

# THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 17 - Issue 8

September 2011

## New strategies in the fight to stop Agenda 21

By Tom DeWeese

Plantation, Florida has just voted to NOT renew its ICLEI contract. That's the eighth community in eight months to take such action. Plantation joins the growing list that includes Carroll County, MD; Amador County, CA; Edmond, OK; Las Cruces, NM; Spartanburg, SC and Albemarle, VA.

This is wonderful, positive news, indicating that more and more elected officials are starting to hear our arguments against this wrenching transformation of our country. For the first time I'm getting calls and letters from elected officials asking for more information. I am getting invitations to appear on new radio shows that have never aired this issue before. In June, I was contacted by the Glenn Beck show as he prepared an entire program on Agenda 21. He even linked APC information to his blog. I've now been contacted by one leading presidential candidate, along with a possible major donor who is considering helping us fund the fight. In addition to all of that, daily I hear from an ever growing list of activists working in their communities to stop Agenda 21. A revolution is certainly under way across the country.

However, as we are gaining success, we are also beginning to face stiffer resistance from the proponents of Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development. More than ever we are hearing their charges of "conspiracy theories," "fringe nuts," and "extremism." It's to be expected. We are openly challenging them and they are feeling the heat. That means, as we move forward, it's vitally important that anti-Agenda 21 activist be very careful with how

they approach local government to express their opposition.

I'm finding that there is a bit of a misconception in regard to one of the main proponents of Agenda 21, and it is hurting our ability to make progress in the fight. It is vitally important that we all get the following facts right when launching our attacks against ICLEI. Please read carefully. The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) has been a main target by the anti-Agenda 21 forces. We targeted ICLEI because it has a clear United Nations connection, making it easier for us to make our case to elected officials about the UN connection to Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development policy. However, some have misunderstood the ICLEI role and have misrepresented who it is and what it does. The result, in some cases, is that our legitimate arguments have been be ignored and even laughed at.

Let me try to set the record straight and provide some ideas on how to deal with the ICLEI situation. First, the following facts are certainly true and need to be understood by all anti-Agenda 21 activists: ICLEI is a UN NGO organization that helped write Agenda 21 for the 1992 Earth Summit and then set, as its mission, to bring Agenda 21 policy to every city in the world. It does this by meeting with local officials, signing contracts with them to set standards for energy and water use, building and development codes, farming policy, etc. It brings in training for city hall staff; soft ware to manage the programs; guidelines for legislation; networking with other communities, other NGO and Stakeholder groups and other agencies of

*Continued on page 2*

## New strategies to stop Agenda 21

*Continued from page 1*

state and federal government. They reach out to other public officials in the communities, including newspaper editors, school superintendents, local college presidents, and chamber of commerce leaders – all designed to assure everyone who helps make decisions and policy in the community are on board. And of course, ICLEI leads the officials to the most important ingredient to impose Agenda 21 – money - grant money that comes with specific strings to guarantee that Agenda 21 is enforced. That grant money is like heroin in the veins. Once there, the addiction and dependency is in force. Once ICLEI has done its job, the community is hooked, and an entirely new attitude and community atmosphere of top-down control is enforced by the government. ICLEI's influence basically creates an entirely new culture in the community where it becomes natural and basically unquestioned to expect local government to be involved in every aspect of your property, job, family and your whole life.

Now, that's what ICLEI does and that's why we targeted it and why it is so dangerous. However, the manner in which we expose and oppose ICLEI is very important and I have heard some enthusiastic activist go about it in a damaging and ineffective way. First, ICLEI is **NOT** the United Nations, as I have heard some charge before city councils. It is a private organization with its own agenda – of course it is promoting Agenda 21. But to say the city council is paying dues to the UN is just not accurate.

Another misconception is that ICLEI IS Agenda 21 and if the

community stops paying dues and ends their contract with ICLEI the battle is over. I am receiving messages from people who are dismayed to learn their community is still moving forward with Sustainable Development programs even after they ended the contract with ICLEI. The fact is, ending the contract with ICLEI is just the first punch. From there you must be active in an effort to undo any programs ICLEI helped put in place. That includes changing the very culture of City Hall and its ICLEI-trained staff. It means an active campaign to dismantle non-elected boards and councils that are the prime source for enforcement of policy. It means removing your community from regional government councils. And it probably means electing new officials who oppose the Agenda 21 policy and have the ability and courage to stand up to an assault by federal and state agencies who will not be happy that you are rejecting their agenda. And through all of that you will have to be prepared to counter the attacks from the entrenched NGOs and the lackeys down at the local paper. Withdrawal from the drug of Agenda 21 can be deadly.

Finally, I believe there is a more effective way to attack Agenda 21/ Sustainable Development polices in your community, at least initially. You may be fired up about the UN, but others are not. As I wrote a few months ago in my article "How to Fight Back Against Sustainable Development," rather than rushing into city hall and immediately start accusing them of implementing a UN program, take some time to research the policy being proposed or implemented. Determine the effect it will have on the community or your property. Who else will be affected and how?

*Continued to Page 7*

## DeWeese Report

Vol. 17, No. 8  
September 2011

Published by  
The DeWeese  
Company, Inc.

Editor  
Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/  
Fulfillment  
Lola Jane Craig  
Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout  
CJ Scrofani  
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report  
PO Box 3598  
Warrenton, VA 20188

Phone: (540) 422 - 2082

Web Page:  
[www.deweesereport.com](http://www.deweesereport.com)

Copy write  
2011 The DeWeese  
Company, Inc.  
Issn 1086-7937  
All Rights Reserved

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 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

# ICLEI: Research, Education, Action and Risks at the Local Level – Basic First Steps

*Many activists have asked for guidelines and specific details on how to fight back against ICLEI. Below is a step-by-step guideline from Stacy Lynne, an activist from Colorado who has been in the trenches and knows the subject first hand. She's done it. Follow her steps and if necessary, contact her directly for more ideas. TAD*

## Basic Process

The following list outlines the process of exposing the International Council on Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI); it has been used in Fort Collins, Colorado. Other cities in Colorado and throughout the United States are beginning to use this process. One reason it is successful at generating interest is due to the local focus. People can relate to the issues that directly and negatively affect them on a daily basis. They feel the pain and see the damage.

## Keep the Focus Local: It's What Speaks to People

1. Conduct open records access requests. This is a legal process designed to protect our rights to access public information. It is very inexpensive and effective at holding local governments accountable.
  - a. For excellent help with this, please visit the website of Student Press Law Center. There is an automatic letter generator on that site which can help with the process.
  - b. In your first open records request, ask for “any and all documents and communications related to or concerning the organization called ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability.”
  - c. The information you receive as a result of your first open records request will be the starting point for connecting the networks of corruption.
2. Focus on the facts. This makes it impossible for libel and slander charges to be legitimately and successfully filed against you. Adding opinion and/or rhetoric increases your risk of being sued.
3. Attend council meetings and commission meetings. Read the agendas.
4. Listen for sustainability buzzwords at public meetings.
5. Ask local elected officials to make public statements of their support or nonsupport of ICLEI.
6. When speaking about ICLEI, tell fact-based stories using real examples. Use your passion methodically.
7. Research local environmental groups. These are the powerful and effective “stakeholders” who pressure your local officials into adopting ICLEI’s plans.
8. Read your local climate action plan/local environmental action plan/city plan, etc. Research who prepared the report, who paid for the report, and learn how the report plans will impact people.
9. Read your local budget; watch for triple bottom line budgeting process. Follow the money and total the amount being spent on sustainability or green programs. Include salaries of the employee who implement those programs in the total budget amounts.
10. Research which private companies are in partnership with local government (public/private partnerships). Those private companies are profiting from taxpayer money.
11. Obtain a list of local officials and staff who regularly work with ICLEI.
12. Retain all copies of information you are using to speak and/or write about ICLEI. If you use information from ICLEI’s website, print the documents for proof.
13. Ask your local government for the definition of “sustainable development” and “sustainability”.

# Sustainable Development means a wrenching transformation of your life

Rebuttal by  
Tom DeWeese

Recently W. Cecil Steward, dean emeritus of the UNL College of Architecture (Lincoln, Nebraska) launched what can only be described as a diatribe against a talk I gave recently in Lincoln. My topic was Sustainable Development and how it is transforming our nation. In his article, Mr. Steward, rather than provide any substance on the issue, prefers instead, to use words designed to paint me as an extremist playing on people's fear.

Specifically, Mr. Steward accuses me of misrepresenting Lincoln's local Comprehensive Development Plan, and its imposition of Sustainable Development as a "cover for a United Nations based international conspiracy..." I have worked on this issue for more than eighteen years and have routinely experienced similar attacks against my message and my character in cities where I have appeared. For some reason those working to enforce Sustainable Development policies scramble to discredit me and blow a well orchestrated smokescreen to cover their work. Apparently honest debate and disagreement are not part of their plans.

But debate and discussion is the traditional American way. I'll present my case point by point. First, there is a very clear connection between the United Nations and local Lincoln comprehensive development plans. The very term "Sustainable Development" first appeared in a 1987 report entitled "Our Common Future," produced by the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development. The term was first offered as official UN Policy in 1992 at the Earth Summit in a document that is today simply referred to as Agenda 21. IN their own words here is what proponents of Agenda 21 said it is: "*Agenda 21 proposes an array of actions which are intended to be implemented by EVERY person on Earth...it calls for specific changes in the activities if ALL people...Effective execution of Agenda 21 will REQUIRE a profound reorientation of ALL humans, unlike anything the world has ever experienced...*" Agenda 21: The Earth Summit Strategy to Save Our Planet (Earthpress, 1992).

At that Earth Summit, President George H.W. Bush signed American acceptance of the Agenda 21 plan. The next year, in compliance with Agenda 21, President Bill Clinton signed Executive Order 12858 establishing the "President's Council on Sustainable Development" in order to "harmonize" US development policy with UN policy as outlined in Agenda 21. The Executive Order directed all agencies of the Federal Government to work with state and local community governments in a joint effort to "reinvent" government using the guidelines outlined in Agenda 21.

What are these guidelines and policies, and do you see them today in Lincoln? Agenda 21 calls for reduction in energy use; reduction in water use; enforcement of alternative energy use, specifically wind and solar; controls over development, specifically the creation of mixed use neighborhoods that contain high-density housing units (high rise or extremely small lots) along with office space, stores and open space that will eliminate the use of cars; development of public transportation and high speed, light rail trains; etc. All of these policies are based on the scare tactic that man is creating global warming, a charge that is now in great disrepute throughout the world.

yet, proponents continue to press these policies. Literally everything related to sustainable policy leads to higher prices, shortages of goods and calls from planners for sacrifice by citizens.

In Lincoln, literally all of these Agenda 21 guidelines can now be found. Lincoln has "smart-growth" policies that enforce high-density housing with a mix of commercial and residential properties, bike-friendly streets, and walking space. The goal is to eliminate the use of cars as much as possible. Residents are instead encouraged to walk and ride bikes to work and shopping. Electric companies are now installing smart meters which take away homeowner control of electric use. Energy audits are being conducted to determine the energy efficiency of homes. If Lincoln follows suit of other cities that are using this practice to set energy reduction goals, then soon city government will set strict standards for energy use. Homeowners will have to spend thousands of dollars to comply.

## Sustainable Development

*Continued from page 4*

Non-compliance will bring fines. To enforce alternative energy schemes, there are plans to force homeowners to cut back trees in their yards in order to allow open access to solar panels on roofs. And, of course, there is the very important policy to force drivers to “share the road” with bikes – the “complete street,” they call it. In short, Lincoln sustainable policies match perfectly those outlined in Agenda 21. Coincidence?

The bottom line is, city planners, and those like Mr. Steward, have set themselves up as an elite force which believes it knows better how the rest of us should live. They have “reinvented” Lincoln government as top down control to enforce a life style on us, rooted in a one-size

fits all international policy called Agenda 21, on the excuse of a questionable environmental risk called Global Warming. And they certainly don’t want to be questioned by anyone as they do it.

Well, here are some very specific questions I would suggest every citizen of Lincoln ask their planners who are busying themselves in your personal lives: Ask them to name a single thing you can do on your private property without their permission. Ask them what guarantees for protection of private property rights they have included in their comprehensive plans. And above all, ask them, especially Mr. Steward, how often they ride their bikes to work.



## ***E-verify IS a threat to liberty!***

Rebuttal By  
Tom DeWeese

I don’t know Peter Gadiel, and he apparently knows absolutely nothing about me. But that hasn’t stopped him from attacking me in a recent article (Influential Conservative is Dangerously Wrong on E-Verify). His article makes some outrageous statements about me, even to presume he can tell you what motives are in my head when I take a position.

Recently, I released an article entitled “E-Verify and the Emerging Surveillance State.” My opposition to E-Verify is that it is a major tool in the creation of a surveillance society; will give the government the power to decide who works and who doesn’t in America; will be a great burden on both worker and business; and will do absolutely nothing to protect us from illegal immigration or terrorism. In short, E-Verify represents another false promise of security and a greater threat to our freedom.

In an article attacking my position, Mr. Gadiel contends that E-Verify has absolutely nothing to do with the creation of an international ID system. Moreover, he claims I offer no solutions to the illegal alien situation and implies that I am (at least secretly) in favor of the illegal invasion that is devastating our nation.

He opens his article against me by claiming that my opposition to E-Verify is “supposedly a libertarian perspective,” and indicates that is a bad thing. Though I never once used the term libertarian, I understand his reference to the libertarian position, in which some advocate open borders. He mistakenly places my opposition to government surveillance in the same category as open-border libertarians. As I said earlier, he obviously knows nothing about my position on this issue, though my record is very clear. I have written in a series of article over the past decade (available to all on [www.americanpolicy.org](http://www.americanpolicy.org)). All that is necessary to curb illegal immigration is for the federal government to enforce immigration laws already on the books. Secure the border; enforce visas; end free health care, free education and welfare to illegals; allow local jurisdictions to arrest illegals; and stop the merry-go-round game of deporting illegals only to have them return a few weeks later. Above all, when one commits a violent crime, prosecute and put them behind American bars.

It has been widely proven that when a jurisdiction decides to crack down on illegals they leave. Prince William County, Virginia is a perfect example of this, and so is the state of Arizona. Admittedly the Arizona law includes E-Verify, but it is not the reason the invasion of illegals has drastically dropped off in Arizona.

Rather than take these obvious and workable steps, forcing the federal government to do its proper job to enforce its laws, certain parts of the conservative movement, including Peter Gadiel, have opted instead to change the American judicial system from “innocent until proven guilty,” to “guilty until proven innocent.” Worse, the E-Verify system now forces those who started their own business to be the front lines in the battle against illegal immigration and terrorism, instead of government. We already made them the chief tax collector. Enough is enough.

*Continued to page 6*

**ICLEI:** *Continued from Page 3*

14. Photographs are powerful communication tools.
  - a. Tour your town, city and county to illustrate how ICLEI has invaded your community.
  - b. Relate those photos to ICLEI's Charter Principles.
  - c. Make poster boards with the photos to make powerful presentations.
15. Use scientific facts to educate local residents about the truth concerning recycling facts, global warming and climate change.
16. Use the recall process, ballot initiatives and community groups to remove ICLEI from your community.
17. Research the websites of: Michael Shaw, Dr. Stan Montieth, and Tom DeWeese. These are excellent resources for information about sustainability, Agenda 21, and ICLEI.

**What to Expect as You Begin**

1. You will be lied to by city officials on and off the record
2. You will be lied to by city employees (staff) who are working with ICLEI
3. Roadblocks and walls will be put in place
4. Deceptive information will be presented
5. City employees who know the truth will want you to fight ICLEI but they will not be able to publicly assist you
6. ICLEI will not be pleased with your efforts

**Local Focus = Personal Risks**

Tactics used by ICLEI and their associates to quiet the people who are exposing the truth include organized and malicious attacks. Well-scripted radical environmental groups will launch discrediting campaigns against you by using the local media. High-powered law firms will fabricate charges and investigate your actions. City government officials, working with the lobbying groups, law firms and the media will participate in these discrediting attempts. DR

**E - verify** *Continued from Page 5*

Concerning E-Verify's active role in the creation of an international surveillance system, Mr. Gadiel simply says it's not true. And he says E-Verify does not create a new data base for use in surveillance. Perhaps he should learn more about the international surveillance network that is being created with the cooperation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). What most Americans don't know is that the blue print for Real ID did not originate in the United States, but in the backrooms of a United Nations organization called the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). That organization is tasked with the goal of creating a one-size fits all international identification system using massive data banks that contain individual biometric information on nearly everyone in the world.

It is interesting to note that the DHS ordered specific changes to the E-Verify system to include biometric information and the use of enhanced photographs that measure and analyze the unique identifiable characteristics of a person's face into a numeric code, usable and in compliance with these international databases. That identifying facial number code is read by a computer and can track your face by cameras worldwide. In addition, DHS has expanded the number of data bases used by E-Verify to check on employees. Obviously DHS understands that E-Verify is to be used in that international system.

I have studied this surveillance system and the intention to create an international ID system for more than two decades. I have heard every lie and smooth talker assuring Americans there is no international surveillance system. There is and it is growing daily. E-Verify is a central tool for its implementation. With each addition to the ability of government to watch our every move, freedom dies from another cut.

I understand that Mr. Gadiel lost a son in the 911 attacks and that is his motivation to take action to secure the borders. I am sorry for his tragic loss, but I will not sit back and allow his desire for revenge to destroy our nation's freedom. DR

## New strategies to stop Agenda 21

*Continued from page 2*

These are the victims of the policy and the most likely to support your efforts to stop it. In that way, you will recruit new people to the cause. You will find it much more effective than sounding like a rabid bear growling about the UN.

For example, smart meters or energy audits affect everyone in town. What is the problem: government is dictating your energy use that you are paying for. It is a violation of your right to choose how much energy you are willing to buy. It denies you the right to determine how warm or cool your house will be. It denies you the choice of taking a hot shower or not. It even affects your health if you can't get warm enough – or if you are denied access to hot water, allowing germs to grow.

I believe such an argument will gain more support for your cause across the city and across party and philosophical lines than rushing to bring up the UN? Yes, the policy certainly did originate in the bowels of the UN. But why are we opposed to it – because of what it does to us. And that is the place to start to oppose it. As people come to your side, if they want to know more, then will be the time to teach them the rest of the story about Agenda 21 and its UN origins.

So, focus on the victims and the impact the policy will have on the well being of the community and you. Question how they intend to enforce the policy (such as having government agents come into your home). Make your officials explain that. They won't want to. This will show the heavy hand of control required to make the policy work. Put the officials on the defensive over their enforcement efforts and watch them retreat as it's exposed.

The same approach can be used effectively in dealing with plans to put meters on private wells, or in dealing with plans for historic preservation schemes that suddenly disallow private property owners to change or improve anything on their house because "Robert E. Lee didn't see that change." (You have to live in Virginia to understand that reference.)

Ask your County Commissioners this question: "name one thing I can do on my property without your permission." To answer that question honestly will force them to admit that under these policies there is no private property. The important message here is to keep your fight local to stop their global agenda.

Agenda 21 is a vast, complicated structure. The organizations promoting it number in the thousands and

include Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), public policy groups, federal state and local agencies, self-proclaimed "stakeholders," Congress, the White House, 50 state houses, and your local officials. You can't fight them all individually. Instead, fight the policy and watch them come out of the woodwork to challenge you. By attacking the policy you have made them defend it and you will have shaped the debate. Then we'll see who is really wearing the tin foil hats! DR

## America at the abyss

*Continued from Page 8*

The Commission's final report, *Our Common Future*, declared that in order for development to be "sustainable," government must manage development to insure that it is socially equitable, and environmentally safe. The key words here are "government must manage."

Five years later, in 1992, the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development produced Agenda 21, signed by 179 nations, including the United States. This document spells out in 40 chapters of very specific recommendations, just how government must manage development to insure that it is socially equitable and environmentally safe.

Neither private property rights, nor the U.S. Constitution is given any respect in Agenda 21. Nevertheless, since the creation by Executive Order of the President's Council on Sustainable Development in 1993, the federal government, and state and local governments, have been focused on implementing the policy recommendations contained in Agenda 21, disguised as "Smart Growth,"<sup>4</sup> implemented at the local level through "Comprehensive Land Use Plans."

Freedom cannot survive government management. The U.S. Constitution designed a government managed by the people; Progressives have disregarded the Constitution and fundamentally transformed government - to manage the people.

Since the post-war peak of American productivity in the 1950s, the U.S. Constitution, and consequently, individual freedom, have been consistently, and deliberately eroded by the Progressive influence in society, and especially in government. The tidal wave of Progressivism that washed over Washington in 2008 drowned the nation in debt, in its search for "social equity" and "environmental safety."

It should now be abundantly clear that without the U.S. Constitution, and the freedom from government management it guarantees, the American experiment in self-government stands at the DR edge of a cliff, about to fall into the abyss of history.

*Henry Lamb is the founder of Freedom 21*  
[www.freedom21.org](http://www.freedom21.org)

# America at the abyss

By Henry Lamb

There is a direct correlation between America's downward spiral and the nation's departure from adherence to the U.S. Constitution. During the first hundred years, America experienced growth and prosperity never before imagined by people who never knew what freedom was. It was a rough and tumble century; not everyone prospered. Many people were victimized by profithungry capitalists. The answer to this inequity, according to some of the 19th century philosophers, was government management of the affairs of people and their business activities. Proponents of these ideas claimed the name "Progressives." Progressives prevailed at the dawn of the 20th century when Woodrow Wilson won the presidency, guided by Master Progressive, Colonel Edward Mandell House. With few notable exceptions, Progressives have dominated government since the Wilson era.

The single most apparent characteristic of Progressive influence is a complete disregard for the U.S. Constitution. The Founders designed the government of the United States to share and balance sovereign power between the states and the new federal government. The new Senate was chosen by state legislatures to ensure that the states would have a decisive voice in the federal government. No legislation could become law, nor could any treaty be ratified, nor could any Supreme Court Judge or Cabinet level official be appointed, without approval of the states. This state-held power in the new federal government held the new government in check for the first century.

So effective was this check and balance, Progressives were not able to advance their agenda. So they launched a well-calculated campaign to amend the Constitution to prohibit the states from any participation at all in the federal government. The 17th Amendment achieved this result by denying state legislatures the Constitutional right to elect their Senators.

Originally, the Constitution required all taxes to be levied "...uniformly throughout the United States." The 16th Amendment changed that and allowed the progressive income tax. The Constitution gave Congress alone the authority to

coin money "...and set the value thereof." Progressives did not like this limitation, so they contrived the Federal Reserve and now Congress has virtually no say the coinage of money or the value thereof.

These are just a few of the departures from the Constitution caused by Progressives. One of the most consequential departures from the Constitution came at the hands of the Supreme Court in the 1954 Berman vs. Parker decision, which re-interpreted the term "public use" in the Fifth Amendment to mean "public benefit."

Six of the judges were appointed by Progressive-in-Chief, Franklin Roosevelt. Since this decision, the federal government has joined state and local governments in erasing the notion that private property is sacred in the United States.

The idea that governments, not private owners, should control the use of land gained great momentum in 1976, when the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, meeting in Vancouver, BC, declared that:

"Land...cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Private land ownership is also a principal instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth and therefore contributes to social injustice; Public control of land is therefore indispensable...."

Both William K. Reilly, future- Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Carla A. Hills, future- U.S. Trade Representative who negotiated the World Trade Organization, signed this document for the United States.

Five years later, in 1981, the city of Detroit took 1500 privately owned homes, not for public use, but for what the city said was a public benefit, the construction of a new General Motors plant.

Six years later, in 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development declared that development should be "sustainable," defined to be: "...development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."