

STATE OF KANSAS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

13TH DISTRICT
STATE CAPITOL
TOPEKA, KS 66612
(785) 296-7678
forrest.knox@house.ks.gov



17120 UDALL RD.
ALTOONA, KS 66710
(785) 783-5564
repnox@gmail.com

FORREST J. KNOX

HR 6018

A RESOLUTION opposing and exposing the radical and destructive UN Agenda 21

I am testifying in support of HR 6018. Following are condensations of a small amount of the information available on the subject. Investigation yields an explanation of where the ideas have originated for much of what has troubled me in my eight years in the legislature; our willingness to do away with our Constitutional rights and the basic principles upon which America was founded. Note well!

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs

Division for Sustainable Development

From Chapter 21 of Agenda 21 Core Publication

http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/res_agenda21_33.shtml

MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION

33.13. In general, the financing for the implementation of Agenda 21 will come from a country's own public and private sectors. **For developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, ODA is a main source of external funding**, and substantial new and additional funding for sustainable development and implementation of Agenda 21 will be required. **Developed countries reaffirm their commitments to reach the accepted United Nations target of 0.7 per cent of GNP [\$100 billion is the USA share – based on \$15 trillion GNP] for ODA** and, to the extent that they have not yet achieved that target, agree to augment their aid programmes in order to reach that target as soon as possible and to ensure prompt and effective implementation of Agenda 21...

HOUSE ENERGY AND UTILITIES

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS: FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (CHAIRMAN)
ENERGY & UTILITIES (VICE CHAIRMAN)
FEDERAL & STATE AFFAIRS
JT. COMMITTEE ON STATE-TRIBAL RELATIONS (CC
JT. COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL

DATE: 3.16.2012

ATTACHMENT 7

UN Agenda 21 – Rio Declaration 12 August 1992

<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm>

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT*

(Rio de Janeiro, 3-14 June 1992)

Annex I

RIO DECLARATION ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development,

Having met at Rio de Janeiro from 3 to 14 June 1992,

Reaffirming the Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, adopted at Stockholm on 16 June 1972, a/ and seeking to build upon it,

With the goal of establishing a new and equitable global partnership through the creation of new levels of cooperation among States, key sectors of societies and people,

Working towards international agreements which respect the interests of all and protect the integrity of the global environmental and developmental system,

Recognizing the integral and interdependent nature of the Earth, our home,

Proclaims that:

Principle 1 Human beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature.

Principle 2 States have, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, the sovereign right to exploit their own resources pursuant to their own environmental and developmental policies, and the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

Principle 3 The right to development must be fulfilled so as to equitably meet developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations.

Principle 4 In order to achieve sustainable development, environmental protection shall constitute an integral part of the development process and cannot be considered in isolation from it.

Principle 5 All States and all people shall cooperate in the essential task of eradicating poverty as an indispensable requirement for sustainable development, in order to decrease the disparities in standards of living and better meet the needs of the majority of the people of the world.

Principle 6 The special situation and needs of developing countries, particularly the least developed and those most environmentally vulnerable, shall be given special priority. International actions in the field of environment and development should also address the interests and needs of all countries.

Principle 7 States shall cooperate in a spirit of global partnership to conserve, protect and restore the health and integrity of the Earth's ecosystem. In view of the different contributions to global environmental degradation, States have common but differentiated responsibilities. The developed countries acknowledge the responsibility that they bear in the international pursuit of sustainable development in view of the pressures their societies place on the global environment and of the technologies and financial resources they command.

Principle 8 To achieve sustainable development and a higher quality of life for all people, States should reduce and eliminate unsustainable patterns of production and consumption and promote appropriate demographic policies.

Principle 9 States should cooperate to strengthen endogenous capacity-building for sustainable development by improving scientific understanding through exchanges of scientific and technological knowledge, and by enhancing the development, adaptation, diffusion and transfer of technologies, including new and innovative technologies.

Principle 10 Environmental issues are best handled with the participation of all concerned citizens, at the relevant level. At the national level, each individual shall have appropriate access to information concerning the environment that is held by public authorities, including information on hazardous materials and activities in their communities, and the opportunity to participate in decision-making processes. States shall facilitate and encourage public awareness and participation by making information widely available. Effective access to judicial and administrative proceedings, including redress and remedy, shall be provided.

Principle 11 States shall enact effective environmental legislation. Environmental standards, management objectives and priorities should reflect the environmental and developmental context to which they apply. Standards applied by some countries may be inappropriate and of unwarranted economic and social cost to other countries, in particular developing countries.

Principle 12 States should cooperate to promote a supportive and open international economic system that would lead to economic growth and sustainable development in all countries, to better address the problems of environmental degradation. Trade policy measures for environmental purposes should not constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination or a disguised restriction on international trade. Unilateral actions to deal with environmental challenges outside the jurisdiction of the importing country should be avoided. Environmental measures addressing transboundary or global environmental problems should, as far as possible, be based on an international consensus.

Principle 13 States shall develop national law regarding liability and compensation for the victims of pollution and other environmental damage. States shall also cooperate in an expeditious and more determined manner to develop further international law regarding liability and compensation for adverse effects of environmental damage caused by activities within their jurisdiction or control to areas beyond their jurisdiction.

Principle 14 States should effectively cooperate to discourage or prevent the relocation and transfer to other States of any activities and substances that cause severe environmental degradation or are found to be harmful to human health.

Principle 15 In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific

certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.

Principle 16 National authorities should endeavour to promote the internalization of environmental costs and the use of economic instruments, taking into account the approach that the polluter should, in principle, bear the cost of pollution, with due regard to the public interest and without distorting international trade and investment.

Principle 17 Environmental impact assessment, as a national instrument, shall be undertaken for proposed activities that are likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment and are subject to a decision of a competent national authority.

Principle 18 States shall immediately notify other States of any natural disasters or other emergencies that are likely to produce sudden harmful effects on the environment of those States. Every effort shall be made by the international community to help States so afflicted.

Principle 19 States shall provide prior and timely notification and relevant information to potentially affected States on activities that may have a significant adverse transboundary environmental effect and shall consult with those States at an early stage and in good faith.

Principle 20 Women have a vital role in environmental management and development. Their full participation is therefore essential to achieve sustainable development.

Principle 21 The creativity, ideals and courage of the youth of the world should be mobilized to forge a global partnership in order to achieve sustainable development and ensure a better future for all.

Principle 22 Indigenous people and their communities and other local communities have a vital role in environmental management and development because of their knowledge and traditional practices. States should recognize and duly support their identity, culture and interests and enable their effective participation in the achievement of sustainable development.

Principle 23 The environment and natural resources of people under oppression, domination and occupation shall be protected.

Principle 24 Warfare is inherently destructive of sustainable development. States shall therefore respect international law providing protection for the environment in times of armed conflict and cooperate in its further development, as necessary.

Principle 25 Peace, development and environmental protection are interdependent and indivisible.

Principle 26 States shall resolve all their environmental disputes peacefully and by appropriate means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Principle 27 States and people shall cooperate in good faith and in a spirit of partnership in the fulfilment of the principles embodied in this Declaration and in the further development of international law in the field of sustainable development.

The following pages are condensations. Sources and locations are noted.

Democrats Against UN Agenda 21 (website)

<http://www.democratsagainstunagenda21.com/>

SOUNDS LIKE SCIENCE FICTION...OR SOME CONSPIRACY THEORY...BUT IT ISN'T.

Have you wondered where these terms 'sustainability' and 'smart growth' and 'high density urban mixed use development' came from? Doesn't it seem like about 10 years ago you'd never heard of them and now everything seems to include these concepts? Is that just a coincidence? That every town and county and state and nation in the world would be changing their land use/planning codes and government policies to align themselves with...what?

First, before I get going, I want to say that yes, I know it's a small world and it takes a village and we're all one planet etc. I also know that we have a democracy and that as cumbersome as that can be sometimes (Donald Rumsfeld said that the Chinese have it easy; they don't have to ask their people if they agree. And Bush Junior said that it would be great to have a dictator as long as he was the dictator), we have a three branch government and the Bill of Rights, Constitution, and self-determination. This is one of the reasons why people want to come to the US, right? We don't have Tiananmen Square here, generally speaking (yes, I remember Kent State—not the same, and yes, an outrage.) So I'm not against making certain issues a priority, such as mindful energy use, alternative energy sponsorship, recycling/reuse, and sensitivity to all living creatures.

But then you have UN Agenda 21. What is it?

Considering its policies are woven into all the General Plans of the cities and counties, it's important for people to know where these policies are coming from. While many people support the United Nations for its peacemaking efforts, hardly anyone knows that they have very specific land use policies that they would like to see implemented in every city, county, state and nation. The specific plan is called **United Nations Agenda 21 Sustainable Development**, which has its basis in Communitarianism. By now, most Americans have heard of sustainable development but are largely unaware of Agenda 21.

In a nutshell, the plan calls for governments to take control of all land use and not leave any of the decision making in the hands of private property owners. It is assumed that people are not good stewards of their land and the government will do a better job if they are in control. Individual rights in general are to give way to the needs of communities as determined by the governing body.

Another program, called the Wildlands Project spells out how most of the land is to be set aside for non-humans.

U.N. Agenda 21 cites the affluence of Americans as being a major problem which needs to be corrected. It calls for lowering the standard of living for Americans so that the people in poorer countries will have more, a redistribution of wealth. Although people around the world aspire to achieve the levels of prosperity we have in our country, and will risk their lives to get here, Americans are cast in a very negative light and need to be taken down to a condition closer to average in the world. Only then, they say, will there be social justice which is a cornerstone of the U.N. Agenda 21 plan.

Agenda 21 policies date back to the 70's but it got its real start in **1992 at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro** when **President Bush** signed onto it. **President Clinton** signed it later and continued the program in the United States. A non-governmental organization called the International Council of Local Environmental Initiatives, ICLEI, is tasked with carrying out the goals of Agenda 21. Over 600 cities in the U.S. are members; our town joined in 2007. The costs are paid by taxpayers.

It's time that people educate themselves and read the document and related commentary. After that, **get a copy of your city or county's General Plan and read it.** You will find all sorts of policies that are nearly identical to those in U.N. Agenda 21. Unfortunately, their policies have advanced largely unnoticed and we are now in the end game. People need to identify their elected officials who are promoting the U.N.'s policies and hold them accountable for their actions. Only when we've identified who the people are and what they are trying to do will we be able to evaluate whether or not we approve of the policies they are putting forward. Some people may think it's appropriate for agencies outside the United States to set our policies and some people will not. The question is, aren't Americans able to develop their own policies? Should we rely on an organization that consists of member nations that have different forms of governments, most of which do not value individual rights as much as we do? It's time to bring U.N. Agenda 21 out in the open where we can have these debates and then set our own policies in accordance with our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Ok, you say, interesting, but I don't see how that really affects me. Here are a few ways:

So, what does this have to do with Agenda 21?

Redevelopment is a tool used to further the Agenda 21 vision of remaking America's cities. With redevelopment, cities have the right to take property by eminent domain---against the will of the property owner, and give it or sell it to a private developer. By declaring an area of town 'blighted' (and in some cities over 90% of the city area has been declared blighted) the property taxes in that area can be diverted away from the General Fund.

Human habitation, as it is referred to now, is restricted to lands within the Urban Growth Boundaries of the city. Only certain building designs are permitted. Rural property is more and more restricted in what uses can be on it. Although counties say that they support agricultural uses, eating locally produced food, farmer's markets, etc, in fact there are so many regulations restricting water and land use (there are scenic corridors, inland rural corridors, baylands corridors, area plans, specific plans, redevelopment plans, huge fees, fines) that farmers are losing their lands altogether.

What plan? We're losing our homes since this recession/depression began, and many of us could never afford those homes to begin with. We got cheap money, used whatever we had to squeak into those homes, and now some of us lost them. We were lured, indebted, and sunk.

This plan is a whole life plan. It involves the educational system, the energy market, the transportation system, the governmental system, the health care system, food production, and more. The plan is to restrict your choices, limit your funds, narrow your freedoms, and take away your voice. One of the ways is by using the Delphi Technique to 'manufacture consensus.' Another is to infiltrate community groups or actually start neighborhood associations with hand-picked 'leaders'. Another is to groom and train future candidates for local offices. Another is to sponsor non-governmental groups that go into schools and train children. Another is to offer federal and private grants and funding for city programs that further the agenda. Another is to educate a new generation of land use planners to require New Urbanism. Another is to convert factories to other uses, introduce energy measures that penalize manufacturing, and set energy consumption goals to pre-1985 levels. Another is to allow unregulated immigration in order to lower standards of living and drain local resources.

All of this sounds unbelievable until you have had direct experience with it. You probably have, but unless you resisted it you won't know it's happening. That's why we'd like you to read our blog 'The Way We See It' ([click here](#)). Go to the section in the blog (look on the right side under Categories) called Our Story. You'll get a look at how two unsuspecting people fell into a snake pit and survived to tell about it.

Special Report Sustainable Development: Transforming America

by Henry Lamb

December 1, 2005

As the "sustainable development" movement continues to gain momentum, it is worthwhile to step back and take a long look at the big picture, painted with a broad brush to reveal what the United States might look like as the movement's vision is more fully implemented over the next 50 years or so. The picture painted here is based on official documents published by several government agencies and non-government organizations during the last decade. These documents were rarely reported in the news, and average working people have no idea what sustainable development really means, and even less knowledge of what is in store for the future.

The Vision Half the land area of the entire country will be designated "wilderness areas," where only wildlife managers and researchers will be allowed.

Sierra Club's proposal to reorganize North America into 21 Ecoregions. The Sierra Club, one of hundreds of non-government organizations actively working to bring about this transformation, has suggested that North America be divided into 21 ecoregions, that ignore existing national, state, and county boundaries. In 1992, they published a special issue of their magazine which featured a map, and extensive descriptions of how these ecoregions should be managed. (1)

The Reality This vision is quite attractive to many Americans, especially those born since 1970, who have been educated in the public school system. To these people, nothing is more important than saving the planet from the certain catastrophe that lies ahead, if people are allowed to continue their greedy abuse of natural resources.

The first Wilderness Act was adopted in 1964, which set aside nine million acres of wilderness so "our posterity could see what our forefathers had to conquer," as one Senator put it. Now, after 40 years, 106.5 million acres are officially designated as wilderness. (2) At least eight bills have been introduced in the 109th Congress to add more wilderness to the system. (3) And every year, Congress is asked to designate more and more land as wilderness. Most of this land is already a part of a global system of ecoregions, recognized internationally as "Biosphere Reserves." In the United States, there are 47 Biosphere Reserves, so designated by the United Nations Education, Science, and Cultural Organization, (4) which are a part of a global network of 482 Biosphere Reserves. This global network is the basis for implementing the U.N.'s Convention on Biological Diversity, (5) a treaty which the U.S. Senate chose not to ratify. (6) The 1140-page instruction book for implementing this treaty, *Global Biodiversity Assessment*, provides graphic details about how society should be organized, and how land and resources should be managed, in order to make the world sustainable. This treaty was formulated by U.N. agencies and non-government organizations between 1981 and 1992, when it was formally adopted by the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. Consider this instruction from the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*:

"...representative areas of all major ecosystems in a region need to be reserved, that blocks should be as large as possible, that buffer zones should be established around core areas, and that corridors should connect these areas. This basic design is central to the recently proposed Wildlands Project in the United States." (7)

Now consider "this basic design" as described in the Wildlands Project:

"...that at least half of the land area of the 48 conterminous states should be encompassed in core reserves and inner corridor zones (essentially extensions of core reserves) within the next few decades.... Nonetheless, half of a region in wilderness is a reasonable guess of what it will take to restore viable populations of large carnivores and natural disturbance regimes, assuming that most of the other 50 percent is managed intelligently as buffer zones. Eventually, a wilderness network would dominate a region...with human habitations being the islands. The native ecosystem and the collective needs of non-human species must take precedence over the needs and desires of humans." (8)

Even though this treaty was not ratified by the United States, it is being effectively implemented by the agencies of government through the "Ecosystem Management Policy." The U.S. Forest service is actively working to identify and secure wilderness corridors to connect existing core wilderness areas. (9) Both state and federal governments have enacted legislation in recent years to provide for systematic acquisition of "open space," land suitable for restoration and rehabilitation, to expand wilderness areas, and to provide "viewsheds" beyond urban boundaries. In the last days of the Clinton Administration, the Forest Service adopted the "Roadless Area Conservation Rule," which identified 58.5 million acres from which access and logging roads were to be removed. In the West, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are driving ranchers off the land by reducing grazing allotments to numbers that make profitable operations impossible. Inholders, people who have recreational cabins on federal land, are discovering that their permits are not being renewed. The Fish and Wildlife Service is forcing people off their land through designations of "wetlands," and "critical habitat" which render the land unusable for profit-making activities. Much to the chagrin of the proponents of sustainable development, some of these policies have been slowed, but not reversed, by the Bush administration. Nevertheless, agencies of government, supported by an army of non-government organizations, continue to transform the landscape into the vision described in the Wildlands Project, and in the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*.

Blueprint for Sustainable Development Other agencies of government are working with equal diligence, to create the "islands of human habitation," otherwise called sustainable communities. The blueprint for these communities was also adopted at the 1992 U.N. Conference in Rio de Janeiro. Its title is "*Agenda 21*." This 300-page document contains 40 chapters loaded with recommendations to govern virtually every facet of human existence. *Agenda 21* is not a treaty. It is a "soft law" policy document which was signed by President George H.W. Bush, and which does not require Senate ratification. One of the recommendations contained in the document is that each nation establish a national council to implement the rest of the recommendations. On June 29, 1993, President Bill Clinton issued Executive Order Number 12852 which created the President's Council on Sustainable Development. (10) Its 25 members included most Cabinet Secretaries, representatives from The Nature Conservancy, the Sierra Club and other non-government organizations, and a few representatives from industry. The PCSD set out to implement the

recommendations of *Agenda 21* administratively, where possible, and to secure new legislation when necessary. One of the publications of the Council is "*Sustainable Communities, Report of the Sustainable Communities Task Force.*" (11) This document, in very generalized language, makes sustainable communities sound like the perfect solution to all the world's ills. Another document, however, describes in much more precise detail exactly what sustainable communities will be. This document was prepared by the Department of Housing and Urban Development as a report to the U.N. Conference on Human Settlements in Istanbul, June, 1996. This report says that current lifestyles in the United States will "...demolish much of nature's diversity and stability, unless a re-balance can be attained - an urban-rural industrial re-balance with ecology, as a fundamental paradigm of authentic, meaningful national/global human security." (12) This highly detailed 25-page report goes on to describe the sustainable community of the future:

"...Community Sustainability Infrastructures [designed for] efficiency and livability that encourages: in-fill over sprawl: compactness, higher density low-rise residential: transit-oriented (TODs) and pedestrian-oriented development (PODs): bicycle circulation networks; work-to-home proximity; mixed-use-development: co-housing, housing over shops, downtown residential; inter-modal transportation malls and facilities ...where trolleys, rapid transit, trains and biking, walking and hiking are encouraged by infrastructures."

"For this hopeful future we may envision an entirely fresh set of infrastructures that use fully automated, very light, elevated rail systems for daytime metro region travel and nighttime goods movement, such as have been conceptualized and being positioned for production at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis; we will see all settlements linked up by extensive bike, recreation and agro-forestry "E-ways" (environment-ways) such as in Madison, Wisconsin; we will find healthy, productive soils where there is [now] decline and erosion, through the widespread use of remineralization from igneous and volcanic rock sources (much of it the surplus quarry fines, or "rockdust", from concrete and asphalt-type road construction or from reservoir silts); we will be growing foods, dietary supplements and herbs that make over our unsustainable reliance upon foods and medicines that have adverse soil, environmental, or health side-effects. Less and less land will go for animal husbandry, and more for grains, tubers and legumes." (13)

Sustainable communities cannot emerge as the natural outgrowth of free people making individual choices in a free market economy. Nor can they be mandated in the United States, as they might be in nations that live under dictatorial rule. Therefore, the PCSD developed a strategy to entice or coerce local communities to begin the transition to sustainability. The EPA provided challenge grants, and visioning grants to communities that would undertake the process toward sustainability. Grants were also made available to selected non-government organizations to launch a visioning process in local communities. This process relies on a trained facilitator who uses a practiced, "consensus building" model to lead selected community participants in the development of "community vision." This vision inevitably sets forth a set of goals - each of which can be found in the recommendations of *Agenda 21* - that become the basis for the development of a comprehensive community plan. (14) According to the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), 6,400 local communities in 113 countries have become involved

in the sustainable communities Local Agenda 21 process since 1995. (15) ICLEI is one of several international non-government organizations whose mission is to promote sustainable development and sustainable communities at the local level. Dozens of similar national NGOs are at work all across the United States. A cursory search on the term "sustainable communities" through Google or Yahoo will return a staggering number of responses. The federal government deepened its involvement in the transformation of America by providing millions of dollars in grants to the American Planning Association to develop model legislation which embodies the principles of sustainable development. The publication, *Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook: Model Statutes for Planning and the Management of Change*, provides model legislation to be adopted by states. Typically, this legislation, when adopted, requires the creation of a statewide comprehensive land use plan that defines the administrative mechanisms for regional government agencies, and provides planning models for counties to use in creating county-wide land use plans. Municipalities within the county are required to produce a plan that conforms with, and is integrated into the county and state plans. (16) Using the coercive power of the federal budget, which the PCSD describes as using "financial incentives and disincentives," the federal government had little trouble getting states to rush to adopt some form of the model legislation. The state of Wisconsin, for examples, says this about its comprehensive planning act:

"The Comprehensive Planning Law was developed in response to the widely held view that state planning laws were outdated and inconsistent with the current needs of Wisconsin communities. Commonly recognized as Wisconsin's "Smart Growth" legislation, significant changes to planning-related statutes were approved through the 1999-2001 state biennial budget. Under the new law, any program or action of a town, village, city, county, or regional planning commission, after January 1, 2010, that affects land use must be guided by, and consistent with, an adopted Comprehensive Plan, s. 66. 1001, Wis. Stats." (17)

The APA's Legislative Guidebook offers several forms of the model legislation. States have considerable latitude in the legislation that is adopted. Consequently, each state's legislation may be different, and may impose different requirements on county and city governments. Regardless of the difference, however, they all contain the basic principles set forth in *Agenda 21*, and they all require the development of plans that result in the implementation of the recommendations contained in *Agenda 21*. One of the fundamental elements of all the plans requires limiting development (growth) to certain areas within the county. Planners draw lines on maps, supposedly to prevent development in "environmentally sensitive" areas, but which, in fact, are often quite arbitrary and sometimes influenced by political considerations. The value of land inside the development areas skyrockets, while the value of land outside the development areas plummets - with no hope of future appreciation. Another common element of these plans is to limit the activity that may occur within the various plan designations. In King County, Washington, for example, property owners in some parts of the county are required to leave 65% of their land unused, in its "natural" condition.

"Known as the 65-10 Rule, it calls for landowners to set aside 65 percent of their property and keep it in its natural, vegetative state. According to the rule, nothing can be built on this land, and if a tree is cut down, for example, it must be replanted. Building anything is out of the question." (18)

Consequences of Sustainable Development What is perhaps the most serious consequence of sustainable development is the least visible: the transformation of the policy-making process. The idea that government is empowered by the consent of the governed is the idea that set the United States apart from all previous forms of government. It is the principle that unleashed individual creativity and free markets, which launched the spectacular rise of the world's most successful nation. The idea, and the process by which citizens can reject laws they don't want, simply by replacing the officials who enacted them, makes the ballot box the source of power for every citizen, and the point of accountability for every politician.

Nowhere is this injustice more visible than when eminent domain is used to implement sustainable development plans: The *Kelo vs. The City of New London* case brought the issue to public awareness, but in cities throughout the nation, millions of people are being displaced, with no hope of finding affordable housing, in the new, "sustainable" community.

These people are the victims of the "greater good," as envisioned by the proponents of sustainable development. Less visible, but no less important, is the erosion of individual freedom. Until the emergence of sustainable development, a person's home was considered to be his castle. William Pitt expressed this idea quite powerfully in Parliament in 1763, when he said:

"The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the crown. It may be frail - its roof may shake - the wind may blow through it - the storm may enter, the rain may enter - but the King of England cannot enter - all his force dares not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement." (24)

No more. Sustainable development allows king-government to intrude into a person's home before it becomes his home, and dictate the manner and style to which the home must conform.

The question that remains unanswered is: will Americans accept this new sustainable future that has been planned for them and imposed upon them?. Or, as Americans have done in the past, will they rise up in defense of their freedom, and demand that their elected officials force the bureaucrats and professionals to return to the role of serving the people who pay their salaries, by administering policies enacted only by elected officials, rather than conspiring to set the policies by which all the people must live.

Endnotes

1. Sierra Club ecoregions: <http://www.sierraclub.org/ecoregions/>
2. Wilderness.net (<http://www.wilderness.net/index.cfm?fuse=NWPS&sec=fastFacts>), a project of the Wilderness Institute, the Arthur Carhart National Wilderness Training Center, and the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute. (October 27, 2005)
3. Campaign for America's Wilderness (http://www.leaveitwild.org/psapp/view_art.asp?PEB_ART_ID=397) (As of May 1, 2005)
4. See Eco-logic Powerhouse, November, 2005, and <http://eco.freedom.org/el/20020302/biosphere.shtml>
5. Agenda Item 1(7), Report of the First Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and

Technological Advice, Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Second Meeting, 6-17 November, Jakarta, Indonesia, (UNEP/CBD/COP2/5, September 21, 1995).

See also: <http://www.freedom.org/prc/legis/hr901test.htm>.

6. "How the Convention on Biological Diversity was Defeated," Sovereignty International, Inc, 1998 - <http://sovereignty.freedom.org/p/land/biotreatystop.htm> .

7. "Measures for conservation of biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Components," Global Biodiversity Assessment, Cambridge University Press for the United Nations Environment Program, Section 13.4.2.2.3, p. 993.

8. Reed F. Noss, "The Wildlands Project," Wild Earth, Special Issue, 1992, pp.13- 15. (Wild Earth is published by the Cenozoic Society, P.O. Box 492, Canton, NY 13617).

9. Report to the Interagency Grizzly Bear Working Group on Wildlife Linkage Habitat, Prepared by Bill Ruediger, Endangered Species Program Leader, USDA Forest Service, Northern Region, Missoula, MT, February 1, 2001. See also: <http://www.eco.freedom.org/el/20020202/linkage.shtml>.

10. See: <http://clinton4.nara.gov/PCSD/>

11. See: http://clinton4.nara.gov/PCSD/Publications/suscomm/ind_suscom.html

12. "Community Sustainability; Agendas for Choice-making and Action," U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, September 22, 1995. See also: <http://eco.freedom.org/reports/sdagenda.html>

13. *Ibid*, pp 21f.

14. See <http://eco.freedom.org/col/?i=1997/9> And <http://www.sovereignty.net/p/sd/suscom.htm> For a discussion of the consensus process, and sustainable communities.

15. International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives web site, October 28, 2005 (<http://www.iclei.org/index.php?id=798>)

16. Summary of the Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook, 2002 Edition, (<http://www.planning.org/growingsmart/summary.htm>)

17. State of Wisconsin, Department of Administration web site: http://www.doa.state.wi.us/pagesubtext_detail.asp?linksubcatid=366

18. FoxNews.com, July 10, 2004 <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,124358,00.html>

21. "Forfeiting the American Dream: The HUD-Funded Smart Growth Guidebook's Attack on Homeownership," The Heritage Foundation (<http://www.heritage.org/Research/SmartGrowth/BG1565.cfm>), July 2, 2002.

22. "Eminent domain; eminent disaster," Eco-logic Powerhouse, August, 2005 (<http://www.eco.freedom.org/articles/maguire-805.shtml>) , for a discussion on this issue.

23. President's Council on Sustainable Development, We Believe Statement #8

<http://sovereignty.freedom.org/p/sd/PCSD-webelieve.htm>

24. William Pitt, the elder, Earl of Chatham, speech in the House of Lords.--Henry Peter Brougham, *Historical Sketches of Statesmen Who Flourished in the Time of George III*, vol. 1, p. 52 (1839).

(<http://www.bartleby.com/73/861.html>)

25. Sustainable Development as defined by the U.N.'s Bruntland Commission report, *Our Common Future*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 43

26. This website, <http://www.demographia.com/dbr-ix.htm> provides an abundance of reports and studies that challenge effectiveness of sustainable development.

Copyright (C) 2005 Freedom.org, All rights reserved

