



“The ‘Smart Growth’ Concept is an Absolute and Utter Fraud!”

Planning, Property Rights, DNR, and Environmental Corridors
“Restoring Our Founding Freedoms” – Freedom 21 Radio Series (Feb 4, 2003)
WSAU (5.50 AM) News Radio, “Sound Off Central Wisconsin”, Wausau, Wisconsin

Pat Snyder – Radio Host

Dr. Michael Coffman – (guest on phone) President, Environmental Perspectives, Inc.

Mrs. Marilyn Hayman – (guest in studio) Chairman, Citizens for Responsible Zoning and Landowner Rights, Inc.

Highlights **bolded**, underlined, and/or *italicized*.

Comments [added].

First Hour

Pat – Well hello everyone. Welcome to this Tuesday edition of “Sound Off Central Wisconsin”.

As we have another interesting day when it comes to the future and land and “Smart Growth”, or Comprehensive Planning. My guests today, first over the phone is Dr. Michael Coffman. He is currently the President of Environmental Perspective, Inc. [EPI], and Executive Director of Sovereignty International. EPI focuses on providing professional guidance and training in defending environmental problems and solutions based on Judeo-Christian principles of stewardship, as contrasted with...(Marilyn – Pantheistic.) pantheistically [the universe, taken or conceived of as a whole, is God; the doctrine that there is no God but the combined force and laws which are manifested in the existing universe (Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary)]-based environmentalism. Wow! And also, he's received his bachelor's of science in forestry and MS in biology at Northern Arizona University. [Also] a Ph.D. in forest service at the University of Idaho at Moscow, up there in Idaho.

And you heard Marilyn Hayman is with me as well. Thank [you] Marilyn for that pronunciation [for the word pantheistically]. She's retired from the Minneapolis school systems. She taught elementary and special education for 30 years there, and received her masters in education psychology from the University of Minnesota and a BA from Milwaukee Downer College. She's Chairman of Citizens for Responsible Zoning and Landowner Rights, Incorporated down there in Maiden Rock, Wisconsin. And thank you for coming Marilyn (Marilyn – A pleasure.). And Dr. Coffman, thank you! (Dr. Coffman – Well thank you for having me on.)

And sorry I messed up that word there, you guys. I'm just not scientific I guess [laughter]. Well we're going to talk a little bit more about the details here, and there's some interesting aspects. The folks that have followed this series realize there are two points of view. And maybe you can tell us your involvement and how you really got interested in this.

The one point of view is that there's an agenda being put on by the UN, the federal government of the United States --- right to the state level...of getting folks into the mindset of getting into large urban centers and getting off of the lands where forests and other regions are. And in the other sense when I talk with the folks that are trying to get these comprehensive plans going. They're saying there's no such thing...local control will still be there for the towns and townships and villages. So there is contradiction. So let's start Dr. Coffman – how did you get involved – I know you've been involved in forestry, but how did you get involved in this quest about comprehensive planning or “Smart Growth”?

Dr. Coffman (Doctor) – Well for one thing I was teaching and doing research up at the Michigan Technological University at Houghton, Michigan for about 12 years. When I moved to/ started a research program for Champion International which covered northern Wisconsin and the western end of the upper peninsula of Michigan – during that period of time I began to become aware that **there was a real serious effort to bring a system of control to forest practices, not only in the lake states but all of the United States and perhaps even the world.** When I moved back to Maine to assume a similar position where I am now – I took over a project for Corporate America...the Paper Industry of America on research on acid rain and global climate change. And then started working very closely with the EPA, the U.S. Forest Service, as well as many of the environmental organizations. And my suspicions of about 10 years prior were realized as I understood that **there was a huge agenda out there to bring control not only over forestry but other aspects of our American life.** And finally decided in 1992 (late 1991/92) to leave the forest industry and forestry responsibilities per se and begin to alert the American people as to really what was happening, because **there is – no question about it – a huge agenda out there to begin the process of control.**

And it's interesting that you mention that the other side will say that there is a need for comprehensive planning and that there will still be local control. But if you look at the local control that is occurring, what you find is that **they have selected people that are volunteering; usually paid professionals on environmental organization staffs, and so forth – to be on public/private partnerships with either the state or the federal government.** And you might have a token county commissioner [supervisor] or city councilman, or state representative involved in it – but **they have no direct accountability to the people that are actually involved. And while there is local input, that input is not accountable to the people – the citizens of that particular community whatsoever. And as a consequence, that sort of local control is a euphemism – it just does not exist.**

Pat – Let me ask you this. A lot of the counties here in the state of Wisconsin are bringing in consultants to talk with all the city and township folks about this comprehensive planning, and trying to find out from them what their likes and dislikes are for rural and urban...and leading these group discussions. Are these consultant groups legitimate? What do you think their role is? They're saying they're trying to facilitate so that all groups get together rather than meet with them individually.

Doctor – I can't give you a stock answer on that [Pat] because it's one of those things where there are certain consultants that are very well prejudiced toward a certain side of the agenda – one side or the other. There are those who really are not attached to any particular agenda and they're using existing laws and models to implement what they believe is the right course of action for a county or regional planning or whatever the case may be. So there really isn't a hard and fast answer. **The vast majority are oriented toward a command and control state-level or federal-level control of natural resource land use utilization.** (Pat – mm hmm.) And that is what we need to be concerned about. Even if they're not aware of what they're doing, is that **they're actually implementing a plan that takes the control of the destiny away from the people, and puts it in the hands of planners at the state or federal level. And they're not accountable to the people of which they have governmental control!**

Pat – Okay, and Marilyn you can jump in any time you'd like on these issues as well. I went to a meeting about this and they said that this is a state of Wisconsin mandate. That they all have to join in on these comprehensive plans, and each city or township needs to present a plan to them of what they have for the future. Is this really true -- I mean do they have to do this?

Doctor – I’m not sure of what the state of Wisconsin law requires. States like California for instance do have a comprehensive planning law. But they leave it pretty much up to the local communities as to how it’s supposed to be implemented. And what happens is that you have college-trained planners come into the planning department who are full of ideas that you have to control this and you have to control that, while they use a lot of verbiage...while they have local control, and all the rest...their economic development and so forth...**when they come out with their plan it’s usually overwhelmingly oriented toward protecting the environment at the loss of the economy of the local planning unit.** And this is what concerns me the most! And these people may be honest in what they’re trying to do. They have just been trained in these areas to believe the people out there are destroying the environment and they need to be controlled! That’s why they come up with these plans. They may not be having an agenda of their own, it’s just that’s how they’re trained!

Pat – Okay.

Marilyn – Actually, the people...**townships are being told that the law is mandatory.** But there’s some question and there are some people who are challenging the idea that it is a mandatory law. **The law says that townships may enter into a “Smart Growth” planning program [yet final interpretation of the law is still subject to the courts]. If they choose not to there is apparently no [current] reason -- nothing to prevent them from remaining out of it [unless the courts later determine the law to be mandatory].** The point is if they once get into it, and they take grant money, then they must follow the program as it’s laid out by the state. And I believe that there are 9 elements that must be included in their plan. And **when they say it’s a “local” plan – if your plan does not meet their approval, you have to change it! And eventually it is no longer your plan! Eventually it’s a plan that somebody else feels is appropriate for you.**

And when you talk about facilitators [consultants] leading – that’s a very good word. They do lead, and I have been at meetings where the facilitators have eventually gotten just about everything they wanted into the programs. And **we’d go to a meeting one night and there would be comments made by citizens – they’d never appear in the transcripts the next time we came to the meeting! But there would be things there that were never discussed at the meeting...that were just kind of slipped in and added because the planners apparently thought that this was appropriate.** So it is a process of “leading” – truly.

Pat – Okay! Let’s take a quick break here doctor. I’ve got to take a commercial break. We’re visiting with Doctor Michael Coffman; also Marilyn Hayman. We’re talking about comprehensive planning, “Smart Growth”...and much more. Our lines are open. This is “Sound Off”.

-----Break-----

Pat – Welcome back to “Sound Off Central Wisconsin”. 845-2155...#550 from your Sprint PCS Cellcom cellular phones. My guests on the phone [are] Dr. Coffman, President of Environmental Perspectives, Inc. (EPI) and also Marilyn Hayman, who is the Chairman of Citizens of Responsible Zoning and Landowner Rights. And every time we get into this I am more intrigued. I learn so much more -- I hope our audience does as well. Dr. Coffman, let’s continue on, we’ve got a phone call but I want you to maybe go back in time again. We’ve done it a couple of times but it’s always good to find out where the roots of this thing got rolling and then we’ll take some questions on the phone.

Doctor – Well if you'll recall, the environmental movement got a second breath. It first took off in the late 1800s, and it got a second breath in the 1960s. And in 1972 Lawrence Rockefeller, through the Rockefeller Brother's Foundation or Fund, sponsored a research effort headed up by Bill Reilly who became the first EPA director. And it was titled "The Lease of Land: The Citizens' Policy Guide to Urban Growth". And it was a policy basically that outlines what we know as "Smart Growth" today. And Congress tried to get several laws passed during the early 1970's following this pattern of land use control. And they failed miserably because at that time people were still pretty knowledgeable of the importance of property rights.

But they have piecemealed through the years...developed this process using urban sprawl as the justification to begin to implement land use control around urban areas [and] eventually around the rural areas that followed this plan almost to a tee. And that's what we're seeing actually being implemented around the country right now – is the control of all land use activities by either the federal or state government. And it has very dangerous implications! It's not that we don't need to protect the environment, because we do. But as I said earlier, once you begin down this road of using professional planners who got their training in a college education setting that is basically oriented toward this kind of state control over land use, you're going to find that **almost all of these comprehensive plans will take on the tone of protecting the environment at the expense of the people.**

And there needs to be a better balance. I know the state DNR says that there's going to be balance and so forth, but I have yet to see one. I am not familiar enough yet to say that about the Wisconsin DNR – I have a lot of friends in the Wisconsin DNR – but at the same time it has been historically the case in other states that I have been involved in where when you come out with **these comprehensive plans they really deny the people property rights and deny people the opportunity to utilize their land in a way that benefits them and the society as a whole to the maximum extent!**

And you have to also acknowledge that a person who owns land, and is wanting to farm it or to utilize it in a way that is going to benefit themselves in later years or their families... or keep its market value they're not going to do things to that land that are going to destroy its potential.

Most landowners are very responsible. Yes you have a few bad apples, but at the same time to kind of control the ability of everyone to utilize their land, just to try to control the few that are bad is not the way to go.

Pat – Okay. Let's take a phone call. First we say good morning to Ron. Ron, how ya doing? Where are you calling from Ron?

Ron – I'm in Westboro right now. (Pat – Okay, well welcome to "Sound Off". What's your question?) I don't really have a question. [But] with the state mandating this program – because I'm the town chairman of the town of Hill in Ogema -- (Pat – Okay.) **they said that if towns didn't act on this thing, the counties would take over and do their planning for you.** That's what we've gotten any information about. (Pat – So that's what you've heard right there – that you either play ball or we'll guide you.) Right. That's basically what's happening. And right now Price County has [developed] a resolution to try to get rid of "Smart Growth" planning altogether. (Pat – Excellent! Excellent! Price County.) There's going to be a big meeting at Strafford on the 13th at 8:00 o'clock [p.m.]. (Pat – Yeah, that'll be at the Country Aire Banquet Hall.) That's right. So I'm definitely going to be there and I hope we get something accomplished that night.

Pat – Okay. Well thanks for calling Ron and keep up the good work. (Ron – Thank you.) All right.

Doctor – I would like to follow up on what Ron was saying. I'm not sure what county he was referring to... (Pat – Price County.) ...Price County. **If they are trying to get rid of "Smart Growth" altogether, [they need to take] the tremendous opportunity of doing so, because we are putting together a program [Local Environment and Resource Network -- LEARN] right now of where counties/cities (municipalities) can actually begin the planning process themselves without going the comprehensive planning route. And they can meet state and federal restrictions and take control over how their county [or whatever size local governmental unit] is going to be actually done to protect the citizens of their county, and the economy of the county while at the same time addressing some of the environmental concerns that need to be addressed.**

Pat – Is there a website for that where they can learn more, or how do they find out about that to get involved?

Doctor – I almost didn't say anything because we're not yet at that point. (Pat – Okay.) I'm hoping that in a month or so we will be and maybe I can contact Marilyn at that time [or vff21@vff21.info] and let her know that we have the information available... (Marilyn – We will spread the info.) ...where **we can provide assistance to people like you in those particular counties and help their county commissioners [supervisors] understand their legal rights and standing both within state law and federal law!** This isn't county supremacy or anything else, this is using the existing state and federal law to be able to become joint and equal partners with either the state or the federal government in how you're going to implement some of these laws at the local level!

Pat – Okay, let's take another call as we go down to Plainfield. Peter! Hi, welcome to "Sound Off".

Peter – Yea, good morning. I may have too specific a question – I think Marilyn might be able to answer it. I'm in Portage County. And we've got [an] unusually large number of retired "smart" people down here. [Laughter.] They're aggressively trying to set up their program and get it certified early. And I'm wondering, once a county's program gets certified, is there a chance they can franchise that out to less "smart" counties, and derive some income off of that? I know Sarah...a regular guest of yours (Pat – Right, [.]) talks about how they're not going to let this, that, and the other thing happen. And I'm just wondering what is the consequence if your plan is found to be not so "smart"? Are you then going to be compelled to follow the lead of counties that are "smarter" than you? And if that's the case would these counties have an opportunity to have a franchise and say "Hey, you can buy our plan from us"...and then there'd be a monetary incentive also to become "smart"?

Marilyn – I'm sorry, I have never heard of that before. And I really don't know how to respond to it.

Pat – Well he's trying to figure out (Marilyn – Yes.) -- see, he's a businessman trying to think about a way to make a profit. But Peter I don't think they've thought that far ahead. I don't think they care about a profit.

Peter – **They're pushing so hard in this county, that they want to be a model.** They're speaking of being a model county, and also reaching their requirements early...and what would be the incentive for that?

Marilyn – Do they outnumber you? (Pat – Do they outnumber you Peter?)

Peter – It goes from township to township. This county is run by the city. (Pat – of Stevens Point.) Yes, they get a disproportionate number of people on the county board. And so the city can dictate anywhere in the county. (Marilyn – Yea.) And that’s kind of the way it goes. There is only Stevens Point in Portage County.

Pat – Okay. You brought up a good point Peter but I’ve got to get ready for news. Do you have another question real quick? (Peter – No that was about it.) Okay, thanks. (Peter -- Bye.) All right, news coming up. That's interesting. I haven't heard of that theory before. (Marilyn – I haven’t either.) I guess if everyone’s supposed to be “smart”, I guess I want to stay dumb, right? [Laughter]

Hold on Doctor, we’ll take a break for ABC News...Doctor Michael Coffman with me; Marilyn Hayman. We’re talking about comprehensive planning. We have much more to talk about. We’ll do that here in the next half-hour...next hour as well.

We will have live coverage for the memorial service in Houston for our astronauts that perished over this last weekend here. That will be coming up as well. More “Sound Off after this news break. 845-2155.

-----Break-----

Pat – And welcome back to “Sound Off Central Wisconsin”. I’m Pat Snyder. And my guests today Doctor Michael Coffman, President of the Environmental Perspectives, Inc., also Executive Director of Sovereignty International. And Marilyn Hayman, right here from Wisconsin. She’s Chairman for Citizens for Responsible Zoning and Landowners Rights.

That kind of takes us to the next area when we think about landowners’ rights and private property. And we were talking off air Michael about the whole importance of property rights and you break it down so well. Share that again with us.

Doctor – Well **one of the things that people don’t fully recognize [is that] 77% of the American people live in an urban environment that occupies 2.5% of the American landscape.** Their houses are stacked on top of each other sometimes, in apartment buildings sometimes, and single units. But they see the problems of what happens with urban development and so forth, and they’re concerned about then what happens in the rural areas as well. Even though the things that they’re being told are happening generally are not happening.

The thing that concerns us the most is that the “urbanites” see zoning as a positive thing because it protects the asset value of their particular home from the development of a smoke-belching company, industry right next to them or something of that nature that’s going to lower their property rights. **You can’t extend that out into the rural community however. The rural community has to have the ability to develop or utilize their land in a way that benefits them the most.** And therefore, **when you start putting these kinds of comprehensive zoning laws into effect to supposedly protect the environment, very often they don’t. And I say that as having a PhD in this particular area.** They’re done for political reasons, not for environmental reasons. Then you’re actually denying the people the right and the ability to utilize their land in the best way that benefits them. (And in the process of it benefiting them it benefits society in general). And as a consequence, you are denying them the ability to control their own destiny.

Interestingly enough, if you go to the former Soviet Union, the way that the people were controlled in the Soviet Union was not [primarily by] the KGB and so forth pointing the gun at their heads (that was always a method of last resort), but **the primary mechanism that was utilized in the Soviet Union for controlling the people was the**

control of property rights. There were no property rights. Therefore you had to live in a government home or apartment. You had to work at a government factory. You had to take government transportation -- everything was controlled by the government. And as a consequence, if a person got out of line with the local communist commissar, he (and his family) could be thrown out on the street because the commissar determines who gets to live in those apartment facilities. Or he could lose his job. Whatever the case may be.

That is what's happening with all of these state-controlled regulations and comprehensive planning [in the U.S. and here in Wisconsin] where you have a group of people that are totally unaccountable to the people over which they are administering these regulations [and] are now controlling in the same way as the commissar did their property rights. You lose your independence -- you lose your freedoms -- you lose your ability to control your own destiny.

The other side of the story is the wealth generating capacity of private property. It has now been very strongly proven over the last several years -- a multi-million dollar research effort was implemented all over the entire world by a guy by the name of Hernando Desotto, a Peruvian who went in and defined exactly why capitalism did not work in the Third World nations or the former communist states. And what he found was astonishing. Those people did not have well defined property rights like we find here in the United States and to a lesser extent in the other First World nations.

And what happens then is because they may own their home in a local area -- say in the Philippines or in Jamaica or some place like that -- they may own their own home that is recognized on the local basis, but [it] has no formal legal ability or standing, and therefore has no asset value. You cannot borrow against that to start your own business. And it's not very well understood, but 70% of new American business starts in the United States come from borrowing money against your own private property and your homes (here in the United States). Therefore, since they do not have that ability, they are stuck where they are. They will never get themselves out of poverty because they do not have the asset value that private property can bring.

Very often in these nations, and he gave many many examples where it takes two to three hundred bureaucratic steps to actually register new private property ownership so that you can get asset value. It can take up to ten to twenty years to do that. That's because of all these regulations._

What are we creating here in the United States with this comprehensive planning?! **Layer upon layer upon layer of regulations that are gradually reducing the ability of people to use their land as an asset value to actually spread their business, expand their business, start a new business, whatever the case may be. And by doing so, you're denying them the ability to create wealth!**

Now, finally, the last point that Hernando Desotto made in his analysis was that he estimated that **there is 9.3 trillion dollars of actual capital available to these third world nations, these poor impoverished people that cannot be utilized. He calls it "dead capital". 9.3 trillion dollars!** Now that is a hundred times more than all the foreign aid ever given by all the First World nations to the developing nations to develop. That's a hundred times more than that! **These people already have their asset values in-place where they could bring themselves out of poverty, except that their governments will not allow them to do so, by denying them their property rights!** They don't need foreign aid.

When I was in South Africa (last August/September [2002]), during the World Summit on Sustainable Development, we were doing a protest march and I was explaining this to the

media – the international media as we were marching along. There were hundreds and hundreds of people that were demanding the ability to have free trade and so forth. And as I was explaining this to the international media the people would just go wild. They would give me hugs and shake my hand and so forth *for explaining* what it is that they are looking for! **These people are looking for private property, we're in the process of actually denying people private property through these comprehensive zoning laws!**

Pat – So what you're saying is [that if] this thing goes into fruition eventually here in the U.S., we could become like a Third World nation!

Doctor – Exactly! And we have actually seen it, because they have actually implemented this kind of concept in totality in the Adirondack State Park in upstate New York. **We have all the evidence there where these kinds of controls will actually destroy the economy of the counties and the communities** that exist in those particular areas. Its done in the Columbia River Gorge area where they developed a scenic area that's now federally and state controlled. We have good examples of what happens when you bring this kind of control into a local area. **It will destroy your economy and the people within it!**

Pat – Wow! Anything to add to that Marilyn? (Marilyn – No, let him continue.) Yea! Wow, this is some heavy...I mean what type of timetable do you see on this thing? If it goes unabated...they always talk about 2010 as wanting these comprehensive plans in place from the cities [and all Wisconsin municipalities]. Do you see this like [for] our kids or our kids' kids...is this their future?!

Doctor – They're actually striking to have it fully implemented by the time our kids are adults. Say within the next twenty years or so. And again, most people do not realize it, but the Community Character Act of the federal government in the last Congressional session, would have done exactly this. It would have provided huge grants to local communities, local counties, cities and so forth, **for implementing this kind of "Smart Growth"**. And just as Marilyn was talking about earlier in the hour, when once that begins to happen, what you're [we're] finding is that **these cash-starved counties, and cash-starved cities and so forth, or local townships, are looking for help – but they don't realize that by getting that couple hundred thousand dollars or whatever it is they are going to get in the form of a grant is that there's all these strings attached, that they literally have to then follow if they're going to utilize that money!**

Pat – So they get you addicted, you take it, and then you gotta play ball!

Doctor – Then you gotta play ball! (Pat – Wow!). The Department of Housing and Urban Development funded a study in the year 2002 called "*Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook: Model Statutes for Planning and the Management of Change*". Again, that follows right hand in hand with the Community Character Act, and will implement this kind of draconian [harsh, restrictive] comprehensive planning at the local level.

They are looking to move very fast, before people wise up as to what's happening, and that their rights and civil liberties are being destroyed and controlled by the state or federal government, or even in their local community, if the local communities do not have wise commissioners [supervisors] and councilmen and so forth that are on the various boards. And every one of these suggestions establishes a planning commission of some sort that is not accountable to the local people. Yes, it is somewhat accountable to the county commissioners or the city councilmen or something of that nature, but in fact, **in the actual day to day operation, they are far removed from accountability of the people** they are forcing this on as you can possibly get. And it usually takes a major, major effort to finally get the city council or the county commissioners to take action against the planning commission.

Pat – Well let me ask you a question since you do have friends in the DNR here in Wisconsin... **what about the DNR?** I mean they're not elected. But it sure seems like they wield a lot of power.

Doctor – They do, and that concerns me greatly. I've always admired the Wisconsin DNR when I lived there, but that's been twenty years ago. And at the time the DNR had a mentality of **servicing the people**. Now I don't know what it does now. Because I have not been familiar, have not had to interact with the Wisconsin DNR. But I am familiar with other DNRs and other similar organizations in other states, and **over the last twenty years they have gone from a concept of servicing the people to a concept that their primary responsibility is to save the environment from the people**. (Marilyn – Exactly.) And that gives you a whole different attitude on the part of the bureaucracy within a state or the federal government itself.

Pat – Well from what I read you hit it right on the nail. 'Cause I think our DNR (and I'm not talking about every member, but that seems to be the administration's agenda) [motto] is protect the environment from the people.

Doctor – Yes, and that's a totally backwards way of approaching environmental protection because what you do is you build up an adversarial relationship between the government agency and the people. **Most landowners want some help in how to manage their land** in a way that provides both the benefits that the person or the company is looking for, as well as what the state requires in the form of environmental protection. They want that kind of help. And as a consequence they're willing to do it. The SCS [Soil Conservation Service, later called the NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service) which is/was more focused on protecting the land *from* farmers.] of the federal government was organized that way. They've done tremendous good for farming and so forth in helping farmers do a better job in agriculture, and protecting the environment, and still gaining yields for their own personal benefit. But that's not the way the federal government works anymore, nor does it sound like the way that Wisconsin DNR is working. Where they're focused on protecting the environment from the people, you build up this wall -- this chasm between the bureaucracy and the people. And **the bureaucracy, by the force of law, has this mentality that they have to squash the peoples' rights in order to protect the environment**.

Pat – All right. Well let's take a break here Michael. I'll let you take your breath and we've got a caller holding. Jeff, hold on, we'll get to your question for Dr. Michael Coffman and Marilyn Hayman, our guests today on "Sound Off".

-----Break-----

Pat – Welcome back to "Sound Off Central Wisconsin". The lines are open at 845-2155, #550 from your Sprint PCS or Cellcom Cellular phone. [A] very interesting hour. Another one to come up after this on this comprehensive planning. You know, you think I'm drilling this into you but folks sometimes you've got to be repetitive, repetitive, repetitive to make it sink in to some of the folks heads, and to counter some of the other side that we've been hearing. Marilyn Hayman my guest. Dr. Michael Coffman also my guest this hour. We do have a caller, with a question. Let's go to Pittsville – Jeff, thanks for holding through the break and welcome to "Sound Off".

Jeff – Good morning Pat. If you remember Pat, I called back in October [7 Nov] when you had someone on about "Smart" Growth. (Pat – Yes.) I called in to tell you I was in the process of purchasing a farm, and they were taking sixty-eight acres of that land, because it was a foreclosure before I got it. And it was a foreclosure through the

government, (Pat – Right!) that they were able to switch from one government agency to another. Now Fish and Wildlife has sixty-eight acres of that land that I cannot do anything on. (Pat -- It's your land but you can't...) It's exactly what he's talking about! **What makes them think that they can manage that better than myself?!**

Doctor – They can't.

Jeff – **And [to show] how goofy this is, I was standing there – and of course they want to turn this back into wetland -- this was agricultural land. They want to put this back into wetlands!** And right next to the road there's some tall grass, and I said "well geez, is all this going to be under water?!" And they said "no". Of course this is next to the road. And I said, "Okay, well it sure seems like good habitat for partridge and stuff. Do you plant them?" And they said, "Well, most of our money is allocated for the prairie chicken in southern Wisconsin." (Pat – Oh for goodness sakes!) (Doctor – Yeah.) Now I about fell over laughing at them at that point, which probably wasn't good, but – [laughter] this is how stupid that is!

Pat – Now where is this specifically now Jeff – in Pittsville area? (Jeff – Yes.) What county is that again? (Jeff – It's in Wood County.) Wood County. Okay. Wow! So you can't do anything on sixty-eight acres that before was foreclosed -- were growing crops?

Jeff – Correct. Because the farm has been vacant for awhile now, and I'm not going to say that it wasn't a beautiful crop. But back when I first moved there and I had just 2.5 acres out of that section, there [were] some nice crops there at the time. **It was pitched probably and crops could grow there again or trees, or what have you! But they're going to take, and dike this land up, and make it into wetlands! And then they're going to call it recreational land, and double my taxes on it for my agriculture! Ain't that great?!** (Pat – Oh my goodness!)

Doctor – Yea that's not uncommon what Jeff is describing. I see this all across the country as I talk to different people. And it's what happens when you start to separate the responsibility of the governing agencies...the state DNR...whatever you want to call them in the different states... when their mission, **when their perceived mission changes from assisting the people on the land to stopping the people from doing things on the land.**

Jeff – Yea. Well Pat if you recall like I said back in October. (Pat – You did! You said I remember your call!) I have been messing around with this thing...I actually just finally closed last week Tuesday! (Pat – Wow!) And now they just sent me more paperwork they want me to sign after they've already cashed my check! So I'll keep you posted on this. (Pat – Yes, okay do that Jeff! Thanks for your call.)

Pat – All Right. 845-2155. Let's go to another call from Wausau. Kris joins us, Hi Kris.

Kris – Hi. I just turned on your station. I heard your guests' opinion of the DNR, and what you guys are talking about. (Pat – Right.) I don't know if you've talked about the situation in Oneida County, with the water front property? (Pat – No, go ahead and share that with us.) Well basically -- and this is all originating from the DNR – **if you're within 75 feet of the high water mark (Pat – Right.) you're limited as to what you can do to your property or to your structure.** And it was basically at the beginning [that] you couldn't really do anything. You couldn't add on, et cetera. **You could only maintain it and on the maintenance part you're limited with that.**

And if you're within 40 feet of the high water mark you basically had to let your property just rot! (Pat – Oh my gosh!) But now the people have spoken up. **They've changed it where if you're within 40-75 feet (your building structure) then they're a**

little bit more lenient. They'll allow you to add on, et cetera. But now, still if you're within 40 feet, you can't do anything. And we have a cabin up there and we're at 37 feet. (Pat – So what are they going to do? They don't want you to move it do they – your cabin?) Well, I don't know. If we want to add on for example a room, I don't know – if we tell them we'll take 3 feet off the front of our property (you know, the lake side)...if they'll allow us to do that. (Doctor – They probably will not.) [] Probably not, right.

Doctor – Kris, **is the Wisconsin DNR responsible for this program?** (Kris – Yes, from what I understand. And the planning commissioner for zoning is putting their ordinances out based on the standards or the requirements of what the DNR said). The county planning commissioner? (Kris – Yes, from what I understand.) Okay, I think eventually if you can just hang tight for a little while we're coming up with a program that if you have a planning commission that is more interested in [enforcing state law than in protecting peoples' rights] we have tools that we're developing right now that will allow you to actually become joint and equal partners with the state and begin to define what the state can do and what they cannot do at the local level.

Pat – Okay, good we'll do that here. I've got news coming up but thanks Kris for those [] facts. Go ahead real quick Marilyn.

Marilyn – Well, I was going to say basically **what she has is a non-conforming structure. And if you read the DNR documents carefully the purpose of a non-conforming designation is to ultimately remove the structure from the site.** (Doctor -- Yes.)

Pat – Wow! All right, we've got a newsbreak from ABC. We'll come back with more of Doctor Michael Coffman, Marilyn Hayman here on "Sound Off".

--- Break ---

Second Hour

Pat – Welcome back. Hour number 2 here of "Sound Off Central Wisconsin". My guests – Dr. Michael Coffman, who is the President of Environmental Perspectives and Executive Director of Sovereignty International, and Marilyn Hayman who is Chairman of Citizens for Responsible Zoning and Landowner Rights right in Maiden Rock, Wisconsin. And I think we do have a caller on the line. Irene is calling in from Schofield to join us. Hi Irene thanks for holding and welcome to "Sound Off".

Irene – Yes, I am very worried that this country may be made into a communist country. Like you remember last October that one lady [guest Joan Veon] was on the show and she said that the United Nations is working to make the United States a communist country. And then she explained how we would have no freedom. (Pat – That's right) And for many years I have already been signing petitions to different organizations that want us to get out of the United Nations, but the government hasn't done anything yet. But I keep on signing them and I think we people should get out of there.

Pat – Well, I'm with you there Irene...full lock, stock, and barrel. We'll start another League of Nations of our own with another agenda. Good idea Irene...

Irene – And I keep on signing those petitions. Like one man, when he took the petitions to the United Nations (petitions from people, thousands of them)...and the United Nations had said you can bring them but when he got there some big boss said to his officers, "Get him out of here! Throw him over the fence! (Pat – Oh boy.) That's what they did, they dragged him on the cement steps and threw him over the fence. And then they threw the petitions all over the sidewalk. I wouldn't know the news otherwise but I read all my letters that I get. (Pat – Wow.) And I guess he's still fighting it. Then they put him in jail

for 3 hours! But luckily there was an attorney that got him out of that jail. (Pat – Okay.) And he didn't do anything wrong, but those petitions, it was the United Nations. So see how cruel they are?! We don't want to be in it!

Pat – Well I'm with you. All right Irene thanks for your call. All right. Well you know what Michael and Marilyn it does seem there is an agenda with the United Nations. And there are people baffled out there why we stay in that organization, but maybe there's a reason uh?

Doctor – Well there is a reason. I think it's part of an overall agenda too, because **there's no question that the United Nations right now is talking about implementing global governance.** That was pretty much sealed in the year 2000 during the Millennium Summit held in September at the United Nations where 150 or so Presidents and Prime Ministers and so forth from all around the world met. And they basically gave their tacit approval through consensus to **a plan to bring this global governance into fruition using international treaties as a mechanism to control the activities of everyone on planet Earth.**

And fortunately, the big meeting they had this September (the [2002] World Summit on Sustainable Development) did not do what the United Nations and the global community wanted it to do. **The citizens themselves rose up and they stopped it!**

Pat – That's right. Talk about that briefly. We do have a couple of calls. But that came an hour away...are you talking about that Senate passage?

Doctor – That's a different issue but the same result! **Is back in 1994 the United Nations was trying to get us to ratify an 18-page treaty (basically an outline of a treaty) that hadn't been written yet. And we discovered through some sources in Europe and so forth what was intended in that treaty. And that treaty would have mandated what was called "The Wildlands Project". The Wildlands Project calls for setting aside one half of the United States into wilderness core reserves and interconnecting corridors.** And the interconnecting corridors would usually be along river ways and streams or along mountaintops. (Pat – And I'm sure this would have meant the Great Lakes region along the lakes.) Yes -- no question about it. **And in these core reserves no human activity can take place!** And this hadn't been decided yet but probably not even hunting or fishing. It would be left completely to nature!

Pat – Now wait a minute now! **Our senators were going to buy into this?!**

Doctor – They did buy into this! In fact, they were ready to ratify it at 3 o'clock in the afternoon when we finally got the documentation that we pulled out of Europe and gave it to them, showing them what exactly what it was going to do. And I had been working on a map, that would illustrate graphically what these core wilderness areas and reserves would look like. And it caused such a furor within the U.S. Senate that George Mitchell who was the majority leader at the time took the treaty right off of the executive calendar! They never...it was within an hour of the "closureable", where it would be taken to do the actual ratification. They were within an hour of doing that and he saw that what we had been telling him all summer was true – based on the United Nations documents – and he pulled it right off the executive calendar! It was never voted on. (Pat – Oh my...) It came that close!

Pat – Who introduced it?

Doctor – The actual treaty was introduced by a number of senators. Well, let me put it this way. President Clinton signed the treaty and sent it to the U.S. Senate for ratification. It was then picked up by a number of Democratic senators to actually carry the ball within the Senate to get it ratified. And that process went to -- like I said – one hour before the

scheduled ratification vote when we were able to introduce evidence right out of the United Nations that showed very clearly (Pat – Wow!) what they intended to do.

Pat – All right. Let's go to the phones again. Carl's been holding. Hi Carl. Welcome to "Sound Off." Do you have a question?

Carl – Well, not really a question...I am part of a land use group over in the western part of the state. And I think that the land use group that I belong to (what is part of a township) is very important in that it's made up of both farmers, business people [and] professional people. And **we've really over a 24-month period we've asked the people what they were looking for in their township. And we've come up with a plan that will meet their needs.** And there are certain restrictions, but the people have the right to come to the plan group, and voice their opinion and ask for changes, and we're willing to look at those things!

Doctor – It sounds to me like you're doing exactly the right thing. Because this is where you can introduce the county or in this case township culture, economy, and so forth. Because **you're getting input from all of the citizens -- you're finding out what can be done, what should be done to protect the citizens and advance the economy of the township as well as enforce the various environmental laws (both federal and state)** in a way that protects the citizens and their property rights and the asset value of their land while at the same time meeting the laws that have been passed by the state and federal government. It's exactly the right way to go!

Carl – I think what we're looking for is to make sure that everything's done in an orderly fashion. Some guy doesn't come and take 80 acres and subdivide it, and starts putting a bunch of roads in that don't make a lot of sense, and that don't meet the town's standards as far as safety as far as fire and ambulance, and things like that. And we just want things done in an orderly fashion! And by doing it by the town we keep the county not completely out of it, but we have a say so for our own township before the county or the state can get involved with it.

Doctor – Absolutely! (Pat – Perfect!)

Marilyn – **As long as you do your planning on a township level, and don't get yourself involved with the state planning programs, you're okay.** (Doctor – Yes.)

Carl – We had when we started...we had somebody from the county come in and basically talk to us. But when it finally came down, the proposal that we made up and presented for the township was by the town members. (Doctor – Which is great!)

Pat – That is great! Keep up the good work and who knows, you might be the blueprint that is going to be used by a lot of folks!

Carl – Well I think a lot of them where we are...we're in Chippewa County and a lot of the townships followed this and I think we're all pretty much on the same pattern of what we're doing.

Pat – Okay! Hey Carl I really appreciate your call! (Carl – Sure.) Thank You. 845-2155 as we have another caller. Jake from Marathon! Thanks for calling "Sound Off" Jake.

Jake – Yes! I'm serving on the local municipalities planning committee, working with this Smart Growth legislation. The last caller was very helpful in terms of answering some of the questions I had. We've been working on this and we've surveyed our constituency. The only thing I'm wondering now...we've been going to these regional planning sessions and the last time they proposed some information whereby we could request funding that is

available, up to \$5,000 per municipality. And I think what I'm hearing from the people you have on the program are saying, "maybe it's better not to use that funding (Marilyn – Exactly.) because you become subservient to...?" (Pat – Then they've got you evidently. Is that what you're saying?) (Marilyn – Exactly.)

Doctor – Yea that's generally what happens. Now I don't know exactly what the funding mechanism is that you're referring to. Marilyn might be able to address it a little bit better. But generally that kind of funding comes with a lot of strings attached. And before you take the funding you ought to see what all the strings are they're going to require you to do.

Jake – Okay, how do we find that out?

Marilyn – Can I give them an example of one of the strings? (Pat – Sure!) **There are 9 elements to the Smart Growth plan. One of the elements involves environmental corridors and environmentally sensitive areas. All Smart Growth plans will require that you map environmental corridors.** The whole corridor program has been discussed for perhaps the last 30 to 40 years and there are two sources that give you a pretty good definition. One of them is the "Farmland Preservation Program". And under that program they discuss 'special or unique lands to be preserved'. They present it as a model and **they say, "environmentally sensitive areas should be mapped for each township"**. The maps would delineate the rivers or stream corridors and include the adjacent steep slopes.

Now the Farmland Preservation Program created a map for each township in every county, indicating what are the environmentally sensitive areas. This was presented as a model for our county – I live in Pierce County. And they wanted to add these farmland preservation maps to the county map. **When we took the township maps and put them together for the total county, we discovered it was close to a third of Pierce County [that] would be encompassed by these environmentally sensitive corridors.** (Pat – Wow!) **When the people had a chance to see the map and they could very clearly delineate where they lived, they protested! They were opposed, overwhelmingly opposed!** And over a number of months and with many different meetings we finally got the land management committee to back off, and we did not map them in our county plan.

But there have been maps like that created for every township in the state. So if you want to know first of all which lands are going to be included in these environmentally sensitive areas you can go to your land management department and ask them to see the farmland preservation plan for your county. It will be dated either 1982 or 1985. It contains a map for each township. You can get a copy of the township maps and you'll have a very good idea of what it is they want to put aside.

The second source that you can look at is a document from the DNR from 1994, which is called "Land Use in Wisconsin: A Draft Report of the DNR Land Use Task Force." It discusses potential DNR actions. And these are for protecting the linear stretches of land generally along rivers and streams. It also provides for linkages between larger wildlife habitats. If there are no rivers or streams you could perhaps include woodlands as linear stretches. It also includes dry runs, runs, and the DNR adds "adjacent upland areas." The report directs the DNR to aggressively pursue expanded protection and restoration of environmental corridors.

Now you need to understand that protection equals control! (Doctor – Yes.) They suggest that the communities are to address how individual properties should be used. Now here this is a direct confrontation with the state's constitution that says

all land is “allodial”, which means it is sovereign – there is nobody else that can control it.

The environmental corridors are the central vision for land use management in Wisconsin. The goal of the DNR is to preserve, enhance or restore these corridors. Know what they mean: preserve means “keep it as it is, limit future use.” Enhance means “make it larger.” Restore means “return it to its natural state.”

Now Smart Growth planners are using these corridors as part of their program to regulate and to control the land with the Smart Growth plans.

Doctor – **Marilyn, what you just described is the “Wildlands Project”!**

Marilyn – Of course it is! **It is the “Wildlands Project” in microcosm! (Doctor – Yes.) The “Land Use in Wisconsin” document was a prologue to the 1999 [Wisconsin] Smart Growth Law! It foreshadowed the creation of a land use council and the state land use planning. And it suggested the use for grants for communities for planning land use. All of the language of Smart Growth is contained in that document from 1994: sustainability, urban sprawl, partnership citizen...the whole gambit of things.**

And when they talk about urban sprawl our local representative told me just the other day that **only 3% of the state of Wisconsin is now covered by urban development.** When you go into a city like Milwaukee it looks like the whole state is covered over with houses but in effect 3% is a very small bit of land and it certainly is far from a crisis. It certainly is not a sprawl!

Doctor – **The whole urban sprawl, “Smart Growth” concept is an absolute and utter fraud! And by implementing the kinds of controls they are doing across cities and urban areas in the United States, including Madison and Milwaukee and so forth, what they are doing is that they are actually creating the very problems that they say they are solving!**

We have yet to find a single example where Smart Growth has accomplished the goals of lowering pollution emissions, for solving traffic problems, or making housing more available for the poor. All of these various things that Smart Growth is supposed to do it actually does even worse then letting the natural course of private property rights take its course!

Pat – Wow!

Marilyn – The Smart Growth law requires that every town [city, county] plan to address agricultural, natural and cultural resources. It requires that you must map and you must develop programs for conservation and effective management of environmentally sensitive areas and stream corridors. **These must be included in your Smart Growth plans. Your lands will be put aside and you will not be able to use them. They’re going to prevent future development on that land. And remember *mapping is the precursor to regulation!* (Doctor – Absolutely!) They cannot regulate the land until they map it! (Doctor – Right.) They have to have a distinct area in mind and then they can put regulations on it. (Pat – Wow!)**

Doctor – One of the things that I think can be very beneficial to the citizens of Wisconsin ([especially] the rural citizens of Wisconsin) is to do exactly what I think it was Jeff [Carl] or someone earlier that called in was doing at the local township level. You can do that at the county level too...is to **form citizen groups** of actual landowners and businessmen in your particular county or township that have a desire to actually perpetuate the economy and the culture of the local unit (either the township or the

county or city as the case might be). And **take and develop a plan -- this is kind of the heart of what I've been trying to say all the time -- is develop a plan, a [land] use plan, resource use plan that helps and protects the citizens while at the same time meets the letter of whatever state law or federal law that is existing.**

And you don't have to have corridors! The purpose of corridors isn't to establish a corridor for a corridor's sake. The purpose of corridors theoretically according to all of their literature and so forth is to protect the water quality. If you can develop alternative mechanisms that meet the standards that are required by the state law or the federal law (TDMLs [the Clean Water Act requires that states develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for surface waters that do not meet and maintain applicable water quality standards] and so forth then there's no reason to have corridors! And as a consequence, **if the local governing unit at the township or the county level develops a plan and says that we're going to protect our water resources this way and not use corridors, it's very likely that there's nothing the state can do about it.**

Marilyn – If I can add just one thing however Mike. (Pat – Sure.) The other purpose of corridors is the linkages for wildlife migration. (Doctor – Yes.) And this is something that is quite important in the DNR literature. They want to have the corridors linking the various habitats.

Doctor – The thing I want to emphasize as a scientist at this point, putting on my PhD hat (Pat – Sure.) is that **these corridors are overblown in their importance. Yes they're important, but a state like Wisconsin where you have wood lots -- even in agricultural areas you have inner connecting wood lots and so forth -- these are something the farmers want, and they themselves will serve as corridors!** (Marilyn – Exactly.) They don't have to establish a specific corridor in a specific area like they want to do! There has been plenty of research done to show that natural kinds of activities that landowners do in a natural condition will most often meet the kind of requirements that are served by these corridors and so forth. You don't need to establish them by law or regulation!

Pat – All right. We're going to take a break for news here Michael. Hold on, plus we've got Jerry and Herman hanging on with questions about all this. A quick news break from ABC.

--- Break ---

Pat – Welcome back to “Sound Off Central Wisconsin”. I'm Pat Snyder; my guests Dr. Michael Coffman who is the President of Environmental Perspectives, Inc., and Executive Director of Sovereignty International. Also Marilyn Hayman who is the Chairman of Citizens for Responsible Zoning and Landowner Rights, Inc., and you wanted to get one more thing in real quick (Marilyn – I surely do) and then we're going to get to Jerry.

Marilyn – Okay. I would like to alert people to the fact that Senator Risser has introduced legislation during the last legislative session (Pat – And we should say that Senator Risser is from...Madison. Oh surprise, surprise...go on.) All right, **his legislation would give the DNR authority to designate and map upland environmental corridors!** **Now this would not be just to the top. It would go into the land beyond the rim of the steep slopes.** **It's really a long-term goal of the DNR.** It did not pass; however, it will be reintroduced...if not this year it will come back in another year or two simply because this is what the DNR has been looking for.

It's rather interesting because **if the Smart Growth program goes through in your county and your land is already mapped for environmental corridors, this will all be convenient for the DNR! They won't have to do anything more! They can simply begin to write the rules to control the areas!** (Pat – And they can move you!) They

could move you. Right! (Pat – So these people that are worried about a tower going up on their land, you might be moved anyway!) Right! The administrative rules could preclude any kind of use and essentially render this land useless. **And it could still require the property owner (Pat/Marilyn) to pay taxes! (Pat -- And they get no compensation for it?!) No compensation!**

And the other thing that's interesting about DNR – the regulations are usually incremental. They start out kind of easy like. But the interpretations change over time! They can insert a word or delete a word here and there and change the entire intent of the particular regulation! The activities you were once allowed to participate in can be totally disallowed, your homes can become non-conforming and this would of course affect its value, it's mortgageability... It would perhaps even require the removal ultimately. Now that may sound extreme, but we have seen this happen in Pierce County, where landowners were eventually just simply moved out of an area. (Pat – My gosh!) So it's really important if your town has been working on a Smart Growth plan, you better find out right now what your plan is including. Maybe reassess what you're doing – **you might even want to bail out of that plan (Pat – Right), **and do your own planning for your own township [community]. Protect the value of your land and continue to keep your freedoms for yourselves.****

Pat – All right. And like you said too Michael, somebody from an urban setting like a senator from Madison...he has no idea what's going on up here in the north!

Doctor – No he doesn't. And that's true all across America. That's where the political power is, [again] 77% of the American people live in an urban environment that occupies only 2.5% of the American landscape. And as a consequence, **what you're seeing is a very powerful political body that occupies so little area is controlling the lives of almost everyone else and all of the other 98% of the land area of the United States!**

Pat – Okay, let's take a call because Jerry's been very patient. From Wausau, thanks for holding Jerry! Welcome to "Sound Off".

Jerry – Hi Pat, thank you. And hi to Marilyn and Michael. [] I just want to make some suggestions to the actual people who live in Marathon County, and also some suggestions on where to look on the [internet]. **Marathon County government wants Smart Growth!** **If you don't want Smart Growth the only option you have right now is get in touch with the county board and explain to the members that if Smart Growth comes to Marathon County each and every one of them will be voted out of office!** (Doctor – Absolutely!) (Pat/Marilyn – Yes/Very Good!) **And mean this! Don't vote your party, vote your nation just once in your life! Do something good for yourself and your grandchildren people!**

Pat – This doesn't know any parties does it Jerry?

Jerry – This Rio conference in 1992...that occurred on George Bush's the First watch. And Bill Clinton just ate the idea up and ran with it, and now George Bush the Second is continuing this problem.

Pat – All right, go on Jerry!

Jerry – Okay, listen people, do a web search. Type this in...search for "depopulation+north america". Rather than me coming off like a paranoid you go look at it yourself. Go look at the UN organization. **The UN Charter is antithetical [opposite/in direct conflict] to the United States Constitution!** (Doctor – Yes!) These two documents can not exist together in the world. **And nation states are a dead concept to these people! Our nation no longer means anything outside of our own love for it!** I mean this is really

serious! They're talking about things like returning California, Texas and much of the southwestern United States...return that to Mexico. We're all going to be living in huge megalopolis metro areas surrounded by large areas of wilderness and don't you dare get caught in it!

Pat – And didn't they say something about the Louisiana Purchase?

Jerry – A lot of the Louisiana Pur[chase] – they want Americans to live around the oceans and stay out of the Midwest. Stay out of the middle of the country! **They want this nation returned to pre-European situation.** (Pat – Holy mackerel!) **And that is in these documents.** Just go look it up folks! Look up www.smartgrowth.org. Look up www.smartgrowthamerica.org. That's all one word []. Just start looking, **start up with "depopulation+north america" and you are going to be terrified!**

We're not talking about people who call in and say "well I like my neighborhood association rules". We're not talking about that! (Doctor – No.) We're talking about absolute control of every aspect of your grandchildren's lives! (Pat – Okay.) I'll let somebody else talk. (Pat – Jerry, good job man!)

Doctor – Jerry, all I can do is support what you're saying because **we have read through thousands of pages of United Nations documentation and that's exactly what they're intending!**

Jerry – Yea, I've been trying to fight this for years and I've always come across as a nut ball. I'm glad to see that some people with a doctorate are now starting to say the same stuff.

Marilyn – Well part of the advantage now is that in the past it was done rather covertly. Now it's being done out in the open. They make no effort to cover up what they intend to do. So people can no longer call you a kook because all the documents are on the internet. You can see exactly what they have in mind.

Jerry – I think part of my problem with that is that now they're being so open about it – is they may think they've already won!

Marilyn – Well I read a short little paragraph in one of the UN documents and I told Mike about it, I can't remember where I saw it. But it said that **all of their efforts of years of work could unravel completely if there was enough public opposition!** (Pat – Jerry will listen off the air. Go ahead Marilyn.) If people really get organized and people **really understand what's happening** and they begin to participate and they begin to **put pressure on their local representatives...** **Remember these people have their jobs at your behest! If they think they're going to lose their jobs they're more likely to go along with what you want.** (Pat/Doctor – Absolutely/yes!)

Pat – And these environmental agencies, you know "The Nature Conservancy" with Paul Newman, and Sierra Club...all these groups have this agenda, they don't want people to go camp all the time, they want to keep it out of our hands and take it because they don't think we know how to take care of ourselves! Let's look at "Anwar", Alaska [Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or ANWR ("Anwar")]: **all of these politicians [saying] how we're going to destroy the environment... and the people of Alaska want us to go up there and drill!** (Doctor – Yes.) (Marilyn – Of course they do!)

Marilyn – And when Mike was talking about the Wildlands Project, I think I'm right about this Mike...**47 biosphere reserves have already been designated in the country.** Every one of our national parks has land that has been put aside in wilderness for wild lands. I read 66% of our national parks and BLM [Bureau of Land Management] lands are already designated for wild lands.

Pat – And they're called like biospheres (Marilyn – biospheres, right) and that means we can't do anything in our own nation without the UN's approval, is that what that means?!

Doctor – That basically is true. We still have so called sovereignty over them, at least our national parks. The BLM, part of that land -- it's not 66%, it's a fairly small percentage as far as Bureau of Land Management (Marilyn – I think this was the total of all federal government lands). Yea. **There's about 52, 54 million acres total tied up in these kinds of biosphere reserves and world heritage sites.** The world heritage sites are based on a treaty that was signed in 1972. And the biosphere reserve program is a memorandum of understanding between the United States and UNESCO [United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization]. And both of those, **we have to follow the dictates of the management plans and so forth of the United Nations or we will be declared a site that has defaulted, and has some pretty severe penalties associated with that.** And so by default we are following the United Nations plans on how to manage those areas, even though we theoretically still hold the title to them.

Pat – Okay. Let's get another call in here real quick because he's been holding too. Herman, from Marathon County. Thanks for holding so long. Welcome to "Sound Off".

Herman – Hello. Yea, I'm living out here in the town of Stettin, and I'm listening to all of this malarkey about this [Stettin Smart Growth] planning. And I was sitting on several meetings in our township about local planning and one of the guys that was in charge of that was from the University of Wisconsin [Extension] and he had some pretty horrendous ideas! So here they had this all complete and then a fella from the planning commission says that well now this is all over with now we're going to go to Smart Growth.

And this really scares me because I don't know how many people in Marathon County realize we got a little bit of teeth in this planning already! Because along Highway 29 the town of Stettin seen to it that they went to work and put in a highway overlay district, and this is from Highway 29 one-half mile north, and you're very well controlled now -- you can't do nothing hardly. (Pat – Wow! I'll be darn! So it is starting to plant some roots?!) Oh yea! And now like I say now they're going to start into Smart Growth, and while you go there [to the meetings] you talk and they don't like to hear what you're saying (Marilyn – It will get worse.)

Pat – What is the rest of your group for Stettin [saying] when you went to that – did you go to that meeting last Wednesday? (Herman – No I didn't go to that one.) Oh. I was just curious to what the rest of your township thinks about that.

Herman – Well, see that's the sad thing. I think 99% of the people don't even realize what the heck is really going on. They're all living as you can see quite comfortable. (Pat – Yup) And "it doesn't apply to me". And most of those meetings we went to, there was probably 2 or 3 people there. And the whole planning commission wasn't there even, it was usually 2 or 3 people that were there, and this was all planned out and given to us that way.

Marilyn – Actually, that's part of the problem. **People don't know what's happening. They don't understand. They haven't seen the maps to understand how much of their land is going to be controlled. They don't bother to go to the meetings.** The people that go to the meetings are mainly the people who support the Smart Growth program!

If somebody goes they want to be trusting, they want to be cooperative, they don't want to rock the boat, they don't want to risk saying something that people are going to challenge at all. It takes strong determined people to oppose this but it

can be opposed. But people must become aware of what's happening and they must speak up!

Pat – Okay, very good Herman! Thanks for your call. (Herman – Okay.) All right, 845-2155. We've got a little time left. Another area you're not going to see a lot of help...Michael I know we were talking about this...is the media. I mean you never see anything (Doctor – No) in the newspapers, or on the special reports about our rights being taken away. They just buy into this don't they?!

Doctor – Yes they do. In fact what we've traced back and [found is] **a lot of the people that are advancing this global agenda are also owners of the media.** And they hire editors. The journalists themselves generally are not corrupted in this instance but [owners] will hire editors who will screen stories and so forth that are only favorable to this kind of thing: [e.g.] "Smart Growth is a very good thing, land use/property rights and so forth is a bad thing".

But then you get into the whole arena of education! And I'm not only talking about the journalistic schools. ***It's permeating all of our school systems,*** but **the journalistic schools are now totally focused in a very liberal rousseauan-type of mentality** [a philosophy of believing the individual is essentially good but is usually corrupted by society. The philosopher Rousseau was one of the first modern writers to seriously attack the institution of private property, and therefore is considered a forebear of modern socialism and Communism] **where the state should control all these different things so a reporter comes out and he's hired by your local newspaper – it's his world view that these things should happen!** And when something like that happens he may not even think it's newsworthy because that's what should happen! And the whole news media is very very distorted and I don't know if you've read the book by Goldberg called *Bias* (Pat – Oh yes!), but it really shows how bad the media is distorted because this is the way they think.

Pat – Yes. And people think that I'm making this stuff up sometimes about the media and the bias but holy smokes, I'm not the only one around here that will bring this topic up. And I'm sure people think that...well I know they think I'm kind of an activist on the right side – a nut (Marilyn – the correct side). And maybe you've heard this too Michael, and you a Ph.D.! I mean you're not going to do something that's purposefully going to harm the environment (Doctor – No), or kill our planet off. But **they [the media] have a tendency to write and to say that "if we are against their plans we suddenly are against the environment"**. They campaigned in this last governor's race in Wisconsin about the Crandon mine up there with this cyanide, and if the state didn't buy it cyanide was going to be in our waters and we were going to be poisoned!

Doctor – You know that's very interesting. A guy by the name of Bastiat in France, he was a French legislator, in 1850 wrote a book called *The Law* [available at www.alibris.com]. A very fascinating book (Marilyn – a tiny book), it's only about 70 pages long, and in it he said that **the socialist mentality when they come to actually implementing their agenda will define anyone that opposes them as anti-civilization, anti-this or anti-that. Paint them all in one breath and that's how they win because they demonize their opposition in this way by saying that if you're against this then you're against the environment** – that you're pro-destruction and pro-pollution and so forth. That's the way they demonize different people and it was interesting to me when I read the book *The Law*, that **this is exactly what Bastiat said would happen if we ever got this kind of society!**

Pat – mm hmm. Well let's take another quick call or two []. Let's get Mark from Rib Mountain. He's been holding. Hi Mark, welcome to "Sound Off".

Mark – Hi Pat, good morning. Hey, you are kind of a nutty activist that likes to cause trouble... (Pat – Yea, I am, I am [laughter]) I got in on this conversation late today. I came in when Jerry was talking. I'd just like to know **who's behind all this?** Is it our town leaders, is it our senators... and everything else? And if it is **it sounds like we're voting in the wrong people!**

Pat – **We're not looking close enough at who we're voting in**, and now – not to take over this conversation – but now they want to regulate what can be said 60 days before an election [and] what groups can be given money to win – because they don't want groups like Michael and Marilyn are representing to be able to speak because **they know the papers are liberal and they'll keep pushing the agenda along!**

Mark – Right. That's scary, it's a scary thought.

Marilyn – Well I think one thing that's important is that people who feel as we do **use letters to the editor columns as much as possible**. (Doctor – Yeah) You can write a single letter, you can send it to 50 newspapers. And rural newspapers particularly are willing to (Pat – Right) print pretty much everything that they get. So that's one way. And the more letters that come in, the more people will be alerted to the problems.

I think another reason why this whole thing is going so smoothly is because they **[Smart Growth proponents] don't talk about regulations**, they don't talk about control, they just talk about "well, we're doing a plan." (Pat – Right) **They don't tell that the plan ultimately leads to [greater] regulations!**

Mark – **I just don't understand how a typical American can go for this stuff?! (Pat – Because they think it's going to help the environment, and they don't want to hurt the environment for our kids' future.)** Well, yea. (Pat – You know that's how they tie it in, that we're going to destroy the earth!). **What future will there be if we get all this stuff?! That's the thing!** (Pat – Everyone will be clogged into cities, working at government factories, and 'be happy that you have that'...!)

Marilyn – **They're concerned about urban sprawl. What we're going to end up with is urban stack.** And if you think that that's not so, take a look around any city in the country that you can go to and you can see that multiple housing is being pushed really strongly.

Pat – Well the scare tactics started back – I remember in high school in the early 70's they were trying to say that the industrial corridor would run from New York along [the Great Lakes] all the way around to Chicago. That there would be nothing but urban sprawl...one thing connecting another...Chicago to Gary, over to Cleveland, all the way up.

Marilyn – Well the other thing that people don't remember is that since 1950 we have had 119 million additional people added to our population. Population grows, they have to have a place to live.

Pat – Right. All right Mark thanks for your call! All right, let's get one more in before we break. Russ from Weston we have a couple of minutes, what's your question?

Russ – [] I think our friend FDR started us down this slippery slope years ago (Marilyn – mm hmm) ...the socialist viewpoint. And your speaking about the liberal media – I always thought that "Wausau Rag" was liberal, but since Peter [] has taken over as the Opinion Page Editor it's really gotten worse. I don't know if you think so or not? (Pat – Well I really don't respect much of what's been written there.) Well I mean he's got almost no one appearing on that Opinion Page except people writing from that viewpoint! (Pat – Well he's thrown in Anne Coulter to appease some of us.). Well she's one of the few. []

Pat – We'll have to get into this another time. We don't have enough time now to talk about it now. Thanks Russ.

I want to thank you two for coming in. Michael, [] why don't we get some websites out in the last minute here.

Doctor – Our primary website is www.discerningtoday.org [second site is www.epi.freedom.org]. In there we have all the discussion on property rights, Smart Growth, and so forth that we've been talking about over the last 2 hours and you can actually download that information and show it to others if you want. We have it in longer format...multi-pages (Pat – mm hmm.) and down to single pages and so forth so that it meets the requirement for different people for different things.

And we have a brand new video called "Impeding Global Governance" that you might be interested in as well where we actually define what the current activities are at the international level to do exactly what we've talking about the last two hours. And how that was stopped this last September, how we threw a monkey wrench into it. And so it's temporary, it's not going to last forever (Pat – Right.) but reason did prevail. And the people in these developing nations had a big part to play in that effort to stop that agenda at the international level.

Pat – All right. Well Michael thank you so much for being on today! (Doctor – Thank you) We will talk again! Thanks. All right, Dr. Michael Coffman. Marilyn, do you have a website?

Marilyn – No, sorry we don't. (Pat -- All right, okay, well I know you are active. Are you going to be up at that [Strafford] meeting on the 13th [of Feb]?) No I can't make the meeting, but I would like to suggest to people as Michael just said -- **if you find interesting bits of information make copies of it! If you find letters to the editor you think are good, make copies of it and hand it out to people! Get people interested and aware of what's happening!**

Pat – All right. Marilyn, thank you for coming up as well! (Marilyn – Well, my pleasure. Thank you so much). All right. And that's today's "Sound Off Central Wisconsin".

-----End of Program-----

In cooperation with WSAU News Radio, this radio program and transcript were produced and provided by VFF21 -- Veterans and Friends for Freedom 21. © VFF21 - All Rights Reserved. Additional copies of the transcript are available at vff21.info, and by e-mail at revereradio@vff21.info.

WSAU Information

WSAU News Radio (AM 550)
557 Scott St.
P.O. Box 5595
Wausau, WI 54403, USA

Phone: 715.842.1672 or Call-in to 715.845.2155
Fax: 715.848.3158
E-mail: wsau@wsau.com
Web Site: www.wsau.com

Biographies of WSAU “Sound Off Central Wisconsin” Guests, 4 Feb 03

Dr. Michael S. Coffman

Dr. Michael S. Coffman received his BS in Forestry and MS in Biology at Northern Arizona University at Flagstaff, Arizona and his Ph.D. in Forest Science at the University of Idaho at Moscow in 1966, 1967, and 1970 respectively. Since then he has become a respected scientist and ecologist who has been involved in ecosystem research for over twenty years in both academia and industry. He taught courses and conducted research in forest ecology and forest community dynamics for ten years at the Michigan Technological University, a leading forestry school in the Midwest. While there, he published a book on forest ecosystem classification in Upper Michigan and Northern Wisconsin, which has become the standard for classification in the region. He also assisted the U.S. Forest Service in developing an Ecological Land Classification System for each of the National Forests in Region-9.

Until 1992 Dr. Coffman was a manager for Champion International, a leading forest and paper products company in the United States. During his tenure with Champion, he became Chairman of the Forest Health Group within NCASI (National Council for the Paper Industry for Air and Stream Improvement), a respected scientific research group for the Paper Industry. In this, and other related responsibilities, he was responsible for millions of dollars of research and became intimately involved in such national and international issues as acid rain, global climate change, wetlands, cumulative effects and biological diversity. During this time he was a spokesperson for the Paper Industry for the media.

Dr. Coffman is currently President of Environmental Perspectives, Inc. He also serves as Executive Director of Sovereignty International, Inc and the Local Environment and Resource Network (LEARN). He provides professional guidance and training in defining environmental problems and conflicts, and developing solutions to specific issues as well as the hidden dangers of international treaties and agreements that threaten our Constitutional protections, especially property rights. He has written three books exposing the environmentalist phenomenon; *The Birth of World Government, Saviors of the Earth?*; *The Politics and Religion of Environmentalism*, and *Environmentalism!; The Dawn of Aquarius or the Twilight of a new Dark Age?*

In his present capacity as Exec. Director of Sovereignty International, Inc. he is intimately involved with the science that drives the issue of global warming and sustainable development and global political agenda behind the effort to create global governance. Dr. Coffman speaks to a variety of groups nationally who are interested in the scientific truth and political agenda behind global warming and other environmental issues to advance global governance. LEARN provides knowledge to local citizens on how to help local government attain equal powers with the federal and state governments in implementing environmental laws in order to protect both the environment and the rights of local citizens.

Dr. Coffman can be contacted by e-mail at DTT@discerningtoday.org.

Marilyn Hayman

Marilyn Hayman is retired from the Minneapolis school system, where she taught elementary and special education for 30 years. She has a BA from Milwaukee Downer College and an MA in Educational Psychology from the University of Minnesota.

Marilyn is chairman of Citizens for Responsible Zoning and Landowner Rights, Inc. (CRZLR), and is one of the founding members. CRZLR is a non-partisan organization -- farmers, business people and homeowners -- concerned with regulations impacting the value and use of our private property. CRZLR was established in 1989, with primary membership in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota. CRZLR is supported by donations from people who share these concerns.

CRZLR supports conservation -- wise use -- of resources and is concerned over rampant, 'regulatory sprawl.' The "vision" of regulators and the "community" has taken precedence over the rights of those who have planned, saved, purchased and paid taxes on their property. Because many of these problems have their origins at the state and national levels, CRZLR concerns itself with legislation and regulations coming from these higher levels of government. Many of the most important issues relating directly to our property rights receive little or no attention from the popular media.

CRZLR believes knowledge is power; and thus attempts to inform the public of important property issues. American citizens have a great deal of power, but before they can be effective politically, they must know what is going on. Hopefully, that understanding will lead them to contacting their representatives and expressing their views.

Marilyn can be contacted by e-mail at mhayman@cannon.net.