

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.AMERICANPOLICY.ORG

Revolution Takes Time and Planning *WE'VE ONLY JUST BEGUN*

By Tom DeWeese

It is now obvious that Rep. Ron Paul will not be elected President of the United States in November 2008. There are those who have predicted that the Republic will die if Paul is not occupying the White House next January. A dire prediction, most certainly overstated, but considering the candidates left in the offering, it can be said with equal certainty that the Republic is going to be severely damaged by the next administration.

Rather than throw ourselves in a fetal position and wait for Armageddon, now is the time to make some concrete, long term plans to assure we can elect the next Ron Paul. That, in fact, is exactly what Rep. Paul had in mind when he started his campaign in the first place.

Without getting involved in the dynamics of party politics and the Herculean task involved in gaining control of a national party, let me offer three ideas that the average Ron Paul true believer can do right there on the local level.

First, every true believer in the Ron Paul Revolution must understand exactly what it is we are revolting over and then begin to control the debate. We should make sure that the other side does not dictate the way issues are framed. Today, Clinton/Obama/McCain gives us a false choice – they call it security. Security from terrorism; security from the unknown such as the dips and spins of uncontrolled free markets; security through free universal health care and so forth.

In fact, the real debate is a choice of freedom vs. control. National IDs won't protect us against terrorism or illegal immigration. It is never safer to lock ourselves in a cell. The illegals should feel the heat for their actions - not average, law abiding Americans. Controlling our borders isn't racism; it's about the rule of law. Just because someone announces a new program to "protect the environment" doesn't mean it's true. Government control of the economy is not a good thing

– ever. And there is nothing patriotic about the Patriot Act.

The average American wants freedom – if he understands what it is. And he doesn't want government intervention into daily life. Eighty percent of the American people oppose amnesty for illegal aliens. The same numbers are vitally concerned about the Supreme Court decision on eminent domain. But so many of these core issues have either been ignored in the political debate or they are being whitewashed as protection policy. We have to change that perception and we can't sell our revolution until we do.

Second: One has to plan for a revolution five years in advance – not five months before an election. One of the reasons Ron Paul's campaign did not catch on is because the media marginalized him from the start. They called him fringe, long shot or maverick. And they said it over and over. While the true believers called it censorship and insisted that Ron Paul had more support than the media reported, the fact is, when the votes were counted he became a five percenter – just as the media had predicted. As that happened in primary after primary, Paul was ever more dismissed.

However, had he surged in the

IN THIS ISSUE:

4. ABSOLUTES:

UN's World Heritage Sites
Infringe on US National
Sovereignty

6. INSIDERS REPORT:

Agenda 21 or Freedom 21 -
Connecting the Dots to Tyranny

8. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:

Property Rights vs. Bread Lines

polls and dominated in the primaries – just like Obama – the media would have been forced to report it and the revolution would have caught on, whether they liked it or not. How to make that happen? Start now for the next time.

While so many are lamenting that the Republic is dead, we are ignoring the very silver bullet that the Founding Fathers provided to assure a Republic everlasting by making government at the local level the most powerful force. The silver bullet is still there, rusting in the dust from lack of use.

The silver bullet is precinct captain. You scoff? You were hoping for something more exciting? Well, that's probably the very reason we've ignored it. We would much rather turn our attention to Washington, Congress or presidential campaigns. Frankly that's the very reason why those offices are so much more powerful than they are supposed to be – because we've let them become so by placing all of our attention on them while ignoring local organization and involvement in government.

But the power still lies in the precinct captain. Our opponents know it. They have left no lowly office untouched. Every office has power to impose policy, even dogcatcher, city treasurer and city clerk. The people who collect taxes and issue permits control building, development and how private property is treated. Start there and then move up to city council and mayor.

How important are these local offices? Consider this. Just two years ago the United Nations held a major conference in San Francisco on a policy called Sustainable Development. This is a policy of top-down government control that eliminates private property rights, makes limited government impossible and promotes the establishment of non-elected regional government to impose it - in short - everything Ron Paul's revolution is supposed to stop.

At the UN conference the main targets were the mayors. Those who attended were asked to sign two documents in

which the mayors pledged to undertake 21 action items over the next few years to implement Sustainable Development. These action items include water policy, energy policy, transportation and health. They were provided sample legislation and pledged to enact it.

Our enemies know that the power to impose this tyranny on us is now at the local level. And that's where they are concentrating their efforts. So it will do little good to spend time trying to stop them through Congress or the White House.

What does the UN understand that you and I don't? That it doesn't matter what Washington policy is, they will just get the local communities to do it – because the towns and cities have the power to decide for themselves. That's how the Founding Fathers intended it.

Think globally act locally is not just a slogan. It's an agenda. It's been used against us to diminish our freedom because we have neglected it. Now, to save our Republic and way of life we need to make it our agenda.

How to get started? Make a chart of every single elected position available in your county. Break it down to the precinct level and then to the ward level. List every office, every board position, and every neighborhood precinct position. Now you will begin to see how large a task it is. But take it one step at a time and start to fill those spots. You need to find a leader for every neighborhood or precinct who will carry literature, make phone calls and turn out voters on Election Day. One of the most common reasons people gave for not voting for Ron Paul is that they never heard of him. A good precinct captain can make sure that never happens again.

Now, as you are organizing the precincts, use that now found network to begin to elect revolution-minded candidates for the local offices. Work quietly. Please don't hold a news conference to announce to the community that you intend to take it over. Work through whatever party you

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 14, No. 5 May 2008

Published by
American Policy Center

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Copy Editor
Virginia DeWeese

Correspondence/Fulfillment
Sascha McGuckin
Carolyn DeWeese

Graphics/Layout
Kristy Wilson

The DeWeese Report
70 Main Street, Suite 23
Warrenton, VA 20186

Phone: (540) 341-8911
Fax: (540) 341-8917

E-mail:
ampolicycenter@hotmail.com

Web Page:
www.americanpolicy.org

© 2008 American Policy Center
ISSN 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

Newsletter of the
American Policy Center

Permission to photocopy, reprint and quote articles from The DeWeese Report is hereby granted, provided full acknowledgment is included. All reprinted articles must say: "Written by Tom DeWeese, editor of The DeWeese Report (unless another author is listed). All reprints must carry The DeWeese Report address and phone number. Samples of the reprint must be provided to The DeWeese Report.

want – even the Democrats. The goal is to get our people, who support the principles of the Ron Paul Revolution, into places of decision making. It would be a dream to have candidates from every party running on the same issues. It's a goal to shoot for. The other side seems to have achieved it.

Take over a precinct – just one. You will control the election of every candidate at every level – at least in your part of the city. Then organize a second precinct, and so on. You will need the precinct worker to make sure voters get to the polls. You will need poll watchers to make sure our votes are counted. Plan your work, work your plan and make our issues the ones people care about. It's hard work, but that's how a real revolution wins.

Third, pay attention to non-elected review boards, policy committees and planning commissions. Can you get one of your people on it? Who is doing the appointing? Get on the board and control policy - or better yet, make moves to abolish the board as unnecessary or unconstitutional. And don't stop there.

You need to have the ability to create controversy against policies by current office holders. This will help you find like-minded folks to join you. And it will help create public debates on issues so your candidates can address them and win. Remember, most people would oppose many of these policies if they knew anything about them. Tell them.

Consider this idea: if your local farm bureau or Chamber of Commerce, for example, isn't representing you – start new ones. Understand this – you don't have to just take their double-dealing and double speak. Go around them. Show up at council meetings, or at meetings of any agency or board that purports to make policy that affects you.

As a new group representing business interests, homeowners, or farmers, demand your say. Back up your demands by issuing news releases and doing interviews on local radio and television as you represent your new group. Over and over again repeat the message that the governing body isn't representing the interests of your constituents. If you make enough noise as a group, which is truly standing up for farmers or business or property owners, those victimized individuals will find you and follow your efforts. And the revolution grows.

Organizing today is the only way to assure victory tomorrow.



PROPERTY RIGHTS... (Cont'd from Page 8)

They cannot use the equity in their homes (because there is none) for starting or expanding businesses. There are no legal records of their ownership. There is no way to leverage it. As de Soto explains it, they live in an extralegal universe that runs parallel to ours.

De Soto says this dead-equity in the Third World adds up to some 9.3 trillion dollars. "This is a number worth pondering: \$9.3 trillion is about twice as much as the total circulating US money supply. It is very nearly as much as the total value of all the companies listed on the main stock exchanges of the world's twenty most developed counties: New York, Tokyo, London, Frankfurt, Toronto, Paris, Milan, the NASDAQ, and a dozen others. It is more than twenty times the total direct foreign investment into all Third World and former communist countries in the ten years after 1989, forty-six times as much as all the World Bank loans of the past three decades, and ninety-three times as much as all development assistance from all advanced countries to the Third World in the same period."^[3]

Read that paragraph again. Let it sink in. Shocking. Eye-opening. So why aren't these people joining the legal economy? Do they really want to remain in the extralegal society? No, they would move into the legal community if there were the mechanisms in place to facilitate it. But as de Soto notes, "As things stand, the creation of one integrated property system in non-Western nations is impossible."^[4]

His plan is so good that he is helping establish property rights reform programs in over 20 countries and has more than 50 heads-of-state asking him to help them.

De Soto's solution is neither left-wing nor right-wing. But it is definitely free-market capitalism, not socialism. And it is not based on raising millions of dollars to feed people for a day or a week. If the organizations that are raising all of this money for the bread lines truly cared about helping the poor, they would run a dual effort; one to provide emergency aid for the moment; the other to create a process to give the people the ability to help themselves.

But I think a key factor of their resistance to such an effort is that de Soto's solution relies on property rights and private ownership and many of the people who work for the established charity organizations don't believe in the right to private property. They have very grave opposition to supporting something that might allow a huge portion of the poor in the world to leave the breadlines to make their own way if that means is capitalism and property ownership.

So, while these self-sustaining do-gooders are pretending to help the poor and starving peoples of the world, other organizations and people will have to come to the fore and really start helping these needy people. For that to happen, new organizations will have to take up efforts to assure de Soto's solution will reach more areas of the world. De Soto's answer to poverty will spread, is spreading. But not fast enough.

We need to have his ideas taught in our colleges and universities. His book must be promoted; it should be a best-seller.

Remember, without the right to private property, people are not free. Allowing all the people of the world to be free would promote peace far faster and more permanently than any accord.

Kathleen Marquardt is Vice President of the American Policy Center and news editor for Freedom21.com. She is the author of the best selling book, "Animal Scam".

³ De Soto, Hernando, *The Mystery of Capital*, Basic Books, p.35

⁴ *Ibid* p. 162



ABSOLUTES....!

UN's World Heritage Sites Infringe on US National Sovereignty

By Tom DeWeese

Many Americans have been disturbed to find that there are 22 areas in this nation that have been designated as United Nations' World Heritage Sites. These sights are natural places such as parks or cultural monuments like Thomas Jefferson's home, Monticello.

As a result of a UN treaty called "The Convention Concerning Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage," these sites come under the jurisdiction of the United Nations' Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Such designations have been the source of major debate as to whether the UN has infringed on sovereign American territory.

However, the debate may be about to rage even hotter. Because Interior Secretary Dirk Kempthorne has just announced his selections of 14 more sites to be considered for nomination by UNESCO as World Heritage Sites.

Today, of the original 22 UN Heritage Sites that are located on American soil, fully 68 percent of American national parks, preserves and monuments are included in the UN designations.

The new sites will include Dayton, Ohio Wright Brothers-related aviation sites; Civil Rights Movement sites in Alabama; George Washington's home, Mount Vernon in Virginia; Hopewell Indian Ceremonial Sites in my home town of Newark, Ohio; and the Virginia State Capitol building in Richmond, to name just a few of the selected sites. These will be added to the existing list that includes Independence Hall, Yellowstone Park and the Statue of Liberty.

Proponents of the UN Heritage Sites say such designations are nothing more than a great "honor" to the nation. They assure us that there is no threat to American sovereignty and that all designated sites remain firmly under control of the United States government.

If true, then the question must be asked, why is an international treaty with the United Nations necessary? The United States has already designated most of the

UN Heritage Sites as United States parks or preserved historic sites. The land is already being preserved and protected for AMERICAN heritage purposes. These lands are valuable for their historical significance to this nation.

REPEAT: WHY DO WE NEED AN INTERNATIONAL TREATY TO DO WHAT THE UNITED STATES HAS ALREADY DONE FOR ITSELF?

WHO OWNS WORLD HERITAGE SITES?

It is true that you will not find any UN documents clearly stating that the world body controls or owns American soil through the World Heritage Site Treaty. It is also true that you will not find blue-helmeted UN soldiers standing guard over any of the sites.

To fully understand the threat to American sovereignty posed by the UN designation of World Heritage Sites, one must first link this program to a series of other treaties and policies, and how they impact American sovereignty. Above all, one must understand that many in our government see such programs as another tool to build massive federal land-control programs.

There is strong evidence of close collaboration between the U.S. Park Service and the UNESCO World Heritage Site Committee. There is also strong evidence that the designation of UN World Heritage Sites goes hand in hand with the Administration's Sustainable Development program. That program is nothing less than a massive federal zoning program that dictates property development on the local level, in the name of protecting the environment. The goal of Sustainable Development is to lock up vast areas of American land, and shield it from private use.

The designation of United Nations' World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves can and does result in the centralization of policy-making authority at the federal level, particularly by the Executive Branch. Once a UN designation is made and accepted by the Federal Government there is literally no opportunity

...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

for private American land owners to dispute it or undo the designation.

Private property rights literally disappear, not only in the officially designated area, but worse, in buffer zones OUTSIDE the designated area. Not only has the federal government been using these treaties and agreements to limit access to, and use of these lands to all Americans, but they also have used the UN designations to limit use of private property OUTSIDE the boundaries of the site.

That is exactly what happened outside of Yellowstone National Park (a World Heritage Site) when UNESCO delegates were called in by the Park Service in an attempt to stop the development of a gold mine - located OUTSIDE the park. The UNESCO delegates declared Yellowstone to be the first “endangered” World Heritage Site and called for a protective buffer zone of 150-MILES IN DIAMETER AROUND THE ENTIRE PARK. The buffer zone would stop development and access to millions of acres of private property. Such is the purpose of the World Heritage Sites.

Moreover, in becoming party to these international land-use designations through Executive Branch action, the United States is indirectly agreeing to terms of international treaties, such as the Biodiversity Treaty - a UN treaty that has never been ratified by the United States Senate.

Nevertheless, in 1994, the U.S. State Department published the “Strategic Plan for the U.S. Biosphere Reserve Program.” Taken straight from the unratified Biodiversity Treaty, the State Department program is to “create a national network of biosphere reserves that represents the biogeographical diversity of the United States and fulfills the internationally established roles and functions of biosphere reserves.”

A chief tactic used by the UN and the Federal Government when designating a biosphere reserve or a World Heritage Site is to rarely involve or consult with the public and local governments. In fact, UNESCO policy actually discourages an open nomination for World Heritage Sites. The “Operational Guidelines for the Implementations of the World Heritage Convention” states:

“In all cases, as to maintain the objectivity of the

evaluation process and to avoid possible embarrassment to those concerned, State (national) parties should refrain from giving undue publicity to the fact that a property has been nominated inscription pending the final decision of the Committee of the nomination in question. Participation of the local people in the nomination process is essential to make them feel a shared responsibility with the State party in the maintenance of the site, but should not prejudice future decision-making by the committee.”

In other words, the nominating committee is to hide the fact that a massive land grab is about to take place. Then, at the appropriate moment, the committee is to involve some local yokels to make them think they have something to say about the grab, then send them away, so that the committee can move ahead, unhindered. They aren’t supposed to worry about the fact that private landowners have just lost control of their property.

This is not the way the U.S. Constitution says things should be done. This is how despots at the United Nations run things. The Administration is allowing them to do it for the sake of more Federal power.

By allowing these international land use designations, the United States promises to protect the sites and REGULATE surrounding lands if necessary to protect the UN-designated area. Honoring these agreements forces the Federal Government to PROHIBIT or limit some uses of private lands outside the international designated area UNLESS OUR COUNTRY WANTS TO BREAK A PLEDGE TO OTHER NATIONS.

In a nutshell, here is the real game being played. Through such policies, the Federal Government is binding our nation to international treaties and agreements that stipulate that the United States will manage these lands in a prescribed manner in order to achieve certain international goals and objectives. In other words, we have agreed to limit our right of sovereignty over these lands.

That is why it is charged that World Heritage Sites are an infringement on United States sovereignty. You won’t find the smoking gun by reading the treaties. It can only be found in understanding the “intent” and the “implementation” of the policies.



INSIDER'S REPORT

Agenda 21 or Freedom 21 Connecting the Dots to Tyranny

By Tom DeWeese

Which do you choose? A way of life where you are the master of your destiny, or one where virtually all decisions are made for you by one ruling body or another? It's the classic struggle facing every human on earth. Freedom or control.

Truth be known, there are many who actually choose control. It makes for a well-ordered society with few surprises. In a controlled society, one doesn't have to make complicated career choices, health care is provided.

Community planners decide where housing will be placed. Committees decide what industries are to be allowed and how they will operate. Self-appointed watchdogs decide the foods that you shall be permitted to eat, to protect our health, of course.

Family planners decide the number of children allowed and how they will be raised. Those children, of course, will be well taken care of every day in public education centers that not only provide a centrally planned curriculum, but also provide for all physical and mental health needs.

Crime can be eliminated in the coming Utopia because there will be no real possessions or personal property to steal and no personally owned weapons to threaten the authority of the State. Economic security is promised in a better world as everyone equally sacrifices their earned wealth to the State so all may live in harmony, free of greed and the stress of daily living. Everything is well organized, peaceful and controlled. Everyone is secure in the knowledge that tomorrow will be just like today.

On the other hand, there is the chaos of what some call freedom. In such a society, people are fully responsible for their own actions. Untethered individuals throw a monkey wrench into a well-ordered society by inventing new gadgets that make life easier and more productive, but threaten old ways.

"Selfish" people pursue their own dreams and ideals without ever worrying about how they fit into the order created by the State. They want to benefit from the fruits of their labor, own property and raise families without controls established from the wisdom of the community.

Imagine such a society in which parents get to decide how best to educate their children. And think of the irresponsibility of individuals actually being able to choose if and how they want to invest their money to prepare for retirement. In the so-called free society, people eat what they want without benefit of government approval. Children are part of the family that bore them, not overseen by the State. People start enterprises without asking permission. Nothing stays the same, except

that individuals are secure in their homes and have the ability to live their lives as they choose.

Control today has a name. "Agenda 21." This is the name of a policy document first unveiled at the United Nations' Earth Summit in 1992. Implementation of the treaty is through a policy called Sustainable Development. This program is now the official policy of the United States and is being systematically imposed in every single state of the Union and in every city and town. There are very few exceptions. Sustainable Development is no less than a ruling principle through which decisions for all aspects of our lives are determined through public/private partnerships between government (at all levels) and private institutions in our communities. They provide guidelines to determine business decisions; property use; medical care; education curriculum; foreign policy; economics; taxes; labor policy; career decisions; housing; building material; farming policy; and much more. Agenda 21 is based on the principle that government is the maker of rights.

If you choose freedom, then there is a counter to Agenda 21 and its Sustainable Development program. It's called Freedom 21, and it's quickly growing into a "freedom movement." Freedom 21 is not an organization. It is a loose coalition of groups and individuals who believe that our nation's Founding Fathers had it right when they established this nation as one with tightly controlled reins on government. The Founding Fathers believed that all individuals were born with their rights of individual liberty, and that government's job is to protect those rights as individuals pursue their own dreams and goals. That's the basis for the Freedom 21 agenda.

Freedom 21 was organized nine years ago by Henry Lamb (Environmental Conservation Organization), Tom DeWeese (American Policy Center), Craig Rucker and David Rothbard (Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow), and representatives of Eagle Forum. Today, this group is joined by The Chicago-based Heartland Institute, Edwatch of Minnesota, Freedom Advocates from Santa Cruz, California, Sovereignty International, Stewards of the Range, OKSAFE of Oklahoma, and the American Land Foundation, based in Texas.

The unique fact about Freedom 21 is that it is truly a grassroots coalition. It has no central infrastructure; no official leader; no budget; no overhead; and no bureaucracy. The co-sponsors are independent organizations which do not give up their individual identity or autonomy to participate in Freedom 21 activities. It succeeds precisely because members are open

to the activities of others and are happy to lend their support. The coalition operates under a set of principles of freedom, first adopted by activists in a July, 2000 conference.

In its first eight years, the Freedom 21 Campaign has served as a mechanism for reaching out to the freedom movement to share ideas and unite grassroots activists. Through Freedom 21 projects and conferences, the movement has been able to introduce leaders in other movements to the principles of freedom and the threat of policies like Sustainable Development. Even more important, one-issue activists are beginning to learn that they share common goals and adversaries with other grassroots movements. Freedom 21 has been instrumental in uniting Second Amendment defenders; property rights activists; free market advocates; tax opponents; personal privacy protectors; family autonomy champions; back-to-basics education activists, and many more. These single-issue activists have come to understand that they all share a common foe in Sustainable Development.

Today, Freedom 21 is providing invaluable tools to help fight back against the threat of the UN's Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development. Four years ago, Freedom 21 leaders developed a six-hour DVD presentation entitled, "Americas' Choice: Liberty or Sustainable Development," designed to help educate activists and elected officials. That DVD is still the most comprehensive presentation on the subject. The DVD was followed with production of a booklet for elected officials entitled, "Understanding Sustainable Development: A Guide for Public Officials."

In 2005, Freedom 21 turned its efforts toward creating new sources to help fund a cash-starved freedom movement. In 2007, the Freedom21 Credit Union opened its doors, offering a unique opportunity for depositors, through the credit union, to help fund the organizations of their choice. Freedom21 has also created its own travel agency to help members and supporters receive discounted travel to conferences and other personal destinations. Also in 2005, Freedom21.com was opened as a unique international news outlet, featuring news, commentary and

action alerts for issues both domestic and international, focusing on property rights, privacy rights, sovereignty and much more.

The most important project each year is the Freedom 21 national conference, this year scheduled for July 24 to 26 in Dallas, Texas. This year's conference will "connect the dots" to show how the UN's Agenda 21 and its policy of Sustainable Development – are directly connected to front page issues like global warming, education, gun control, animal rights, monetary policy, religion, national ID cards, the Security and Prosperity Partnership, the Trans Texas Corridor, and judicial tyranny. It will surprise many to learn that Sustainable Development is really at the root of so many of the problems that threaten our liberty.

The conference will feature addresses by Phyllis Schlafly, Michael Coffman, Larry Pratt of Gun Owners of America, and myself. Attendees will have the unique opportunity to enjoy the banquet dinner with featured guest Jerome Corsi along with Representative Ron Paul and Representative Michele Bachmann. Participants will be able to attend special workshops to learn how to fight back locally against about the Trans Texas Corridor and gun control and learn from experts how to deal with state legislatures. In addition, three state legislators, Arizona State Senator Karen Johnson, Oklahoma State Senator Randy Brogdon and Pennsylvania State Representative Sam Rohrer will focus on state efforts to stop the Real ID Act and the SPP. Allen Quist and Mike Chapman from Edwatch will present documentation on public education's ties to Sustainable Development. In addition, Marc Morano from the office of Senator James Inhofe will dispute the message of Al Gore's film, "An Inconvenient Truth." The conference educates, unites, inspires, and renews the spirit. Go to www.freedom21.org for all the details. Freedom 21 is the gathering place for the freedom movement.

Collectivism, and its false promise of security, may be the accepted policy of the day, but the freedom movement is learning how to fight back. You can join the fight by registering to attend the 9th Annual Freedom 21 National Conference. 

Register Now for the 9th Annual Freedom 21 National Conference

You're Invited to attend:

What: 9th Annual Freedom21 National Conference

When: July 24-26, 2008

Where: Crowne Plaza Hotel - North Dallas, Texas

Have Dinner with:



Dr. Jerome Corsi **Representative Ron Paul** **Representative Michele Bachmann**

Full Registration Includes:

- All conference sessions
- 3 special training workshops
- All breaks and meal funtions
- Thursday night reception featuring singer Jim Worthing
- Friday lunch with Phyllis Schlafly
- Friday night banquet with Jerome Corsi, Representative Ron Paul and Representative Michele Bachmann

Early Bird Special until April 30th ONLY \$225

After May 1st registration is \$275

For full conference schedule and registration information visit www.freedom21.org or call (731) 986-0099. Send registration to:

Freedom21 Conference
PO Box 191
Hollow Rock, TN 38342

SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY

PROPERTY RIGHTS VS. BREAD LINES

By Kathleen Marquardt

When I was young, if I didn't eat all my dinner my mother would say, "Think of all the starving people in China." Today I'm sure parents are prompting their children to clean their plates by invoking Darfur, or Bangladesh or Kosovo. The admonishment means the same as it did way back when I was a child. And, as then, eating all of one's food or not would have absolutely no effect on hungry people in China, Africa, or anywhere else in the world.

For decades we have been trying to end world hunger and poverty. Hundreds of organizations in the world - many in the United States - have raised hundreds of millions of dollars, with which they have purchased tons of wheat and other food to send to countries in Africa and other parts of the world in attempts to nourish the hungry. But as the food feeds starving people while it lasts - days, weeks, perhaps even months - so far few attempts have been geared to long-term solutions.

Even ignoring the huge amounts of food and money that is diverted to the pockets of corrupt politicians and bureaucrats, the food that does make it to its intended destinations provides little relief. While it may stave off hunger for a short while, it causes more problems than it solves.

When the people are given free food, they then have little need or desire to purchase foods from their local farmers. Thus the local farmers can't compete with the subsidy and so go broke and are forced out of farming. So instead of feeding the hungry until the local communities can support themselves, the effort kills any lasting chance of a long-term, self-sustaining solution.

One would think that with knowledge of this dynamic, those charitable organizations would want to reconsider their methods of providing aid to these countries, instead, they themselves have a strong desire to keep this cycle going. In order for them to become powerful in the world of Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) associated with the United Nations, they must grow in size and influence. To grow they must constantly raise more and more money. And to keep their own jobs safe, they feel that they have to perpetuate something they know is less than a band-aid (a band-aid protects while the problem heals; nothing they are doing is healing the starving). So they continue with programs that they know are deleterious.

Instead of providing the people with the necessary tools to create wealth on their own so they can be self-sustaining, they send piles of food off to Africa or some other politically correct hotspot where the suffering of the poor is making headlines. Rather than relieve the suffering, the process actually creates a system of life-long breadlines.

We want to assume that these NGOs are not trying to keep

the people they purport to help in poverty; that they just don't understand what needs to be done to eradicate the starvation and poverty of these Third World nations, so they keep doing what they know how to do - and, more importantly - what will keep them in business.

Walter Williams writes, "Africa is the world's most natural-resources rich continent. It has 50% of the world's gold, most of the world's diamonds and chromium, 90% of the cobalt, 40% of the world's potential hydroelectric power, 65% of the manganese, and millions of acres of untilled farmland, as well as other natural resources. Before independence, every African country was self-sufficient in food production; today, many depend on imports and others stand at the brink of famine."^[1]

With all of these resources, why isn't Africa thriving? Probably the same dynamic working in the US's welfare system is what is going on there, just with a lot more corruption. Here people stay on the dole sometimes for their entire lives; the government - or the charities - "take care of them." The truth is, most people do not want to live this way; they want to determine their own futures. They just don't have the tools to gain their personal independence.

According to Williams, "The worst thing the West can do to Africa is to give more foreign aid. For the most part, foreign aid is government to government. As such, it provides the financial resources that enable Africa's grossly corrupt and incompetent regimes to buy military equipment, pay off cronies and continue to oppress their people. It also provides resources for the leaders to live lavishly and set up "retirement" accounts in foreign banks."^[2]

Hernando de Soto, a Peruvian economist who is President of the Institute for Liberty & Democracy in Lima, began studying the problem of poverty from his own backyard. He desired to help Peru's poor join the legal economy but he needed a plan, a map to take people out of the ghettos and into the legitimate world economy.

De Soto explains his search and his ultimate solution in his ground-breaking book, "The Mystery of Capitalism". To make a long story short, his solution is private property rights backed by the rule of law.

All over the Third World citizens own their homes and lands and businesses, but only in the eyes of their immediate neighbors. They are off the books. De Soto calls this dead equity. They live in their homes, work their lands, run their businesses and put their money in their mattresses or a hole in the ground.

¹ Williams, Walter E., *Africa A tragic Continent*, February 27, 2008, *Townhall*

² *Ibid*