

WILLARD W. GARVEY,
300 WEST DOUGLAS
WICHITA, KANSAS 67209

6 April 1984

President Ronald Reagan
Executive Office of the President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

Re: Privatization

President Reagan, congratulations on rejecting the political system
negatives. Now why not adopt the all positive system -- privatization?
Hold a White House conference on privatization and appoint a
Presidential Task Force on privatization.

Privatization is documented in the enclosed paper from The Heritage
Foundation and dates back at least to Adam Smith, Plato, Aristotle and
Jesus.


Privatization's more recent advocates include most of the non-profit
sector -- and the entire profit sector. To name a few, Peter Drucker,
Milton Friedman, Heritage Foundation, Reason Foundation, Pacific
Institute, Manhattan Institute, National Legal Center for the Public
Interest, VOLUNTEER - National Center for Citizen Involvement,
International Executive Service Corps, United Way with its Services
Identification System, churches, labor unions, etc.

Privatization is now "an idea whose time has come". The knowledge,
communication, and computer industry can make political represen-
tatives obsolete.

Privatization might well be the theme for the 200th anniversary of the
Constitution. Privatization is essential for national salvation.

To restore privatization is the National Center for Privatization's
purpose. May we help you?

With best wishes



WILLARD W. GARVEY

WVG:ks

Encl: Heritage Foundation paper
National Center for Privatization brochure

File: ^{Gov.} Reagan

This envelope contains a statement of

K. Maureen Heaton,

the person who acquired the

KEY DOCUMENT, accidentally!

Heaton was a direct descendent of

John Hart (signer of the

Declaration of Independence).

Heaton took the Plan to her supervisors

who exposed it all over California

in September 1974, before it was used

which gave us more time.

Now it is being used which gives us proof

of deliberate treason.

We must use this document again

to expose that it is the core behind all the tragic

plans that are ruining our nation today!

**THE PLAN TO COLLAPSE
THE
GOVERNMENT**

**THE POLITICS OF CHANGE
IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM**

FOREWORD

This report was authorized and compiled under a contract dated July 1, 1972, between the Office of Intergovernment Management, State of California, and the Institute for Local Self Government, Berkeley, California.

In general, the Project Director, Mr. Ronald B. Frankum, and the Assistant Project Director, Mr. Vigo G. Nielsen, Jr., conducted this study in coordination with the staff of the Council of Intergovernment Relations and with the Governor's office, which was initiating a program for the study of restructuring of local government.

✓ This study, following previous C.I.R. activities, is part of a statewide undertaking to modernize and improve California local government, increase its responsiveness, efficiency and economy.

✓ This particular report, using documented case material, focuses on the process---"How to"---by which political and administrative leadership is employed to bring about reallocation and reorganization.

Under the contract, the investigators were to provide the necessary "real world" insights into what happens to bring about change in local governmental structures. The investigators were not charged with providing an exhaustive analysis but, rather, to find, examine and document the practical methodology of change.


The project was performed under the general direction of Randy H. Hamilton, Ph.D., former Executive Director of the institute, and the final report was edited by its present Executive Director.

January 31, 1974

John C. Houlihan
Executive Director

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. There must be a climate for change in order for the restructuring of local government to occur, whether this restructuring involves drastic reform, reorganization, modernization, or a minor administrative realignment. While the following does not represent an exclusive list, the factors mentioned here are those which most often create such a climate:

- 
- a. a Collapse of government's ability to provide needed services;
 - b. a Crisis of major magnitude;
 - c. a Catastrophe that has a physical effect on the community;
 - d. the Corruption of local officials and
 - e. the high Cost of government and the desire for a higher level of services.

2. Some change will occur, in one form or another, if any of the first four factors (Collapse, Crisis, Catastrophe or Corruption) are present, especially when they are of major dimension. It is up to governmental leaders who are directly affected to employ the available alternatives. However, information obtained during the research study does not indicate that any of these four factors are currently generating a climate for change in California.

3. Preoccupation with the Cost of government and desire for more efficient service delivery does exist in California at this time. These factors are a motivating force but,

by themselves, do not cause change to occur. It is necessary to organize and carry out a change Campaign capitalizing on the factors that provide a climate for change.

4. The campaign may vary in scale but regardless of the size of the effort, every campaign contains some very specific features.

The larger the scale of the restructuring attempt, the more important it is that all features are included. The features are: Planning and Contemplation, Education and Involvement, Community, Compromise, Concern, Cadence, Cooperation, Comprehension, and Concentration.

5. If an optimum combination of these features is absent, it will take longer to accomplish the change than originally anticipated by the change instigator.
6. Every successful reorganization has an instigator, who is the principal change agent, and a nucleus of workers who manage the change effort from the beginning stages through final implementation.
7. Unsuccessful reorganization efforts, while often characterized by many of the same features as a successful campaign, frequently lack the factor of a climate for change, and the campaign, if there is a semblance of one, is not well executed.
8. Local government reform is a Political Campaign.

The Politics of Change in Local Government Reform

The purpose of this envelope is to explain how a citizen came upon this evil plan, and after the shock of it, what she did to expose it. It was exposed only on a state level in California. Consider this information:

1. Maureen Heaton *accidentally* came into possession of the Plan, by being in the publications room at the State Capital in Sacramento, California. She notified her good El Dorado County supervisors, who sent around their Resolution to all 57 other California counties to expose it. Their action did set the planners back in their scheduling in the 1970's.

2. Again, an effort to expose this Plan was sent around to all 58 California counties in a letter about December 9, 1994, which renewed the first El Dorado County effort to awaken other counties to this evil Plan to collapse our government, and its ability to provide needed services: a crisis of major magnitude, a catastrophe that has a physical effect on the community: the corruption of local officials, and the high cost of government and the desire for a higher level of services. Only two small Northern California counties replied and asked for the full document to be sent to them, which was done.

3. The purpose behind using the advice in this Plan was because local govern-

ment officials (the sub-divisions and special districts in our state) would not go under full regional government operation or agree to dissolve their county government, nor their special districts. The formulas in this Plan were set to force them to *change*.

4. The "think-tank planners" (who have devised these methods as sure-fire ways to force sub-divisions and special districts to collapse) are back at it again, as you can see with the banking and stock market crises. The Plan is being applied nation-wide.

In summary, you must warn your county officials that the federal government has exceeded the limit of power that was delegated to it, and are deliberately planning a collapse. Those who promote this plan, are guilty of mal-administration, and even much greater crimes. They are quite boldly working in cooperation with out-side interests to sap the energy of our nation, to destroy our proper form of government, and transfer the people of this republic under foreign global management. Be not appalled! While there is still time, find strength in this, which Pres. Franklin Pierce said in 1859:

"It may be well the circumstances have occurred to arouse us from our lethargy... to the nearness and magnitude of impending calamities. It is comparatively safe to look dangers in the face, and meet them on the advance, but fatal to be appalled by them." It is up to us to resist tyranny!

‘THE POLITICS OF CHANGE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM’

HOW I OBTAINED THE REPORT

by K. Maureen Heaton

In any production, behind the actors seen on stage, there is a crew of ‘hands’ – the ‘advance man’, in charge of propaganda, promotion and related matters; the producers, script writers, set designers, scenery handlers, costumers, stagehands, electricians, ‘props’, and the ubiquitous ‘backers’ or ‘angels’ – the money people. In the real life drama on the world stage today, parallel positions are known as publicists, consultants, planners, aides, directors, facilitators, ‘change agents’, and generally, ‘experts’. And, of course, the ubiquitous financiers – who may or may not be *Yid*. Sometimes, the curtains part enough to allow a fleeting glimpse of the ‘hidden hands’ behind the scenes which prepare the production for public viewing. When this ‘happens’, well-trained stagehands quickly close the curtain, and any watchers who note the action and attempt to describe it are given to understand that they didn’t see it, because there was nothing to see. In the real world, this is known as a ‘cover-up’. Such was the nature of the exposure of the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System. Its existence was denied, its name was changed, its capability was disguised, and the rest was silence. Such, too, was the policy paper known as ‘The Politics of Change In Local Government Reform’ (TPOC) – one of the tactics of the revolutionaries is to respond in silence, when they receive a telling blow. It sometimes works against them when they do that, and the matter of this document ‘TPOC’ was one such incident.

I had been receiving the output from the *California Council on Intergovernmental Relations* (CCIR) for some time, when I went before the Governor’s Task Force on “Local Government Reform”, to present testimony against CCIR and the State meddling in local government affairs. After my appearance there, the CCIR reports stopped coming to my mailbox. I complained to their staff about it, but could not get them to reinstate me as a recipient, so I went to a State Senator, and told him my problem. He called the CCIR office, and told them I was to be reinstated as a recipient, and that I would be over to pick up the documents I hadn’t received. When I got there, I was ushered into the office of the person in charge, who apologized profusely for any inconvenience I had suffered, and told the secretary to see that I had whatever documents they had, which I had not received.

They were just moving into a big new office, and there were huge boxes of material still not put away. The girl started showing me what was there, going to each box in turn, and handing me a copy of its content. I selected those which I had not received. I noticed, though, that there was one box near her desk, which she studiously avoided. When we had finished checking the other boxes, I asked her for a copy of the minutes of the last CCIR meeting, and she had to go into another room to get them. While she was gone, I idly picked up one of the documents from the box she had not looked into. It was titled ‘The Politics of Change in Local Government Reform’ (better known now as TPOC). “Local Government Reform” was the name of the game at that time, so I added it to my stack. (I was supposed to have anything I had not received, and I sure had not received that!)

So that was one time when they would have been better off, if they had just continued sending me the public material. For TPOC was certainly never intended to be seen by such as me. It was a textbook on mind control techniques -- an appalling negation of the principle of self-government, as it told ‘public servants’ how to use “the politics of change” to obtain programs which the citizens did not want.

After I had studied that document which had come into my hands so fortuitously, I was at a loss as to what to do with it. The first step was suggested by the document itself, because it included three “case studies” of situations in California where use of the strategies it provided “to bring about change in local government structures” was discussed. Two of those cases were already history, but the third concerned a matter of Sacramento City-

County-Consolidation (C/C/C), where these techniques were then being used to create a single entity, neither city nor county, but a hash of both.

Now listen up, all you who might think I press too hard for election of representatives. It just so happened that there was one representative on the Sacramento City Council, Sandra Smoley, who had been fighting a courageous but lonely battle against consolidation. I did not know her personally, so I arranged for the TPOC document to be taken to her by a mutually trusted ally, and she blew the whistle on the 'hands' using TPOC to reconstruct her city. Thanks to Sandra Smoley, Sacramento City-County-Consolidated (C/C/C) was defeated for that time.

Suppose Sandra Smoley had not been elected to that seat on the Council. Would there have been a different result?

Let's look at another elected official, this one a 'politician', sometime mayor of Oakland, California, John C. Houlihan. As Mayor of Oakland, Houlihan gave an interview to the Oakland Tribune in 1966, in which he stated that he would be ready to step aside as Mayor, if "full-blown government reform" was implemented statewide. Such 'reform', he said, would do away with Mayors; it would also do away with "cities, counties, districts, and boards of supervisors", and he predicted that this would come to pass before the turn of the century -- possibly by the 1980s.

Houlihan did not have to wait for his prediction to come true to "step aside". Later in 1966 he was taken to court, for looting the estate of an elderly widow, for whom he was conservator. Staunchly maintaining his innocence, he resigned his office under fire. But when he appeared in court, he entered a surprise plea of "guilty", and was sent to prison.

Reagan Now the plot thickens. John C. Houlihan was Executive Director of The Institute for Self Government at Berkeley, in January, 1974, when TPOC was issued. On November 17, 1974, the San Diego Union reported that he had been granted a "full and unconditional pardon" by Governor Ronald Reagan for his crime. So, apparently he was out on parole, at the time he participated in the production of this document which was designed to be a tool to build that governmental structure which he had predicted almost ten years before!

Houlihan is a classic example of a politician, as opposed to a representative.

The second step I took regarding TPOC was to ask for time at the next meeting of the CCIR, to challenge the members to repudiate this document, which listed the CCIR as a sponsor.

While waiting to hear from CCIR, I took the TPOC document to my County Supervisor, and he shared it with the El Dorado County Board, with the result that they passed a Resolution condemning such practices generally, and TPOC in particular. That Resolution was sent to every person of interest involved at the State level, every County Board of Supervisors in California, and eventually was reprinted in a number of newsletters and a few local papers and thus found national distribution. To my knowledge no other action was ever taken against the strategies recommended in TPOC.

In my testimony to CCIR, I read portions of that textbook for "change", such as the one which called for the use of "change agents" to manipulate public opinion and to "mislead, coerce and inhibit the rights of citizens" to decide what "changes" they want in their local government (quote from the E.D.Co. Resolution). I asked for a response as to whether or not the members of the CCIR Board were aware that this document was put out in their

name, and whether they approved of the use of such tactics. The response was -- silence! Not one of the twenty or so members spoke up.

When the next CCIR minutes arrived, they simply said that I had spoken against local government reform. I wrote and demanded a correction of the minutes from the Chair, and a minor correction was made, but no mention of the nature of the material I protested was included.

I wrote again, and repeated my demand for an accurate reflection of my testimony, and received a non-committal reply. I then wrote to my State Senator. No reply! I then wrote to the governor (**Ronald Reagan**), and sent him a copy of my testimony, copies of the letters mentioned above, and requested action from him. No reply! Silence!

It is of interest to note that, when a citizen wrote to the Institute for Self-Government in Berkeley for a copy of TPOC, the response was that that report had been 'compiled' at the request of the *California Council on Criminal Justice* (CCCJ), and was not 'published', but had been sent to the successor agency, the *Office of Criminal Justice Planning* (OCJP). The citizen was told it would cost \$8.00 to reproduce the manuscript and mail it.

Now, there are two interesting things about that:

(1) In the Foreword to TPOC, it states that it was compiled under a contract with the Office of Intergovernmental Management, in coordination with the California Council on Intergovernmental Relations (CCIR) and the Governor's Office. Make of that what you will.

(2) Then, there is the box which contained the TPOC documents. It was in the California Council on Intergovernmental Relations (CCIR) office -- NOT OCJP! The container was humongous -- and it was half full -- or half empty, if you like. Make of that what you will.

It is important for all citizens to know that California's TPOC is not an isolated instance. There are think tanks all over the country, applying themselves to mass behavior modification techniques, such as this, and the evidence of the use of such strategies is increasing.

It is simply amazing that so little notice has been taken of what these would-be manipulators are doing! Uncovering TPOC was a pure and simple happenstance, but thousands of "change agents" are being prepared in our institutions of higher education to continue developing this psywar technique, and that is no accident!

Why do you suppose none of those being trained to control their fellowman protest? Why no recognition of the dangers inherent in "change" agency, which has become an integral part of government action, with elected officials attending seminars, at public expense, to learn how to get their constituents to accept programs neither wanted or needed?

K. M. HEATON
Statement to the
CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
20 June 1974

Last year, in testimony to the federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, meeting jointly with this Council in San Francisco, I warned of the legal and ethical implications in promotion by them, and you, of "regional substate redistricting". Later, I appeared before this body at the final hearing of the Governor's Task Force on the same matter.

Today, I'm making another attempt to direct your attention to the treacherous waters ahead for those who persist in this effort to "modernize" local government.

The Task Force completed their assigned work some time ago, yet no report has been issued. Could that be because their findings didn't bolster the premises on which this effort was stated to be based? At best, a question exists as to the wisdom of continuing promotion of this concept, until that issue has been resolved.

Having worked at the grassroots level in politics for over twenty years, I was convinced that a true sampling of public opinion would refute the assumptions which have been put forward by those who are doggedly promoting regionalism and its components, of which "substate redistricting" is one. The deep concern expressed by citizens and their locally elected officials at the Task Force hearings had a common thread tying them all together - the desire at the local level to make their own decisions there.

This is not surprising, since, historically, local government has been a matter of absolute right, and has been held so by the courts, both here and in England. The California Journal reports that "all literature on the restructuring of local governments is based on false assumptions." I agree. One of those assumptions is that local government is a creature of the State. This flies in the face of the most eminent historians, who have documented the development of governments through the centuries.

Despite numerous attempts in the past to usurp the powers of local governments, and bring them under a central control, never before has there been such an attempt to erase the truth of that fact!

In this country, the courts have held consistently that, even before written constitutions, the people possessed full power of local government, and

still possess all such power which they have not delegated. I submit to you that the people have not delegated the power for this body, the Legislature, OR the federal government to interfere with local self-government. Not knowingly, that is. I would also submit that no such delegation which might be made would be valid, unless they were in possession of all the facts.

All over the country, the people are alarmed at just such attempts to force local governments into strange forms of consolidation or redistricting. In Florida, Wisconsin, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Missouri, Texas - everywhere, the story is the same. When they know the truth, the citizens resist.

This Council maintains that it is following the dictates of the elected representatives of the people. I would suggest that the shoe is on the other foot. I would suggest that the members of this Council should re-examine the original mandate, which created this body, before they go any further. Such directives as have come from the Legislature have been based on recommendations of this Council, and the Council has determined goals and objectives, strategies and tactics.

It was shocking enough to learn last year that this Council was seeking funds from the Legislature to be distributed "for the purpose of assisting and promoting the reorganization of local governments", at the discretion of this Council, let alone finding that the Legislature had complied with the request! Only the surprise veto by the Governor kept the public purse from being made available for such a purpose, in violation of the public interest and desire. By what legal, moral, or ethical standard could this Council and the Legislature justify such a usurpation of the right of local government to make such decisions, on their own, without coercion?

It was shocking to learn of a seminar held under the auspices of this Council for the stated purpose of "exploring local government options" for reform. Were the members of this Council present during the "Conversations at Asilomar"? The record doesn't show. Did that seminar have your approval? Do you concur with the "experts" who gathered there, who did not represent local governments, nor even California thinking, since they were from all over the country, and weren't elected officials? It is evident that they were already supportive of "reform". Have the members of this Council even read the report on that meeting, which carried their authority? If so, do they find that it was, in fact, "exploring local options" - or was it, rather, an exploration of techniques for achieving substate redistricting, despite local desires?

Most shocking of all, however, is a more recent document produced in "coordination" with your staff, by staff in the Governor's Office, and an "Institute for Local Self-government" (a misnomer, if I've ever heard one). This 'Institute' is now headed by a man who is on record as favoring "full-blown government reform", which he, himself, stated means abolishing both cities and counties. Have the members of this Council read "The Politics of Change in Local Government Reform"? If so, do they approve of its publication and use?

THE PEOPLE OF THIS STATE WILL WANT TO KNOW! They will want to know if they are to be subjected to such political abuse as is described in this text, which makes a sham and a farce of public debate on the issues.

Actually stating that local government is meeting the problems of the day, this report admits that "no pressure" is building to demand "local government reform". It then recommends sending "change agents" in, to "develop a climate for change", to start things moving.

Does this Council agree with that recommendation? Does this Council believe that "change agents" should work among the citizens, "*creating diversionary tactics to confuse and disorient opponents at the right moment*"? Does this Council agree that "outside consultants" should be brought in to lend authenticity to conclusions already reached"? Do you agree that "trade-offs are feasible" in obtaining a 'desired' change? Or that a decision must be made "what price must be paid" to obtain citizen support? What price are members of this Council prepared to pay to obtain 'substate districts'?

This textbook for *change* points out that there are five factors in creating "a climate for change", namely;

- (1) collapse of government,
- (2) catastrophe,
- (3) crisis,
- (4) corruption of officials, and the
- (5) high cost of government.

WOULD THE MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL GO ALONG WITH CREATION OF THESE FACTORS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL?

In closing, I ask you to look at the track record of this man who is heading this project, and then determine if you, as individuals, or members of this Council, want to be on his team.



RESOLUTION No. 447-74

OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of El Dorado County has consistently upheld the principle of local elective government, elected by popular vote of the citizens involved; and

WHEREAS, essential to such elective procedures is an informed electorate, basing their decisions freely on accurate information, openly debated, and

WHEREAS, inherent in this process is the right of the citizens not to be misled, coerced, or otherwise inhibited in the free exercise of the elective franchise, and

WHEREAS, any effort to nullify these rights is in direct conflict with the intent of the Constitution of the United States and the State of California, and

WHEREAS, it has been brought to the attention of this Board that a report has been issued by the Institute for Local Self Government, asserting the authority of the Governor's Office, the Office of Intergovernment Management, and the Council on Intergovernmental Relations, which presents prima facie evidence of a deliberate, calculated attempt to mislead, coerce, and inhibit the rights of citizens to determine the need for, the desirability of, and the method to bring about changes in the structure of their local governments; and

WHEREAS, the "Summary of Conclusions" in this report states:

"There must be a CLIMATE FOR CHANGE in order for the restructuring of local government to occur, whether this restructuring involves drastic reform, reorganization, modernization, or a minor administrative realignment. While the following does not represent an exclusive list, the factors mentioned here are those which most often create such a climate:

- a. COLLAPSE of government's ability to provide such needed services;
- b. a CRISIS of major magnitude;
- c. a CATASTROPHE that has a physical effect on the community;
- d. the CORRUPTION of local officials;
- e. the high COST of government and the desire for higher level of services."

(emphasis in the original); and

WHEREAS, it would appear from this document, which is entitled "The Politics of Change in Local Government Reform", that it was received by the Council on Intergovernmental Relations; and

WHEREAS, the techniques described in this report have apparently been used in San Diego County Government Reorganization, in the Consolidation of the Contra Costa Fire Department, and the current effort to consolidate Sacramento City and

WHEREAS, the cited report actually states that LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS MEETING THE PROBLEMS OF TODAY, and that no pressure is building up to cause the citizens to wish the desired reforms, then recommends the use of "change agents" to DEVELOP a climate for change, using diversionary tactics to confuse and disorient the citizens, and to deceive them about the need for reform; and

WHEREAS, this Board of Supervisors is at a loss to understand any legitimate function served by such proposals as these;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado, in the State of California, on this 17th day of September, 1974, that all persons by whom this present Resolution is received be informed that this Board herewith goes on record in strong opposition to any such attempt to deprive the citizens of the State of California, and particularly of El Dorado County, of their right to determine for themselves the forms and functions of their government, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Board notify the Governor of the State of California, the Institute for Local Self Government, the Office of Intergovernment Management, the Council on Intergovernmental Relations, the League of California Cities, the California Supervisors Association, and the Boards of Supervisors of the several counties of the State, that such political abuse as is disclosed in this document is intolerable, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of El Dorado County hereby calls on all responsible citizens and officials to be on guard against any such attempt to usurp their rights and privileges.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado at a regular meeting of said Board, held on the 17th day of September, 1974, by the following vote of said Board:

Ayes: Franklin H. Lane, William V. D. Johnson
W. P. Walker, Raymond E. Laywer,
Noes: Thomas L. Stewart
None
Absent: None

ATTEST;

CARL A. KELLY, County Clerk and ex-officio
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By Shirley D. Matthews
Deputy Clerk

[Signature]
Chairman, Board of Supervisors

I CERTIFY THAT:
THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT IS A CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE.

DATE

ATTEST: CARL A. KELLY, County Clerk and ex-officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado, State of California.

By
Deputy Clerk

Question: Why was the word Local put in the title of the sneaky Houlihan Plan when its effects were for national use?

Answer: Internationalists already had control of federal and state officials. They found local elections (cities/counties) were too numerous and too spread out for them to control who would be elected to local office. Local officials did not want to go into regional arrangements, so a contract was then entered into by 1972 for a 'Plan' to suggest ways to force restructuring of local governments.

Another reason internationalists found local officials difficult was that voters all over the nation were familiar with their own local candidates in their own cities and counties. The 'Plan' reported 5 sure-fire methods, which in the past, caused governments to fail and fall apart. All 5 of these methods listed in the Houlihan Plan are now being used by "change agents" upon unsuspecting U.S. citizens. (Collapse, Crisis, Catastrophe, Corruption and Cost)

It took engineering of only one person to sit in the chair of the Oval Office, as the President, who could sign purported 'laws' to alter the system, (sent from the Congress via A.C.I.R.'s* help), who would *also* use the power of executive orders, sign treaties, presidential directives, revenue sharing grants, etc. *to effect the changes that the internationalists sought, in order to eliminate the Constitution and the Bill of Rights!* Simultaneously, they structured an international government (a New World Order). Was it not easier to elect one key man, at the top of both parties, than to replace thousands of local officials?

It took engineering of only 50 people to hold down the governor's chair in each state *in order to get the state to co-operate with the changes being made in the system* by the Oval Office for regional international government, mandated elements in City and County General Plan documents, grants to states, federal O.M.B. planning, and eventually bankrupting the state.

Local governments presented more risks to these evil engineers. Some seats were acquired, but not enough. Meanwhile, officials in the state houses have done nothing to stop the unlawful militarized Homeland Security Agency or the federal seizure of state law enforcement powers (the police)!

*The Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations drafted the required legislation "in light of the desired changes." Brookings Institute, when accompanying the president to summit conferences, drafts legislation to make international changes possible.