a whole, she called it simply an “ideological stance” that includes some “darn good ideas.”

“Some things are handled better at a regional level and some at the local level, but we all need to work together,” Beutler concluded.

Melody Lane of Coloma described Agenda 21 as having “many tentacles” that reach down even into local affairs. And while it represents a “threat to our Constitution,” she also stressed that the board should “deal with the realities and not the conspiracies of Agenda 21.”

Supervisors eventually voted unanimously to “continue” the matter.