

**TERRIBLE 1313**

**REVISITED**

*by Jo Hindman*

[Click Here to see the Metro Chart, 1961](#)

Blank Page

TERRIBLE 1313 REVISITED

Blank Page

# TERRIBLE 1313 REVISITED

A COMPILATION OF SPEECHES AND  
NEW METRO ARTICLES  
WITH THE  
METROCHART

*By*  
JO HINDMAN



THE CAXTON PRINTERS, LTD.  
CALDWELL, IDAHO  
1963

First printing, March, 1963  
Second printing, April, 1963

© 1963 BY  
JO HINDMAN  
INGLEWOOD 4, CALIFORNIA

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 63-9066

\* \* \* \* \*

## Foreword

**MOST PEOPLE** will take a stand to save home and property. Other people react instantly against economy-choking business practices.

Responsible Americans in the twentieth century seek to prevent bondage of their country in a world government of demoted nation-states.

The above three levels of intelligent citizen concern will find delineated, in the following pages, aspects of a virulent Force that is inimical to person, property, and freedom under God.



The following published articles are included by generous permission of:

Counsel for The National Republic Publishing Co.  
*National Republic Magazine*, Washington, D.C.

“Sacramento Plan’ Pitfalls”

“Bunker Hill—1959”

*Human Events*, Washington, D.C.

“Social Engineering’ for 1984”

*Vital Speeches*, New York, N.Y.

“Will Americans Surrender Their Private  
Property?—Urban Renewal Laws”

Copyright by Jo Hindman

\* \* \* \* \*

## Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. TERRIBLE 1313 REVISITED - - - - -	13
II. METRO AND ITS "FRONTS" - - - - -	29
III. THE "METRO" MONSTER - - - - -	37
IV. URBAN RENEWAL LAWS - - - - -	50
V. "SACRAMENTO PLAN" PITFALLS - - - - -	65
VI. THE BATTLE OF BUNKER HILL—1959 - - - - -	73
VII. URBAN RENEWAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE - - - - -	79
VIII. METRO TESTING GROUNDS - - - - -	92
IX. WILL AMERICANS SURRENDER TO THE 1313 DICTATORSHIP? - - - - -	102
X. "SOCIAL ENGINEERING" FOR 1984 - - - - -	109
XI. 1313 BRAINPICKS THE U.S.A. VIA THE 1960 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE - - - - -	117
XII. METRO VS. THE AMERICAN INDIVIDUAL - - - - -	127
 <i>Appendices</i>	
I. TABLE OF STATE FUNDS PAID TO METRO TREAS- URY—COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS - - - - -	143
II. LESSON PLAN FOR STUDY GROUPS - - - - -	145
III. ACTION PLAN FOR INDIVIDUALS OR ORGANIZATIONS	148
IV. PERSONS AFFILIATED WITH METRO 1313 - - - - -	150
V. 100 CITY ELECTIONS REJECT METRO COUNCIL- MANAGER PLAN BETWEEN MARCH, 1959- APRIL, 1962 - - - - -	157
VI. ABBREVIATIONS - - - - -	160
BIBLIOGRAPHY - - - - -	162
INDEX - - - - -	170

Blank Page

**TERRIBLE 1313 REVISITED**

## Terrible 1313 Revisited

YOU ARE BEING captured without bomb, bayonet, or war cry.

When a government controls a man's property, civil rights, his home and the power of human decision, then he is captured and not free. Metropolitan Government is accumulating such power; if completely victorious, in it will repose All Control.

Metropolitan Government is designed to function through controls placed in city halls, county courthouses, state capitols, and Washington, D.C.

The giant combine that conspires against you proceeds virtually unnoticed, while American attention is riveted on Communism in Cuba and abroad. Nerve center of cell Metro is charted at the front of the book: Metro headquarters—1313; Metro policy—collectivization; Metro program—"metro" government. (See MetroChart.)

Under Metro, states would cease. Cities would become enormous satellites ruled by managerial Metro power. Zone space between cities would be strictly regimented according to arbitrary code. American labor would draw token pay in some sort of currency, but the greatest portion of the pay coin would go to finance the giant Metro.

In the late 1950's, location of the Metro capitol was discovered at 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, a twenty-two organization clearing house. This arsenal of totalitarianism spews Metro directives, programs, and projects over target U.S.A.

In concept, practices, and in rapidly multiplying instances, Metro has wrecked private homes, businesses, property rights, and the ballot franchise. Upon the shambles of these basic concepts in American government, Metro seeks to force upon Americans collectivized Metropolitan Government, *totally*.

The United States Federal *form* of government has been blamed unjustly for the scandal of collectivization. Actually, infiltrants of Metro *into* traditional check-and-balance Federal government have and are engineering conversion of the American Republic into a giant collectivized unit.

Gigantic expansion of the irresponsible executive-staff administrative department of government is a key hashmark of Metro government.

Down on the first-level Metro, dictatorial Metro city managers introduce Metro programs of socialized urban renewal, land use zoning, and Planning with a capital P. City managers agitate for city charter revision to elevate to supremacy Metro managerial rule and to eliminate citizen self-government.

At the state level, the Metro battering against individual rights

and sovereignty continues. The idea is fed out that state constitutions are outmoded and need sweeping revision "to fit the changing times." In the revisions, Metro plans to toss away citizen sovereignty and to give all power to the Metro executives.

Found to be too slow for Metro's conversion of American government into a collectivized unit, the constitution- and charter-revision process has been teamed with a quicker Metro strategy. A law-amending machine has been built within 1313. While charter and constitution revisions are pending or dormant, 1313 disseminates, lobbies, and surreptitiously enacts prepackaged Metro laws or amends safe and sound laws by inserting dangerous amendments.

The repugnant practices of the Metro cell long had drawn scattered hostility from individual citizens, but once the 1313 clearing house was identified as the source of trouble in the late 1950's, the Metro complex has been rocked by recurrent blasts of public opposition.

Now, in the early 1960's, Metro 1313 is revisited; its encroachments and defeats during the past three years are reviewed and assessed.

In the beginning was the National Municipal League in New York (founded 1894).<sup>1</sup> In the 1930's, part of the organization pinched off to colonize in Chicago. The headquarters of the latter group at 1313 E. 60th Street, a four-story building on the University of Chicago campus, became the Metro capitol,<sup>2</sup> known around the globe (Cable address is PASHQ),<sup>3</sup> and nicknamed 1313 by Metro devotees, themselves.

Of the twenty-two core organizations (now twenty-three, following acceptance of BOCA, Building Officials Conference of America), two coleaders—Council of State Governments and Public Administration Service—steer the collectivist cluster. Broadly speaking, CSG controls the political and judicial divisions of 1313; PAS promotes economic Metro.

CSG<sup>4</sup> claims secretariatship of the following 1313 groups:

- Governors' Conference
- Conference of Chief Justices
- National Legislative Conference
- National Association of Attorneys-General
- National Association of State Budget Officers
- National Association of State Purchasing Officials
- Interstate Clearing House on Mental Health
- Other peripheral 1313 groups (See Appendix I)

<sup>1</sup> *A Half Century of Municipal Reform*, by Frank Mann Stewart, University of California Press, Cambridge University Press, London, England, 1950 (Copyright by The Regents of the University of California), Berkeley and Los Angeles, California. Pp. 289.

<sup>2</sup> *Thirteen-Thirteen*, booklet, editions various years, 1959, 1961.

<sup>3</sup> Public Administration Service letterhead, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, Illinois.

<sup>4</sup> The Council of State Governments (1959) Executive Committee Roster and Purposes. Pp. 16.

PAS<sup>5</sup> governs the following 1313 groups:

American Public Works Association  
 American Public Welfare Association  
 Public Personnel Association  
 American Municipal Association  
 International City Managers' Association  
 Municipal Finance Officers Association  
 National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials  
 National Association of Assessing Officers  
 American Society of Planning Officials  
 Federation of Tax Administrators  
 American Society for Public Administration  
 National Institute of Municipal Clerks  
 Committee for International Municipal Cooperation—U.S.A.  
 Building Officials Conference of America.

*International City Managers' Association.* Promotes the council-manager form of government which was pioneered by the 1313 parent body, the National Municipal League. ICMA operates a city-manager job placement service with nationwide and international ramifications.

*National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.* Powerful lobbyist for the socialized urban renewal movement. NAHRO was founded in 1933; a grant from the Rockefeller Spelman Fund started the program. In 1934, NAHRO developed the first comprehensive housing program for the United States and has continuously helped to draft legislation. NAHRO's recommendations on slum clearance are reflected in all urban renewal legislation, from the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 forward to the current year of 1963.

NAHRO has two offices—the central office in Chicago, another in Washington, D.C.

Groups peripheral to NAHRO are: ACTION (American Council to Improve Our Neighborhoods) and NAHB (National Association of Home Builders) and others.

*American Society of Planning Officials.* If all the concepts of this 1313 group were implemented, human life would be reduced to the "economic man" or push-button breathing robot going through the motions of conformity to Metro laws, rules, and regulations.

*American Municipal Association.* This powerful agency sponsors the collection and transmittal of money from the United States to Communist-linked Metro agencies abroad and in Havana, Cuba.

Further linkage is effected through OAS (Organization of American States) which recently, in 1962, went through the motions of ousting Communist Cuba from the OAS fold. Metro's ultimate purpose of regionalization in the Western Hemisphere is promoted by the OAS.

<sup>5</sup> *Thirteen-Thirteen*, booklet, Central Services Division, Public Administration Service, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, Illinois, various years, 1959, 1961, etc. Pp. 24.

According to the charter of the OAS, "Within the United Nations, the Organization of American States is a regional agency." Senator Pat McCarran denounced the OAS along with the United Nations in his ringing speech on the Senate floor almost ten years ago.<sup>6</sup>

Persons misled by the fallacy of "either . . . or" reasoning, which permits only one of two choices, should take a second look at the OAS "bouncing" of Communist Cuba. The anti-Communism of OAS, an organization quite useful to Metro strategy, seems to pinpoint a significant emergent factor: Although Metro government personifies totalitarian collectivism, it is quite obvious that the overt leaders of Metro necessarily are not identified as "card-carrying Communists." Metro's hidden leaders quite possibly could be. If the latter possibility could be true, the Metro hidden brain trust needs merely to wait out the conversion of the U.S.A. into a conveniently collectivized unit, after which their presidium or oligarchy could move in to superimpose the total Communism capping. At any rate, regardless of the hue of sponsorship, the Metro movement obviously seeks to convert the United States into a collectivized governmental unit. Who seizes the controls later, if events become that serious, can be at present only a matter of conjecture. This will be discussed later.

*Committee for International Municipal Cooperation—U.S.A.* Apparently a "desk" in the American Municipal Association, CIMC handles the pipeline of international communication on both hemispheres, including the Communist-linked adjuncts in Europe, admittedly to provide United States support for the IULA (International Union of Local Authorities) at The Hague, The Netherlands, and the Inter-American Municipal Organization in Havana, Cuba.

In the light of the AMA's absorption in the foregoing foreign and Communist-linked "channel" please do consider the recent action of the AMA which strenuously lobbied for the Federal Department of Urban Affairs in Washington, D.C.

*Interstate Clearing House on Mental Health.* Massively promotes socialized psychiatry through 1313's Governors' Conference. The ICMH ten-point program on Mental Health was adopted by the 1954 Governors' Conference.<sup>7</sup> The 1961 edition of the 1313 brochure, *Thirteen-Thirteen*, has dropped the ICMH listing without explanation.

*Governors' Conference.* This Metro confraternity serves up two illustrations: (1) Metro's false public relations strategy that showers Metro with the glory of distinguished names and places, (2) Metro's basic principle to expand executive power at the expense of legislative (citizen-through-representatives) power.

<sup>6</sup> *Congressional Record*, January 28, 1954, p. 934—.

<sup>7</sup> The National Governors' Conference on Mental Health, February 8-9, 1954. Interstate Clearing House on Mental Health, Council of State Governments, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, Illinois, *State Government*, issue of March, 1954.



In the first place, governors do not "join" the 1313 Governors' Conference. They "become" members simply because they are state governors—"ex officio" is the word. As a result, frequent differences and quarrels arise in the Metro Governors' Conference, when responsible governors, found to be not in accord with 1313 goals, find their objections throttled and boycotted. The silencing of nonconforming governors is accomplished through the machinations of the Governors' Conference *secretariat*, the Council of State Governments, but the lustre of their gubernatorial names is used to build false prestige for 1313 Metro.

The beginnings of 1313's Governors' Conference are by no means as honorable as Metro claims. Metro alleges that the present Governors' Conference grew out of a meeting set in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt. The President had "Conservation of National Resources" in mind as a conference topic; Metro bellwethers had "Uniform Laws" in mind. The conflict between the two purposes produced the sterile 1908 meeting which was the first and last of its kind.

A historian of the era, William G. Jordan,<sup>8</sup> pointed out that there was widespread feeling that the "problem" of unifying all laws in the United States could not proceed under official U.S. government auspices, but should be steered by a group of governors working independently.

In 1910 another meeting of governors, called by Metro leaders, laid the groundwork for unifying all the laws in the United States. Vehicle was to be the group, House of Governors,<sup>9</sup> a secret fourth branch of American government. From the viewpoint of executive vs. legislative (citizen-through-representatives) power, compare the HOG concept of Metro with the constitutional United States House of Representatives. The Metro group embodies executive power supreme whereas, the Congress, traditionally, has been the outlet for citizens' power over their government.

President Taft withheld presidential blessing from the HOG meeting and merely sent greetings. From the second prong meeting stems the present 1313 Governors' Conference.

If representative of the "fourth branch of American government," then the contemporary actions of 1313's Governors' Conference are alarming, to say the least. The Governors' Conference toured the U.S.S.R. (1959), promotes Metro's socialized mental health program, voted to invite heads of five Soviet states to tour the United States and to attend the annual Governors' Conference of 1960, passed a resolution (1960) that opposed Congressional inquiry into Metro interstate compact agencies.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *The Great Events* by Famous Historians, copyright 1914 and 1919 by The National Alumni ("an association of college men"), Vol. XXI (A.D. 1910-14), "The House of Governors," pp. 1-31.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> Fifty-second Annual Meeting of the Governors' Conference in 1960,

Bear in mind that interstate compacts, perfectly constitutional in principle when under Congressional sanction, are quite another thing under Metro. The Mental Health Compact between the states bears no approval from Congress. Exploited by Metro, the concept of interstate compacts can be used as a device to wipe out the sovereignty of state governments.

Under the United States Constitution, compacts between states must first be approved by Congress.

Do not be misled by the fact that the Council of State Governments, despite the high-sounding name, and the Governors' Conference paradoxically promote interstate compacts that lead toward erasure of states as political sovereignties; the paradox aptly illustrates that 1313 has programs that are at interim stages and still on the road. For instance, an interim task of the Governors' Conference is slanted toward shrinkage of legislative power (the citizens' voices) and expansion of executive power at the state level, pending creation of supra-state regions. For proof, examine current 1313 plans and certain Governors' plans to reorganize state governments. Observe the proposed expansion of unlimited executive power.

*National Association of Attorneys-General.* Opposed Congressional inquiry, termed "interference," in interstate compact agencies.<sup>11</sup> Engineering a resolution of this consequence through an august body of attorneys-general represents a triumph of Metro public relations strategy.

*Building Officials Conference of America.* Forms an embryo cartel or monopoly inimical to the American ideal of healthy competition and free flow of trade.

When examining any part of the Metro complex, be sure to see the entire "channel." In other words, look beyond the particular Metro committee, association, or group. Look *beyond* to see its links with other groups that comprise the "channel" by which Metro theory, concept, and practices reach the public.

We will illustrate with BOCA.

BOCA was added to the Metro brochure entitled *Thirteen-Thirteen* during 1961, signifying a seat on the PACH exchange. For many years, BOCA had remained a satellite to Metro and part of a channel that included (a) American Society of Building Officials, (b) Pacific Coast Building Officials Conference (recently renamed International Conference of Building Officials).

BOCA's prime purpose is to regulate building construction. The Metro agency piously keeps free from "commercial entanglements" according to its official statement. Farther down the "channel," the International Conference of Building Officials attends to the filthy lucre

---

Glacier Park, Montana, on June 26-29, as reported in *California Commission on Interstate Cooperation*, pp. 30-31, 1959-61. (A report.)

<sup>11</sup> Fifty-fourth Annual Meeting of the National Association of Attorneys-General, *ibid.*, p. 32.

angle. ICBO goes into details such as writing and publishing "uniform building codes," getting them adopted widely in cities throughout the nation, then channeling the profits of the building industry to a select brotherhood composed of Metro-approved manufacturers, building materials suppliers, and others. ICBO's system contains a criteria whereby certain manufacturers are admitted to the inner sanctum as "approved fabricators."<sup>12</sup>

Buyers and sellers in the free competitive market economy long have made use of specifications to insure quality buying and selling. Compare with this the competition-choking market monopoly *politically* created by the Metro complex, wherein the self-appointed Metro combine arranges to have quality and product acceptance determined *politically*, provides a captive consumer market by *political* urban renewal operations, and restricts entry into the market by admitting only Metro-approved fabricators. Under the circumstances *which exist now*, free competition in the United States is on its way out and Metro-controlled merchandising is on its way in.

The embryo Metro cartel manifested in BOCA and BOCA's satellites should be examined under the Clayton Act. This section of the Federal Sherman Antitrust Act singles out as violations any exclusive arrangements where the effect might be "to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce."

If allowed to run rampant, BOCA's politically engineered trade monopoly nurtured by the mixed economy of public/private construction industry ultimately could furnish a Metro template for conversion of other segments of the American free economy into Metro-controlled operations.

Many departments of the 1313 cell remain unexplored. For instance, Metro's design upon the American judiciary has not been studied. Meanwhile, countless Metro peripheral schemes continue unchallenged and unchecked. The exposure task is monumental. The Metro conspiracy has been winning through years of undercover scheming engineered by Metro planners. Their treatises, experiments, and schedules of action fill libraries, both public and private, to overflowing. The author, here, makes no claim to presenting a comprehensive treatment of Metro in this book; it is merely a compilation of findings, to date, pertaining to certain basic and recognizable features of Metro and the mammoth 1313 complex.

People are interested in the actions of people. A question frequently asked: "Who are the persons behind Metro?"

A very long list would result, but a partial list is contained in Appendix IV. Metro operates upon the holding company principle. The Metro

<sup>12</sup> "What the Research Services of the International Conference of Building Officials Can Do For Your Product," Exhibit J in ICBO kit of materials, July 11, 1958. Three mimeographed pages and two approved recommendations, Reports Nos. 1041.1 and 1042.1.

complex, engaged in many activities that do not require intimate coordination, needs only a coordinating authority. Each Metro organization is set up on the "purpose" basis, allegedly independent of the rest. The central structure of authority is 1313's PACH. The PACH interlocking directorate interlocks with the NML parent body hierarchy.

The parent group in New York gives certain top-level services and requires conformity to certain central plans and policies. PACH in Chicago provides a second-level echelon of services, including the international, while each Metro department at 1313 carries on along the lines of its individual purpose.

Curiously, the parent body—National Municipal League—is located across the street (E. 68th) from the Council of Foreign Relations in New York (economic one-worldism center), and around the corner from the Soviet Embassy (Park Avenue at 68th), and the IPA (Institute of Public Administration), next door to the Soviet Embassy. IPA is headed by 1313 official Luther Gulick, peripatetic Metro emissary who junkets around the globe setting up Metro governments in foreign nations.<sup>13</sup>

From Metro's twenty-three core organizations, a labyrinthian maze of 1313 communication extends through channel organizations, groups, associations, and confraternities. To gain an idea of 1313 magnitude, please refer to the 1313-published directory, *Public Administration Organizations—1954* (see Bibliography) and bear in mind that each of the 513 organizations therein further publishes its own directory. Thus, the web leads outward. Any channel of the 1313 labyrinth can be instantly activated for Metro lobbying, procuring, double-dealing, or other pressure tactics. Each 1313 core group is assigned to a specific area of operation. Check their titles.

Whereas, CSG activities are kept secretive and cloaked, PAS activities more often meet the public eye. As legmen of the 1313 clearinghouse, PAS sends teams of investigators and so-called experts around the country to remake American government into Metro government. This is accomplished by survey and "recommendations" released in published form. Duped citizens in each target locale are tricked into footing the considerable expense to have their representative government destroyed.

Metro's epochal victory in establishing Metro charter government in Miami, Dade County, Florida, was engineered by typical Metro strategy. Penitent Floridian civic leaders who were implicated now admit ruefully that their judgment tragically was in error.

The 1313 survey findings that led to governmental ruin in Miami-Dade are published by 1313 in a hard-cover volume, complete with the names of gullible Floridian citizen sponsors. Title is *The Government of Metropolitan Miami* (see Bibliography). Recommendations of a companion volume, *The Government of Metropolitan Sacramento*, have

<sup>13</sup> *National Civic Review*, February, 1962, pp. 62 and 85.

been spurned in California. No further publications of this scope have followed, although lesser studies by 1313 "experts" continually make their appearance.

The Metrocrats (they who promote Metro) opine that citizens don't care who, what, or how government is run, providing they are kept comfortable. Out of this concept of the imaginary beer-and-television citizen stems the Metro phobia for planning: Give 'em highways to ride on, glittering cities to live in, new apartments to dwell in! Metro needs only the power to make all decisions.

Lowered governmental costs through "efficiency" are promised if citizens will transfer the decision-making power to Metro. Actually, costs and taxes soar after any Metro cadre takes over the citizens' government.

Metro planners invariably "goof," and their errors invariably are uncovered by the public intelligence. Following Metro's take-over in Miami-Dade, Metro boasted a cost cut which proved to be a misrepresentation of the truth.

The vaunted 1.1 mill cut in the tax rate, embarrassingly (for Metro) turned out to be merely a bookkeeping trick: a savings account composed of public funds accumulated by the deposed county government was dumped by Metro into the general fund. The Metrocrats promptly announced that the tax rate had dropped. Investigation disclosed that the drop resulted—not from Metro savings, but because Metro had confiscated the public's savings.

Metro's most recent fumble in Florida is a 1962 discovery that Miami-Metro's freeway system takes motorists in the direction opposite from which they wish to go. As the *Miami Herald* stated it (January 23, 1962):

"It has been pretty well established around here that what we need is planning; we have even had planning sessions to plan places to put the plans we are about to plan . . . but if you plan to go to Miami Beach on the expressway, do not plan to get on board at 12th Ave. You can get on the expressway at 12th Ave. if you will, but you must go somewhere else. Miami Beach is all right, but you just can't get there from 12th Ave. unless you break through some barricades that have been recently planned and established to prevent automotive mayhem resulting from previous planning which was perhaps inadequate."

Lawsuits running into hundreds of cases precipitated by Metro's take-over of Dade County were fought through the Florida courts.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Quote from Case No. 29,490 *Miami Shores vs. Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Florida*, in the *Supreme Court of Florida*, July, 1958. Introductory remark of Roberts, J. "This is another in a series of cases arising in Dade County since May 21, 1957, questioning the validity of various actions taken by the Board of County Commis-

The number of anti-Metro elections called and voted upon in Metro's Miami-Dade increases with the years. As citizen perception and dismay continues to cut through the deliberate smoke that Metro puffs to screen its bungling in Miami-Dade (the great experiment!), the margin which pads Metro from defeat grows thinner. In 1960, citizens point out that it is more than significant that Metro's payroll commandeers 8,000 votes! The 1961 anti-Metro election was lost by approximately 8,000 votes!<sup>15</sup>

Plainly, the Metropolitan Government of Miami is a Metro fiasco. More and more citizens throughout the United States, watching the brash experiment, are becoming aware of its monumental failure. Consequently, Metro entrances in other parts of the nation have been stopped or are being delayed.

As a result, Metro today no longer uses the frontal approach. Metro promotes minus the Metro label. Well-meaning people are known to say, "I'm against Metropolitan Government because it is not self-government," then contradict their words by actions that uphold some Metro scheme, such as a land-use plan or a regional library proposal.

To identify Metro, certain Metro features should be known, such as:

1. Metro moves away from independent *parts* to a collective *whole*.
2. Metro destroys check-and-balance government. Metro strives toward expansion of executive (managerial) power function and shrinkage of the legislative (citizen-through-representatives) function.
3. Metro seeks rule by appointees, abolishes the ballot franchise.
4. Metro would abolish States' Rights.
5. Metro would eliminate "inalienable rights," private enterprise, and private property.

*Metro strategies*, as related numerically to the foregoing concepts and principles, are:

1. Geopolitical merging
  - a) Geographic technique. Four, sometimes five steps, mark Metro's geographical merging strategy designed to abolish the republican form of government guaranteed to the states by the United States Constitution.

Merging steps<sup>16</sup>: (1) city-county merging, (2) county-district merging, (3) district-state merging, (4) state-region merging, (5) region-international merging.

---

sioners of Dade County under the purported authority of the Home Rule Charter adopted on that date."

<sup>15</sup> *Los Angeles Times*, October 19, 1961.

<sup>16</sup> *The States and the Metropolitan Problem*, The Council of State Governments, 1956, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, Illinois. Pp. 153.

Examples: (1) The Metro Charter experiment in Miami-Dade, Florida, illustrates step one; (2) Pending multipurpose district legislation in state legislatures exemplifies step two; (3) Metro political inter-state compacts or supra-state Metro authorities can implement step three; (4) The "river system" approach provides a vast topographical base over which Metro seeks to establish political control. (See *Region Building* in Bibliography. Many influential Metrocrats are linked into the TVA, a "river system" approach); (5) Merging agreements between the national governments of the United States and neighboring Canada and Mexico already have been proposed by 1313. (See Bibliography, *The States and the Metropolitan Problem*, pp. 12, 13, 16, notes pp. 132, 138.)

- b) Political merging techniques. Metro caps each expanded/expanding geographical unit with "umbrellas" of appointed executive (managerial) power.
2. Destroying check-and-balance government. Undue expansion of executive branches (a Metro principle) robs power from legislative branches at any and all levels of government. Citizen sovereignty (invested in elected legislative bodies) is lost under Metro.
  3. Ruling by appointees. Elected executives merely are a sufferance of interim nature to Metro. In the ultimate Metro, elective offices would be nonexistent. At present, city managers, county managers, multi-purpose district executives (all appointees) are bestowed with sweeping powers by Metro's *Model City Charter*, *Model County Charter*, and *Model State Constitution* (latter under revision in 1962), and emergent multi-purpose district legislation. The "model" Metro charters and constitutions are published by the 1313 parent body, National Municipal League in New York (see Bibliography).  
Robbing Americans of the right to vote has long been a Metro pursuit. Metro's "short ballot" becomes short because fewer elective offices appear on American ballots when Metro is successful in eliminating a public office that has been elective. Example: Metro proposes appointed sheriffs, appointed coroners—men whose duties put them in control of human life and death.
  4. Eliminating the states and sovereign States' Rights. In Metro jargon, "strengthening" covers a lot of semantic ground. The word "strengthening" can mean interchangeably "enlarging, expanding, collectivizing." Thus, when Metro talks about "strengthening" state government, the techniques of (a) appointed executive power and (b) the supra-state interstate compacts are inferred. The compact—"treaties" would bypass States' Rights and functionally collectivize the supra-state region that would emerge and be dominated by Metro appointees.

Metro's unmistakable favoritism to cities is stressed through promotion of the notion that cities should be supported by Federal largesse, bypassing the traditional role of each state as the "father" of cities within its borders.

5. Metro basically veers toward the collectivist concept: the group vs. the individual. Programs of subsidized urban renewal including property confiscation are examples, also the strangling of the free flow of trade through the Metro construction-industry cartel (just forming).

Many generations have lived happily and prosperously under United States constitutional government before Metropolitan Government came along to disrupt and to uproot time-honored codes and principles of American conduct. To swap Freedom for Metro is unthinkable. Americans have more than a hundred-years start on Metrocrats in the science of lawmaking, law keeping, and living abundantly.

Human beings tend to accept that which rewards them. Any government, to be acceptable, must work toward the individual well-being of its citizens. Metro fails on this count. Metro's entire pattern is a pattern of danger—centralized power with all the weakness of 100 per cent error and 100 per cent corruption. Contrast this, if you will, with the beautifully balanced United States constitutional form of government, where citizens make their laws and elect their governmental leaders.

*U.S. check-and-balance government compared with Metro government*

Definition: Sovereignty is the power to rule

U.S. constitutional government:	Metro government:
Divided sovereignty (power to rule) apportioned into three equal parts:	Collectivized sovereignty (power to rule) vested in one dictatorial part:
Legislative	Appointed executives
Executive	with control over all governmental functions.
Judicial	
with checks and balances, one part upon the other.	

Because the world's history has proved that unlimited authority corrupts into uncontrolled license, Americans detest the principal of concentrated managerial power ("divine right of the elite").

---

*Department of Urban Affairs*  
Reorganization Plan No. 1  
(Urban Affairs)

Transmitted to Congress by the President on January 30, 1962, providing for the establishment in the executive branch of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing of Cabinet rank.

S. Res. 288, 87th Congress, 2d session, Resolved, That the Senate



does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1962 transmitted to Congress by the President on January 30, 1962.

On February 21, 1962, by a record vote of 264 yeas to 150 nays the House adopted H. Res. 530, *disapproving the plan*.

The Urban Affairs legislation is an example of Metro's work at the Federal level. The Metro complex initiated the Urban Affairs notion years ago<sup>17</sup> and has been discussing, promoting, and lobbying for the vehicle under various names, including the very fancy title "Department of Urbiculture." The concept jelled in the proposed title: Department of Urban Affairs. Forerunners of the 1962 Urban Affairs legislation—aborted bills—were mentioned in my *American Mercury* article of June, 1960 ("Who Are the Metrocrats?"). It is heartening to note that both the Senate and the House defeated the Metro legislation; it is interesting to note that 1313 is not identified as its cradle.

The Metro strategy behind the Department of Urban Affairs (which will be revived and presented again, perhaps under a different title) is to have ready a Metro anchor for the cities made stateless by Metro regionalization (Step No. 4), if ever Metro conquers to that extent. In the meantime the cities become tied firmly to central government via subsidies; The Department of Urban Affairs would expedite subsidy giving to cities.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 (Urban Affairs) illustrates the Metro attempt to bypass legislative power. The strength of United States constitutional government—a federation composed of sovereign state governments—paradoxically bares an Achilles heel. Since cities are creatures of the states and exist only by permission of each of the fifty U.S. States, it follows that with states eliminated by Metro, government of the cities must be tied to another Authority. The solution is Reorganization Plan No. 1—Department of Urban Affairs.

A notorious concept in social engineering foretold the forced trend whereby legislative power—the Congress—would be bypassed in *converted* American government. J. L. Moreno, a European emigrant, graphically explained the plan wherein the surge of human "wants" would sweep directly from the masses toward a central national head, completely bypassing state legislatures.<sup>18</sup>

*It is astonishing to see Moreno's prediction being carried out by 1313.*

The Urban Affairs notion has been criticized by the press, including the *Wall Street Journal*, *Nation's Business* and the dailies who mentioned two endorsers of the legislation, but failed to point out that they are key 1313 organizations. U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association (See MetroChart) both have strongly supported the creation of a Metro Department of Urban Affairs.

<sup>17</sup> *The Congressional Record*, February 21, 1962, pp. A1314 *et al.*

<sup>18</sup> *Sociometry. Experimental Method and the Science of Society, an Approach to a New Political Orientation*, by J. L. Moreno, Beacon House, Inc., 1951, Beacon, N.Y.

Whacking away discreetly at the squid tips has a value of sorts, but driving through to the 1313 conspiracy would decide the issue sooner and settle the decision as to whether American government is to remain in citizen hands or go to Metro.

Meanwhile, migrations of 1313 personnel continue, with the Metro agents setting Metro fires wherever they camp. For instance, O. W. (Hump) Campbell, a balding 1313 emissary for years, was awarded the first Metro county managership of its kind in the United States when Miami-Dade's Metro was established in 1957. Campbell was forced to resign from the appointive position during 1961<sup>19</sup> by dissatisfied Floridians, and in 1962 held a job at the University of California in Berkeley.

Paul Opperman, assistant director of ASPO (see MetroChart) took leave from 1313 for Federal positions, then left them to spend ten years as planning director of the City and County of San Francisco. In 1959, Opperman returned to Chicago to become first executive director of Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (NIMAPC, May-June, 1959, issue).<sup>20</sup>

John P. Keith, assistant director of ASPA (see MetroChart), was hired by the Regional Plan Association in 1959 to carry on programs of research and action toward establishing the tri-state Metro region of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.<sup>21</sup>

Herbert Emmerich, former director of 1313 PACH, now is with the United Nations as public administration consultant—a vital position from which to spread Metro government throughout the entire world.<sup>22</sup>

Walter Blucher, executive secretary of ASPO for nineteen years, left 1313 for Detroit, Michigan. He had worked in Detroit as far back as 1919. On a Ford Foundation grant, he has returned to direct a planning program of ponderous proportions for the Southeastern Michigan Metropolitan Research Corporation. For the past forty years, Blucher has visited every major city in the country and some in Canada. Many cities hired Blucher as a planning consultant. Among them was Toronto, Canada, where the first metropolitan government on the continent was formed in the 1950's.<sup>23</sup>

The story of 1313's machinations would be incomplete without mention of the efforts of the League of Women Voters. Troops of this female army rush in to spade up public opinion to yield bouquets in favor of Metro projects. Speaking of the National LWV in 1921, a Metro official welcomed "this fresh new civic army of women, an organ-

<sup>19</sup> *Miami Herald*, February 16, 1961.

<sup>20</sup> Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission Newsletter, May-June 1959.

<sup>21</sup> *New York Times*, June 17, 1959.

<sup>22</sup> *National Civic Review*, September, 1960, p. 406.

<sup>23</sup> *Detroit Times*, March 29, 1959, and January 22, 1960.

ized army, armed abundantly with enthusiasm and well aware of the enemy—and looking for ammunition.”<sup>24</sup>

Persons seeking to understand Metro sometimes ask: “Is Metro Communistic?”

That is, indeed, a valid question.

As in all serious inquiry, an interpretive approach is necessary. Certainly, the 1313 parent body once was headed by a Communist-fronter. The National Municipal League chose as its president Dr. Clarence Addison Dykstra, then president of the University of Wisconsin. NML has praised the late Dr. Dykstra's leadership from 1937-40. Later, Dykstra became Provost of the University of California at Los Angeles (U.C.L.A.). According to the Fact-Finding Committee, Senate of the California Legislature, Dr. Dykstra's sympathy, cooperation, sponsorship, and assistance concurrently was extended to the following Communist fronts and others not listed here, due to limitations of space:

*National Council of Soviet-American Friendship.*<sup>25</sup> This is one of the oldest Communist fronts in existence, being a continuation of the Friends of the Soviet Union;

*American Russian Institute for Cultural Relations with the Soviet Union.*<sup>26</sup> Dr. Dykstra cordially addressed a 1945 conference of this Communist front on his U.C.L.A. campus;

*Institute of Pacific Relations.*<sup>27</sup> Dr. Dykstra was associated with the American Council, one of nine similar councils of IPR in nine countries;

*Hollywood Quarterly.* The magazine was launched under the blessing of Dr. Dykstra and the Communist-controlled Hollywood Writers Mobilization. The California Senate Fact-Finding Committee reported of Dr. Dykstra: “Here again, the dignity and prestige of the university was being used to clothe a traitorous enterprise with respectability.”<sup>28</sup>

A second logical question: “Well, then, is 1313 a Communist front?”

The usual pattern of personnel in Communist-front organizations includes a certain number of trusted Communist party lieutenants, so many veteran fellow travelers, so many fringe or occasional followers of the Party Line, and so many gullibles picked up for the first time and used as fronts for purposes which they do not fully comprehend.<sup>29</sup>

Further, the interlocking directorate is a well-known device of party front organizations.

<sup>24</sup> *A Half Century of Municipal Reform, op. cit.*, p. 168.

<sup>25</sup> Report of the Joint Fact-Finding Committee to the 1951 Regular California Legislature, Sacramento, 1951, p. 286; Report . . . 1948, p. 324.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 1948 Report, p. 170.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 1947 Report, p. 322.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 1951, p. 55.

<sup>29</sup> Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States, Appendix—Part IX, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 1944, p. 262.

Concerning Communist front organizations, the Attorney-General, Mr. Francis Biddle, made the following observation:

Testimony on "front organizations" showed that they were represented to the public for some legitimate reform objectives, but actually used by the Communist Party to carry on its activities pending the time when the Communists believe they can seize power through revolution.<sup>30</sup>

PACH (the 1313 Public Administration Clearing House) reveals its interlocking directorate in its published pamphlet, *Thirteen-Thirteen*, and in the book, *A Half Century of Municipal Reform*, a history of the Metro complex. Incidentally, while in manuscript form, the book was read and approved by Communist-sympathizing Dykstra.<sup>31</sup>

While it is beyond the intention of a sole researcher to review the ramified personnel roster of the 1313 complex and to assess 1313's Red-point saturation, the major outline of Metro's program is easier to check. Also, the traumatic brutalities of the Metro urban renewal program already have raised questions of Communist-inspired direction.

Hourly, Americans are being led deeper into Metro government. They are entitled to know what sort of government they are getting.

A Federal committee took a step in this direction. The Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, House of Representatives, called attention to 1313 in 1954, citing the global political postures of the foundations which donated millions of dollars to the 1313 clearinghouse. The Congressional investigative body (Reece Committee) noted that Carnegie Corporation, and Rockefeller Foundation (Spelman Fund) furnished PACH's initial financing.<sup>32</sup>

Also, Ford Foundation directly gave funds to the National Municipal League and the Public Administration Clearing House, by sworn statement of Mr. H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., president and trustee, The Ford Foundation.<sup>33</sup> Current 1313 literature furnishes instance after instance of the continuing and munificent support of 1313 Metro by Ford Foundation.

The Reece Committee concluded its hurried glance at 1313 PACH by recommending further and deeper study of the "21 organizations" in Chicago.<sup>34</sup> That was approximately eight years ago and nothing official has been done, so let's turn the page—

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 263.

<sup>31</sup> *A Half Century of Municipal Reform*, *loc. cit.*, p. vii.

<sup>32</sup> Tax-Exempt Foundations, Hearings before the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House of Representatives, Part I, May 10-July 9, 1954, pp. 894, 896.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, Hearings, Part II, p. 1031.

<sup>34</sup> Tax-Exempt Foundations Report, 1954, p. 221.

## Metro and its "Fronts"

PROMOTERS OF METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT say that Metro is a new form of government. Metro is "new" only in the sense that a rundown, beat-up jalopy is "new" to the eighth or tenth or twentieth person who is foolish enough to buy the junk.

Metro is merely a sly twist to an old form of government that has plagued the world from early times—dictatorship. The pharaohs built pyramids; the Metrocrats build extravagant transit systems, rebuild cities in grandiose style upon citizen sacrifice.

Metro dictatorship is accomplished through appointed executives crowned with practically unlimited power erected over ever-widening geographic mergings of the realms toward one giant Metro.

Metro is playing for stakes so high that collapse can be the only end—glittering public works, bottomless debt, Metro Authority as despot over displaced humans, the power of appointed and self-appointed minions arrogant with irresponsibility.

Metro starts quietly. They who promote Metro—the Metrocrats—work out details ahead of public announcement, spring the news when ready to put a particular Metro project "on the road."

For instance, Metro may be triggered officially by a resolution, say, by the board of county supervisors deploring "overlapping" in governmental units. The strategy is used in many places. Metro directives, issuing from the common 1313 source, outline methods to that effect. The agent whom Metro considers most suitable to launch a Metro project, at present, is a county supervisor—or the entire board of supervisors, if possible. Years hence, if and when Metro is successful in eliminating units of government closest to the citizens, one may find a Metro multi-purpose district executive or a regional Metro director promulgating Metro moves and projects.

*Strategy in 1950-60's.* First, the supervisor's resolution text deplores "governmental overlapping," making vague references to simplification and tax cuts. The newspapers pick it up, and first thing the citizen knows, a Metro campaign is in full swing to rewrite the county charter from beginning to end.

The words "home rule" figure in Metro doubletalk. Although there are cities and counties in America which have exercised "home rule" since the nineteenth century, these same cities and counties recently have become targets of Metro. Metro is not true home rule; the words merely represent a Metro label—a symbol—designed to make Metro government look good to the citizens.

Metro can accomplish consolidation—in Metro-ese, the word is "in-

tegration"—collectivizing government—without changing the names of cities. In the ultimate Metro, they would be called "places."

Metro concentrated, at first, on the populous 168 to 170 areas designated as "metropolitan areas" throughout the United States. At present it has become significantly evident from Metro's reach for power over the open spaces in less populated areas that Metro is out to subjugate not only urban city dwellers but all the people in the land.

Metro is super-government. Metro promoters constantly seek to widen Metro by wiping out political boundary lines. The Metro five steps illustrate the Metro merging: city-county, county-district, district-state, state-region, region-international.

Metro attempts to expand, starting with the "metropolitan areas" and agitates other trouble spots, so that the Metro spreading will result in one total completed regional merging—just as spots of paint from a spilled can eventually run together and merge into one big blot.

In trying for this political spreading, Metro takes many forms, twisting and turning to circumvent existing laws at city, county, or state level, and changing laws that it cannot skirt. It is appalling to discover how protective legislation has quietly been changed on the statute books, changed in order to "break the locks on the city or county gates of state" and thus to make easier the entry of Metro.

In 1959 the attack was concentrated at the state level due to the fact that many state legislatures were in regular session.

*Indiana:* A Metro piece of legislation showed up in a bill before the legislature (SB #207) introduced early in January, 1959. This proposed to abolish the board of county commissioners, and then to provide for *appointment* by the county council of an administrative officer who would be the head of the county government. The bill sailed through the Senate committee. When it went to the House, time was short and a squabble in committee caused the bill to die there. "It was killed," said an Indiana citizen, "and the alert came from *outside* the Legislature."

An Indiana newspaper, rather red-faced for having supported the bill in editorials no doubt copied from the "canned" releases that pour from 1313, alibied by saying that one of the amendments proposed the county manager as an elected officer. The newspaper apparently thought the idea acceptable, ignorant of the fact that *election* of its managers is merely a temporary expediency; Metro *wars upon elective status*, and tries to substitute *appointive* power.

Actually, any Metro manager, whether elected or appointed, when endowed with the type of limitless and practically uncheckable power given by the Metro charters, is a potential threat to the independent citizenry. Also, past events prove that a vote can change the elective status (invested with great power) to an appointive status invested with dangerous power.

According to Metro, in 1959 there were seventeen counties in the United States headed by county managers.<sup>1</sup>

*Texas.* Metro was successful in placing one of its agents in Texas as Director of Mental Health and Hospitals. The man came from Tennessee. A Texas paper reported: "According to Texas law, which required 12 months' residence for the rights and privileges of citizenship, the doctor would have to be returned to Tennessee or some prior state of residence before he could get free treatment for his own mental health."

Texans rose against the legislation (H.B. 294 in 1959) imported by the Metro agent. The newspaper, *Texas Councillor*, commented:

"The bill was introduced by Roger Daily of Houston who said he had not written it. It had been supplied to him, he said, by (the doctor from Tennessee) who admitted getting it from 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago. This is the same 1313 that is promoting 'metro' or so-called Home Rule, City Zoning Laws and Public Housing Projects."

"1313—A Law Factory? Representatives, when questioned, stated that the Texas Legislature votes financial support to the Council of State Governments (CSG) whose home address is 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago. In return for this support, sample bills and voluminous pamphlets are supplied to committees and individual lawmakers. The CSG also has its headquarters at 1313."

"Mail Order Bills: A spokesman naively commended this method of getting factory-written bills from a mail-order house in Chicago as a way to produce uniform laws. *The Texas Councillor* wishes to remind its readers that a state legislature gets its authority from the grass-root citizens, and not some mysterious giant cell located, but not localized, in Chicago."<sup>2</sup>

*The Iowa Evening World-Herald* of February 20, 1959, reported:

"Two bills affecting county government were introduced. One . . . provides that offices within a county can be combined 'to promote efficiency and economy.' An earlier bill would permit two or more counties to combine offices and administrative functions.

"*County Managers Urged.* The second bill introduced Friday would permit counties to adopt a county administrator form of government, similar to a city manager type."

Metro's concept of the *short ballot* abolishes elective offices and the elimination of candidate names shortens the ballot. *The Evening World-Herald*, of Omaha, on March 20, 1959, reported:

<sup>1</sup> *National Civic Review*, published by National Municipal League, 47 E. 68th Street, New York, N.Y., March, 1959, p. 164.

<sup>2</sup> *The Texas Councillor*, Houston, Texas, March 5, 1959.

"A bill which provides for appointment rather than election of the three members of the Iowa Commerce Commission has passed both houses of the Iowa Legislature. . . . The argument which a majority of the Iowa legislators appeared to accept is that better qualified men are likely to be selected through appointment. The Iowa bill provides for appointment by the Governor and confirmation by a two-thirds majority of the Senate. The trend in most states is toward a shorter ballot and more appointive officials. 'It is something,' the paper warned, 'to which Nebraskans also should devote serious thought.'"

In California, Metrocrat legislators introduced a bill that proposed a gigantic statewide planning empire to be run by an appointee of the governor's own choosing. The proposed Planning Act<sup>3</sup> was lifted almost bodily from Metro's so-called *Model Planning Law* (see Bibliography).

The "parent body" of Metro, the National Municipal League in New York, is the "model charter and model constitution" factory of Metro. NML has published a *Model State Constitution* (5th edition, 1948) in which a Metro governor would commission all officers of the state, then delegate any or all of his administrative powers to an appointed manager.

Among other astounding proposals, the *Metro State Constitution* (see Bibliography) provides that the Metro governor "shall be commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the state and may call them out to execute the laws, to suppress insurrection or to repel invasion" (Article V, Sections 503, 505, 5th edition revised, 1948).

The idea of standing armies maintained by each of the states was discussed long, long ago by Americans prior to the adoption of the United States Constitution. The idea of a state standing army for each individual state was thrown out lock, stock, and barrel at the time. Yet Metro, in its *Model State Constitution*, 5th edition, proposed the reactionary notion.

Our state constitutions do provide for a militia, but a militia is a part-time or "minute man" army and not a standing army, or, within the description of a Metro "armed forces of the state." State legislatures are empowered to provide for militia. Metro's constitution does not so empower the legislatures. Metro hands absolute power over Metro armed forces to the Metro governor.

There is no one method or technique of Metro; its strategies are legion, but all move implacably toward collectivization, gathering-in and consolidating, ruling by appointees, abolishing elective representation of the citizens.

Incognito Metro government in Los Angeles County as compared with the well-publicized Metropolitan Government of Miami-Dade will serve to illustrate the unlabeled and the labeled strategies of Metro. To other counties interested in the description as an object lesson, one

<sup>3</sup> S.B. 597, 1959—California State Legislature.



fact is of major importance: Metro can seize power *without a Metro charter*. To explain:

In Southern California, cocksure Metro promoters tried to dodge the limitations imposed by the state constitution. County supervisors in Los Angeles County *appointed* a Charter revision committee. This being illegal, the committee was disgraced and publicly fell flat on its Metro face.

The illegal attempt reflected badly upon the charter committee's veiled sister, the Metropolitan Area Study Group Commission. The latter mysteriously suspended operations and the entire Metro apparatus in Los Angeles County went underground where the Metro label was ripped off.

Next thing citizens heard was the propaganda that "the people who run Los Angeles simply aren't going to let Metro in." The statement was absurd in the light of developments that were, and still are, taking place. Californians who read the Miami newspapers discovered that, as each Metro proposal was introduced in Miami-Dade, the same matter showed up almost simultaneously in Los Angeles—minus the Metro label. Examples: restrictions upon the bearing of firearms, establishment of Human Relations Commissions (racistic concepts rejected in Miami-Dade, accepted in Los Angeles; the restrictive firearms proposal rejected in both locations).

In Los Angeles County, Metro platform speakers started talking about "skeletal" cities whose municipal functions would be siphoned out by county government of the future (Metro not mentioned). A terrific impetus was given to incorporating cities under Metro's "Lakewood Plan."<sup>4</sup>

The Lakewood Plan, a bit of interim Metro strategy, is billed by Metro as the "Home Rule Route to Modern County."<sup>5</sup> In brief, this plan derives its name from the Metro experiment with the city of Lakewood (population, 60,000) established April 16, 1954. The aggregation of families settled in Los Angeles County in a location between the Pacific Ocean and the city of Los Angeles.

The community was incorporated as a general law city, meaning that it operates under state laws that apply to non-chartered cities. Lakewood is one of the "skeletal" cities—the county supplies its municipal flesh, so to speak, by performing functional services such as garbage pickup, street maintenance, and sewage.

Lakewood is touted by Metro as the first instance in the United States wherein all municipal services were supplied to a city through an outside entity that substituted for local administration.

Obviously, if a county were filled with Lakewood Plan cities, a Metro county could be instantly created by the mere twist of a vote; the simultaneous charge of Metro political electricity would run through

<sup>4</sup> *National Civic Review*, loc. cit., December, 1959, p. 609.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, January, 1959, p. 34.

all the identical Lakewood cities and a Metro county would be created.

Another Metro technique has been identified in Illinois. A citizen in a Chicago suburb has stated: "Here is a pattern which public officials use over and over again: Allow things to get so bad that they, themselves, who are responsible for the bad situation, can point to it and recommend a solution. The solution: *Always more centralized power.* The newspaper obligato keeps 'exposing' the evil and likewise recommends a 'solution' which is Metro."

The Cook County (Illinois) citizen continued, "I had a long conversation with our county supervisor. I can't make him see anything wrong with what he is doing, leading us toward Metro, but *once*, he did appear to grasp what I was talking about, when I told him this Metro crowd guiding us in the background, do not want *solutions* to problems—they want *problems*. So, as long as our villages are manned with Metro city managers and imported Metro lawyers, and the county health department (merged) influence, we are not going to have our problems solved. Our problems can only increase. I think he recalled some times when he, too, felt they could have given help and did not come across. I am sure this fellow is sincere, but he just won't believe that he is being used."

There, in Cook County, Illinois, and all over the United States, other Americans are trying to hold to constitutional government and to defend their American freedom from the Metro political attack.

What can be done to combat political Metro?

#### *City Level*

1. Cities are holding to political self-rule under time-honored charters of constitutional concept.
2. Cities are forestalling wholesale revisions of city charters.
3. Cities are blocking Metropolitanization of ordinances and codes.
4. Guarding against incorporation of new cities under the Lakewood Plan.
5. Toilsome education of persons whose hearts are in the right place, but who do not have enough understanding in their heads.

#### *State Level*

1. Citizens watch current legislation, review changes made in the laws during the last twenty to twenty-five years. Changes have been made, lie on the books, and are invoked by Metro when needed to legalize some Metro scheme.

#### *Federal Level*

1. Pass the Bricker Amendment.
2. Repeal Law 565, which authorizes U.S. participation in UNESCO. (Additions to foregoing, added, Ed.)
3. Rejection of the Department of Urban Affairs in 1962 was a constitutional victory and a devastating defeat to Metro forces. Metro has been promoting the Federal urban affairs notion for many years.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, December, 1959, p. 574; January, 1960, p. 6.

4. Introduction of the International Organizations Rescission Act of 1962 is another step upholding constitutional government; Metro government is the domestic application of United Nations Charter government. H.R. 9567 introduced January 10, 1962, by Hon. James B. Utt would help to demolish the source of Metro ideology. H.R. 9567 is a bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes.

*Metro core*

The Metro attack upon the basic principles of American government is financed by you—an American taxpayer—directly by your tax dollars. One half of the entire radical Metro core (see MetroChart) and perhaps more than half is influenced by the Council of State Governments. CSG is supported by you, through appropriations voted by your state representative or assemblyman.<sup>7</sup>

In addition to establishing Metro in Miami-Dade, the CSG backs the phony mental health movement through direct control of the Interstate Clearing House on Mental Health, a 1313 group. (See MetroChart.)

If states would withhold funds from 1313's CSG, the alien form of Metro collectivized government could be dealt a crippling blow. (See Appendix I for Table of State Funds paid to 1313.)

It is common knowledge that influential Metro organizations, such as American Municipal Association, International Union of Local Authorities, in addition to Communistic linkage also are members of UNESCO, the United Nations world-government propaganda arm.

How can such a thing as Metro happen in the United States?

According to legal analysts, the situation is this: The United Nations Charter is a ratified treaty. A treaty overrides domestic law. The UN Charter mandates social legislation exemplified by Metro. The Bricker Amendment would have taken our Constitution upstairs and put it where it belongs—the Supreme Law of the Land—above the UN Charter. As matters now stand, the UN Charter can be invoked as the supreme law of the land.

We are living under United Nations Charter law when we live under Metro law.

Ever since the United States came into being, there have been critics standing around saying that our American government of checks-and-balances would not work. There always have been critics saying that a bunch of "experts" should rule, that the sovereign power-to-rule could not be left in the hands of individual rank-and-file Americans.

As you know, American government is built upon the political theory of republicanism, or divided sovereignty. In a monarchy, the sovereign power-to-rule is vested in a king. In a dictatorship, the power-to-rule

<sup>7</sup> Refer to a commission in your state government entitled, Commission on Interstate Cooperation, or: Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

is seized by a tyrant. If the tyrannical power is held by a group, oligarchy is the term used.

In the United States, the sovereign power-to-rule is vested in you and other Americans who have pooled the sovereignty of the individual, then divided it with the basic American principal of check-and-balance government, that grass-roots tri-partite type that has encouraged self-rule in small units—the town hall, the city council—the forms which Metro contemptuously calls “fractionalization” and “Balkanized” government.

More than one hundred years ago, a European wrote a letter to an American citizen predicting that our form of government run by citizens could not last, that citizens would not take the proper interest. The European predicted that a Caesar, or a Napoleon, or *home-grown barbarians* would successfully take over American government in the twentieth century.<sup>8</sup> Was he foretelling the Metrocrats?

(Taken from a speech in St. Petersburg, Florida, April, 1959.)

<sup>8</sup> Thomas Babington Macaulay in a letter dated May 23, 1857, to Henry S. Randall, Secretary of State in New York. Reprinted in *The World's Great Letters*, Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1940, p. 331.

## The "Metro" Monster

OUR TRADITIONAL American form of government is under attack by forces here on home ground. The very ultimate of this war appears to be centered upon abolition of private property. Various techniques are being used to tear property from private hands and to place it under public ownership or control.

Two of the assaults will be mentioned here—the attack upon private property through taxation, and the attack through land-usage controls.

The closer government is to the people, the more surely can government be kept from running wild. Yet, strange talk is urging political consolidation—centralization—which takes government farther from citizen control. Strange talk is promoting the idea of appointed executives, or political bosses to run a collectivized government which replaces elected officials traditionally chosen by the American ballot.

This strange Metro talk preaches a political philosophy that kneels to collectivization which Metro calls the *whole community*,<sup>1</sup> and the connotation of *whole community* does not change when Metro's exchange program brings international Metro agents from foreign lands to "study" here, or takes Metro agents from the United States and plants them abroad to act as transmission.<sup>2</sup>

American government was not designed to be a part of a *whole community*. Nobody is more aware of this than the Metro schemers, themselves.

Here is what Luther Gulick, a Metro leader, said recently about time-honored American government:

"If the Devil had looked for a technique to prevent the people who live in a metropolitan area from agreeing among themselves as to how they will solve their metropolitan problems, it is hard to see how a more effective and disruptive instrument of governmental chaos could have been invented than the fractionalization of local governments and local leadership . . . evolved . . . in these United States."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Whole community." See "The City Manager of Tomorrow," by Orin F. Nolting, Executive Director, International City Managers' Association, Chicago, in *Public Management*, XL, No. 10 (October, 1958), p. 235. 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 236.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Luther Gulick, president, Institute of Public Administration, New York, N.Y., address: "The Challenge of the Urban Structure," National Conference on Metropolitan Growth, Sheraton-Park Hotel,

The gargoyle face of political Metro appears in many shapes and forms, but the important features—all based upon merging of political bodies to be managed by Metro appointees—appear to be—in number—five, (1) city-county merging, (2) county-district, (3) district-state, (4) state-region, (5) region-international.<sup>4</sup>

The sixth step—international-world government—Metro has not dared to publish, as yet.

Through Metro, political centralization is wedded to economic paternalism, otherwise known as socialistic public enterprise, and the unsavory pair form a spearhead of the attack upon the American way of life, today.

The entire United States lies under the Metro attack in one stage or another—from Florida to California, Seattle to San Diego, Tennessee, Michigan, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, Arkansas—many other places.

Metro's first shot usually hits a time-honored American document, such as a city or county charter, or state constitution. These are being described, in Metro's impudent slogan, as "horse-and-buggy" charters, and "patchwork" constitutions.

Fierce action usually follows the rattle of Metro contempt for the honored and honorable documents, action such as Metro-instigated "study groups," sweeping and sometimes illegal charter revision committees, whose tragically poor judgment seeks to wipe out the traditional American system of checks and balances, the government which Metro disparages as "fractionalized" and "Balkanized" local government.

American freedom is the target of the Metro hatchet work. On the wreckage of United States constitutional government, Metro seeks to erect its creature of Consolidated Government run by political bosses whom Metro describes as "appointed executives."

The first Metro capitol in the world has been established in Dade County, Florida, where Miami is situated. Floridians aptly term the Metro as "The State of Dade." They observe that a weird new government has been planted in their midst, dictated by a political core situated outside the sovereign state of Florida.

(However, Dade County is becoming disillusioned and the *Miami News*, February 23, 1959, reported "Strong backing developed today to put party politics back into Dade County Commission elections. The move, already being sparked by the Dade Young Democrats, drew the support of the State Democratic Executive Committee. . . . The Young Democrats plan to ask the Metro Commission to voluntarily call an election on the issue. If the commission refuses—and this is anticipated—petitions will be circulated to force a referendum." In the Downey (Calif-

Washington, D.C., November 24-25, 1958, sponsored by U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

<sup>4</sup> The five Metro steps: in *The States and the Metropolitan Problem*, by Council of State Governments, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. (A Report to the Governors' Conference, 1956, John C. Bollens, Director of the Study.)

for) *Live Wire*, Hollis M. Peavey, councilman, is reported as saying "the metropolitan type of government in Dade County, Florida, has been a failure. The people lost their representation in government and one day they woke up to the fact that this almighty metropolitan government could zone, police and do all things—without any regard for the people."

Saddest aspect of the situation is the practice of the Metro core releasing false bulletins to the rest of the United States. Here is one, plucked out of an Alabama newspaper which was foolishly encouraging its readers to espouse Metro. The editorial was based upon material released out of Metro's Chicago headquarters. Its title: *Federated Metropolitan Setup Widely Endorsed in Florida*. The text: "People down in Dade County, Florida, where Miami is located, appear well pleased with their new federated metropolitan government—the first of its kind in the United States."<sup>5</sup> A St. Louis paper<sup>6</sup> also printed glowing words, dropped into its linotype by Metro press-agentry. A newspaper in New York published the same Metro "line."<sup>7</sup> Now, if what Florida papers say is true—and we have no reason to doubt them—all is *not* well in Miami-Dade. According to its papers, Metro has run away with the citizens' government.

Metro revealed its iron hand right from the start. Metro officials who spewed new sets of ordinances, already have junked at least one of them,<sup>8</sup> in order to pass a tighter ordinance that favored, not the citizens, but the untouchable power of Metro boss rule.

That was to be expected. Metro openly promised as much in its plan published in 1954 under the title: *The Metropolitan Government of Miami*, wherein the run-away power of ordinance was explained, described, and stressed. (Another Metro publication stressing the power of ordinance is the more recent title: *The Metropolitan Government of Sacramento*.) Miami-Dade's Metro, on January 6, 1959, scrapped its own ordinance which was based on *voluntary* regulation of private utilities companies, as being "ineffective and unenforceable."

Miami-Dade's Metro is now overhauling assessment practices<sup>9</sup> which could raise property assessments to a height by which private property owners could be killed off, economically speaking.

The Metro core is making a big to-do over Miami-Dade's so-called

<sup>5</sup> *Mobile (Alabama) Press*, December 16, 1958. Editorial.

<sup>6</sup> *St. Louis Globe Democrat*, Sunday, October 5, 1958.

<sup>7</sup> *New York State Taxpayer*, 100 State Street, Albany 7, N.Y. Vol. XX, No. 1, January, 1959.

<sup>8</sup> The *Miami Herald*, February 10, 1959, Sec. C (front page). Old Metro ordinance based on voluntary regulation of private utilities companies was scrapped by the Commission, January 6, 1959, as being "ineffective and unenforceable."

<sup>9</sup> "Metro May Change Your '61 Tax Bill," August 19, 1958. Newspaper announcement that reassessment of Miami-Dade was in process. No masthead name. (Clipping.)

tax cut. Taking less from a taxpayer's wallet while sneaking money from his hip pocket does not constitute a savings to the taxpayer. Equating a tax reduction with a cost, or expense reduction, may not tell the truth, at all. Wise taxpayers know that while political magicians may stand on the stage whittling a *tax bill*—cut to serve the interests of press-agentry and to divert citizen attention—the actual cost may be adroitly shunted over into another cost column whose total the taxpayer, of course, pays.

The city of Evanston, Illinois, has found this to be a fact. Recently, in 1959, Evanstonians ran a check upon their city finances, found that revenue raised from taxes (their wallets) had risen 6½ per cent during the city's five years of Metro city manager form of government, whereas, revenue from hidden sources (their hip pockets, so to speak) had increased 88 per cent—revenue collected from auto licenses, parking fees, traffic fines, sales tax, water meter taxes, and other miscellaneous tax sources that had been dredged up for the taxing purpose.

Total increase in the Evanston budgets is \$1,883,000.00, or 43 per cent over the five years. In this period, cost of living and population increase accounted for only 10 per cent; the balance of the increase (33 per cent) is purely due to a more extravagant level of spending under the Metro city manager.<sup>10</sup> The figures and percentages proved to the citizens of Evanston that hidden drainpipes had been attached to their personal fortunes, tapping and draining off dollars that went to support the costly city manager Metro form of government.

Actually, when Metro officials talk among themselves, they state quite bluntly that Metro government is bound to cost more—and that raises taxes. A Metro author states that "integration" (Metro-ese for "consolidation") actually is no panacea for lowered taxes.<sup>11</sup> Rather, Metro raises taxes. In witness of this fact, stands the Metro axiom: "Expansion or equalization of services may mean higher tax rates<sup>12</sup>. . . . It is often declared that consolidation will mean a tremendous saving as a result of a sharp reduction in the total number of government personnel. But the line work performed by the various units must be continued—in some cases it must be *expanded*—and this requires an increase in personnel over that of the largest unit prior to consolidation."<sup>13</sup>

To bear witness to this Metro warning, public employees in Evanston increased 15 per cent in five years under a city manager form of government.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Evanston (Illinois) Committee for Good Government, 1959.

<sup>11</sup> *Metropolitan Government*, by Victor Jones, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1942, p. 186. Pp. 364.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 187.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 190-91.

<sup>14</sup> Computation made from information (photostated) on official correspondence of City of Evanston, Illinois, signed by Stacey B. Irish, Personnel Director of Evanston, "Council-Manager Government."



A Metro author summarized, "The integration of local government in metropolitan areas may result, then, chiefly in an *expansion*, improvement or equalization of services rather than in actual reductions of budget items."<sup>15</sup>

There you have it, in the words of a Metro high priest: Line costs, or the base of services, cannot be reduced by consolidation; actually, Metro expands the public services. Metro may bring a poor district of a town or county up to the standards of the highest district, and force the high-income district to pay for all.

Therefore, the very core of Metro purpose, repeated again and again in its library of directives, is to raise a tax base from which can be harvested high taxes to pay for the grandiose plans of Metro promoters.

Now, Miami-Dade citizens are fretting under this state of affairs, this new brand of boss rule. Metro has demanded more judges, more police, more firemen, to staff its crushing layer of Metro which is cemented over the city governments.

A disillusioned Metro commissioner has stated: "I don't think that the people ever intended that the city manager, the police chief, or the judges of the municipal courts should make the laws. Those are appointive offices, and beyond the reach of the voters. . . . I'm getting tired of being a commissioner and yielding my responsibilities, obligations, and prerogatives to people I employ on behalf of the taxpayers they're shoving around."<sup>16</sup>

Yet, unfactual reporting, half-truths, and twisting of facts on the part of Metro press-agentry is anesthetizing overburdened and tax-weary Americans all over the country, fooling them into believing that tax relief should come under the proposed Monster Metro. Metro is a political trick to seize power and money; it is not an economy move.

A Metro leader with an academic title has chimed in with the news that Metro will cost trillions of dollars. He said: "The cost of this undertaking, along with the modernization of now obsolete city structures . . . will cost a total of \$80 trillion in 20 years, plus an amount for urban reconstruction which cannot be less than an equal amount, and might as well be twice as large."<sup>17</sup>

The Metro agent was speaking of Metro's vast public enterprise venture in the housing field—*Urban Renewal Redevelopment*—to which Metro has assigned one entire department, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment. NAHRO publicly boasts that it has influenced America's housing legislation; NAHRO maintains a branch

<sup>15</sup> *Metropolitan Government, loc. cit.*, p. 199.

<sup>16</sup> "All Isn't Serene in Our City Hall," by John Pennekamp, *Miami Herald* (n.d.). (Circa 1959.)

<sup>17</sup> Luther Gulick, "The Challenge of the Urban Structure," *loc. cit.*

office in the national capital as an arm to its headquarters at the Metro core in America, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago.<sup>18</sup>

Metro circumvents state sovereignty by forging deadly city-Federal ties through Urban Renewal. In 1958-59, a path was beaten to Washington by city politicians, Metro planners and profiteers, all of whom put on a disgraceful show by begging for Federal Urban Renewal hand-outs. These proponents of Federal aid for American cities are so irked by having to go through Congress for the money, that they asked for a cabinet rank department of Urban Affairs by 1961.

Federal money divvied up by taxpayers keeps this beggar crew in the "crash program" construction business.

Taxpayers pay two thirds federally; one third locally, and the local amount usually gets swollen to twice its size because of inflationary financing charges, interest payments, etc., tacked on by the hometown bureaucrats.

Up to 1959, the state of Florida had stayed out of the Urban Renewal trough. But a man in Washington—an appointee who was dazzled by Metro claims in Dade—gave the go-ahead signal November, 1958, for Metro planners to try to get Urban Renewal Redevelopment going, down in Miami-Dade. It will be interesting to see how the Metro planners will do that. So far, their talk has sounded more like deliberated evasion of law,<sup>19</sup> rather than observance of the law. Florida's constitution has some protective features concerning property rights, and these features seem to embarrass the Metro crowd.

The one bright spot in America's Urban Renewal dilemma to date is the ruling of the Florida Supreme Court which has declared the Florida Slum Clearance and Redevelopment Law unconstitutional (*Adams v. Housing Authority of City of Daytona Beach*, 60 Southern 2d 663). Metro schemers were so overconfident of getting around the law, that the Miami-Dade Urban Renewal Working Program reached the Metro capital in Miami in 1958, waiting to be put into motion.<sup>20</sup>

In states where Urban Renewal operates, a local agency can condemn and seize private property to provide building sites which are leased or re-sold, or operated in some other manner by the public agency. Homeowners are thus dispossessed and lose their private property to public ownership.

During this period of public ownership, no matter how temporary

<sup>18</sup> NAHRO official brochure (National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois).

<sup>19</sup> "Metro Seeks Way to Get Slums Cash," by Leo Adde, *Miami Herald* staff writer (ca December, 1958-January, 1959).

<sup>20</sup> Letter dated December 1, 1958, from Albert M. Cole, HHFA Administrator, to Mr. O. W. Campbell, County Manager, Metropolitan Dade County, Florida; also, federally certified Determination and Certification of Workable Program for Metropolitan Dade County, Florida; also, Summary of the Workable Program for Urban Renewal for Dade County, submitted September 9, 1958, supplemented October 28, 1959.

it may be, under strange laws that have been written (and California is one state where such laws have been enacted) the land can be tattooed with land-usage controls through restrictions and covenants running with the land and lasting in perpetuity.

The following directive comes straight from Metro, and the scheme can be applied to any land acquired under public ownership, whether through tax delinquency, or by Urban Renewal condemnation, or by any future gimmick that may be dreamed up by the Metro mentality to separate Americans from their private property:

"Lands suitable for private uses would be returned to private hands, but the city [or Agency, Ed.] would retain the necessary land-use control over such sites. This would be more effective in the long run than zoning ordinances. . . . When replanning would again be necessary 40 or 50 years hence, the city would not have to go through a costly tedious process of again acquiring title. . . . Land, in other words, can be passed through a period of public ownership during which the public agency can replat the land, clear the title, and adjust land-use patterns. But the city can go one step further. It can limit the future use of the land sold back into private ownership. Deed restrictions and other covenants will accomplish much more than zoning, building laws, or any other exercise of the police power. Only temporary public ownership is necessary to effect long-term land-use plans."<sup>21</sup>

That was written in the early 1940's before Urban Renewal agencies or "authorities" had been created by law. Nowadays, cities usually turn Urban Renewal operation over to agencies created for the specific purpose of accumulating private property in large parcels of "crash" construction programs of redevelopment. Take note that Metro points out that replanning would again be necessary in forty or fifty years; here is another Metro warning—if Metro gets in the saddle, Americans are to be flogged into a constant lather of Metro replanning.

In San Jose, California, a county planning commission has endorsed a scheme whereby some "agency" of government would acquire all nonfarm rights to lands which have been "greenbelted" or placed in exclusively agricultural zones. The owner of such greenbelted property could continue to farm it or sell it to another for farming uses. He could not sell it to anyone who wanted, for example, to subdivide it or build a store on it.<sup>22</sup>

Plans such as these draw fire, because even the most casual of readers

<sup>21</sup> *Tax-Reverted Properties in Urban Areas*, by A. M. Hillhouse, associate professor of Public Administration, University of Cincinnati, and Carl H. Chatters, executive director, Municipal Finance Officers Association, published by Public Administration Service, 1319 E. 60th Street, Chicago, copyright, 1942. Pp. 183.

<sup>22</sup> *San Jose Mercury*, 211 W. Santa Clara Street, San Jose, California, January 26, 1959.

sees that such regimentation comes perilously close to statism at its worst. Such planning imposes a degrading paternalism which says, in effect, "We know what's best for you; we'll tell you what you can or cannot do with your property."

Metro's big mitt is found in this gross invasion of a fundamental right of the American citizen: the right to utilize—and dispose of—his property as he sees fit, so long as the disposal does not infringe upon the rights of others.

When Title VII of the National Housing Act was approved in 1954, providing Federal assistance for urban planning for smaller communities, Metro's New York adjunct rushed to publicize its *Model State and Regional Planning Law*, in order to make the law available for the 1955 legislatures.<sup>23</sup>

The Metro planning cog is tooled to fit into the machinery of Metropolitan Government. Metro's *Planning Law* dovetails with provisions of the Metro so-called "model" state constitution, city, and county charters. The first Metro charter to operate in the world, that of Miami-Dade, prescribes a sweeping planning program which is already on the move.

Metro's *Model Planning Law* reads: ". . . Regional and local planning is important to the national interest. It is not an impossible step from this judgment to the conclusion that the national government may have to get deeper into the traditional state and local activities, especially in metropolitan areas."<sup>24</sup>

In witness of this, take a look at Urban Renewal Redevelopment practices which are binding cities to the Federal government through contractual Federal grants and loans. The mayors, politicians, profiteers and special interest pressure groups who invade Washington to beg for handouts that plunge taxpayers into debt, are hobnobbing with the very power which seeks to separate Americans from their private property.<sup>25</sup>

Today, when the time comes for a court to referee between the covetous agency and the citizen who is losing his property, something happens which was never meant to happen in America. Here is an illus-

<sup>23</sup> *Model State and Regional Planning Law, 1954*. National Municipal League, 47 East 68th Street, New York 21 (the "parent body of 1313").

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. vi.

<sup>25</sup> HEARINGS:

(1) *Slum Clearance and Related Housing Problems*, January 7, 8, 9, 1958, Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking & Currency, House of Representatives;

(2) *Housing Act of 1959*, January 28, 29, 30, 31, February 2, 3, 1959. Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, also the Report (House Report No. 86, 2/27/59);

(3) *Housing Act of 1959*, Jan. 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 1959. Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate; also, the Report (No. 41, 2/3/59);

(4) *Urban Renewal in Selected Cities*, November-December, 1957, Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate.

tration: A certain decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, written by Mr. Justice Douglas (*Berman v. Parker*, U.S. Reports, Vol. 348) was argued on October 19, 1954, and decided on November 22, 1954, dealing with the constitutionality of a District of Columbia statute permitting the taking of private property for so-called slum clearance. The property in question was not slum; it was condemned so that the entire area could be rebuilt in accordance with the land-use plan of the National Capitol Planning Commission.

The Douglas opinion went to astonishing lengths to state conclusively that "out-of-date property" can be declared "blighted" or "deteriorated." The Douglas opinion re-defined the time-honored definition of "public use" into something called "public purpose," or benefit. According to legal analysts, on this one point of definition, and on this revolutionary Douglas decision, hangs the downfall of private property ownership in the United States. That includes every single homeowner in the United States.

The Douglas decision ruled that one man's property can be taken by a public agency to be turned over to another man, when the agency decides that the second man can better turn the property to the public purpose.

How can this happen in the United States? Much as I deplore the Douglas decision and its effects, I believe that I can see why it was written, and I shall present facts that may tell you why.

Let's review. Before the days of Metro's Urban Renewal scheme, the police power of eminent domain was used sparingly on a structure-by-structure basis with each individual condemnation case being decided on its own circumstances.

Today, under Urban Renewal, the police power of eminent domain has been unchained to run wild, to bulldoze formerly privately owned buildings because they do not measure up to some "Planner's" idea of beauty or architectural fashion.

When *Berman v. Parker* was before the District Court, that tribunal earnestly pointed out in a decision that legal minds now describe as the "pioneers' last stand":

"The hypothesis . . . is an urban area which does not breed disease or crime. Its fault is that it fails to meet what are called modern standards. . . . Suppose its owners and occupants like it that way? Suppose they are old-fashioned, prefer single-family dwellings, like small flower gardens, believe that a plot of ground is the place to rear children, prefer fresh to conditioned air, sun to fluorescent light? In many circles, all such views are considered 'backward and stagnant.' Are those who hold them therefore 'blighted'? Can they not, nevertheless, own property?

"Or suppose these people own these homes and can afford none more modern? The poor are entitled to own what they can afford. The slow, the old, the small in ambition, the devotee of the out-

moded have no less right to property than have the quick, the young, the aggressive, and the modernistic or futuristic. Is the modern apartment house a better breeder of men than the detached, or row house? . . . Are such questions as these to be decided by the Government? And if the decision be adverse to the erstwhile owners and occupants, is their entire right to own the property thereby destroyed?"<sup>26</sup>

The Douglas decision answered, Yes.

The Douglas decision said: "(k) If the Redevelopment Agency considers it necessary in carrying out a redevelopment project to take full title to the land, as distinguished from the objectionable buildings located thereon, it may do so. (l) The rights of these property owners are satisfied when they receive the just compensation."<sup>27</sup>

Has the Douglas decision spoken to each property-condemned American, and warned the rest of us whose property may be condemned, in words to the effect: "Put up and shut up?" Has the Douglas decision informed Americans that we have come to the end of something that we have regarded as precious and have been accustomed to suppose that we would never relinquish?

Mr. J. M. Lashly, of the Missouri Bar (St. Louis) said of the Douglas opinion: "The decision and opinion passed over quietly, like the Fourth of July in a foreign country." Are Americans living under foreign law?

Great Americans have been warning us, year after year, in speech after speech. One of the historical warnings came from the floor of the Senate on January 28, 1954, during the great debates concerning the Bricker Amendment (S.J.1.)

Hon. Patrick McCarran in example after example, in his great speech,<sup>28</sup> "The Present Danger to the Constitution of the United States," pointed out how alien law can be invoked and set in motion in the United States under the terms of the United Nations Charter. He recalled that the Attorney General of the United States, in 1953, testifying before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, took the position that action regarding social legislation is obligatory upon the United States under Article 56 of the United Nations Charter.

Senator McCarran quoted the Attorney-General, as follows: "A notable example are Articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter, obligating the parties to promote stated social and economic objectives

<sup>26</sup> *American Bar Association Journal*, June, 1955, Vol. 41, pp. 501-3, "The Case of Berman v. Parker: Public Housing and Urban Redevelopment," by Jacob M. Lashly, past-president of the American Bar Association.

<sup>27</sup> *Berman et al., Executors, v. Parker, et al.* Appeal from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Argued October 19, 1954, decided November 22, 1954.

<sup>28</sup> McCarran speech, *Congressional Record*, January 28, 1954, p. 934.

and pledging themselves to take joint and separate action for the achievement of these purposes."

Senator McCarran attached his own remark:

"Every phase of the daily life of our people is within the scope of the broad purposes enumerated in Article 55 of the United Nations Charter: Civil, political, cultural, social and economic. This broad power is not limited by any provision in the treaty (UN Charter). There was not even any attempt to circumscribe it by any revision added at the time of ratification by the Senate.

"Under the present state of the law, a ratified treaty confers on Congress unlimited power to legislate on the subject matter of the treaty. . . . The Charter of the United Nations is a ratified and approved treaty. . . ."

Senator McCarran quoted from the United States Constitution to illustrate how the Constitution *prohibits* Congress from interfering with unalienable rights. He said: "The first amendment is not a direct guaranty of freedom of religion, or freedom of speech, or freedom of the press, or freedom of assembly; it is only a prohibition on action by the Congress in derogation to those rights."

Now, back to Senator McCarran's remarks concerning the social legislation of the United Nations Charter: "These factors include the growing doctrine . . . which permits the Congress to gain through treaty, power denied to it under the Constitution."

That is what Senator McCarran pointed out in 1954. Is it true that the UN Charter is establishing UN-legislative power in the United States, power that collides with the prohibitive diction of the Constitution of the United States?

How about the power of taking private property as illustrated by the case of *Berman v. Parker*, just reviewed? The Douglas decision was not drawn out of thin air. From what, then, was it drawn? Certainly not from the Constitution of the United States.

Years ago, Senator McCarran pointed to the UN Charter. He pointed to the section which binds the United States to carry out United Nations conditions ". . . of economic and social progress and development."

Is, then, the United Nations Charter where the hordes of Metro planners get their mandate to perform acts such as the taking of private property from one citizen to transfer it to another?

On page 17717 of the *Congressional Record* of August 22, 1958, is inserted the report of the American Bar Association to its Board of Governors concerning Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives. The report reads, in part: "The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."

Twined in the framework of collectivized Metropolitan Government we find Urban Renewal which condemns and seizes private property upon a whim, today described as public *purpose*—or welfare, a strictly pseudo-liberal term.

Under Metropolitan Government, we find an apparatus for abolition of private property, not by one method but by several—through oppressive and confiscatory taxation which results in reversion of property to public ownership, by urban renewal condemnation and seizure, by land-usage controls, by the "punishment clauses" being written into urban renewal sales of agreement by which an owner loses his fee title to the public agency if a stipulation is infringed. It is common knowledge that Metro adjuncts hold membership in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, including UNESCO, the propaganda agency of the UN.

In the Congressional report known as SPX, (Soviet Principle X [ten]), principle X is "paralysis"—paralyze the target, the U.S.A. The committee of Congress warned: "Record shows that, except through the Supreme Court, the special capabilities of paralysis, as an essential element of the Communist global conquest, are nowhere more effective than in and through United Nations."<sup>29</sup>

Metropolitan Government collectivization runs counter to government of check-and-balance provided by the Constitution of the United States.

We need to do what Senator McCarran said to do: "Get back to Constitutional Government."

A first step in the right direction is to resist Metro, any and all of its piecemeal forms and shapes, wherever they appear.

At the state level, we can prevail upon state legislatures to cut off appropriations to Metro's Council of State Governments. The Council's secretariat controls almost half of the Metro core which promotes various features of Metropolitan Government. Metro's Council of State Governments is supported *exclusively* by appropriations of the legislatures of all the State Governments.

At the national level, we can insist on passage of the Bricker Amendment which would correct the condition in which treaty law is overriding domestic law.

It is high time to start talking more openly about repealing Law 565 adopted in 1946 which authorized the United States' acceptance of that expensive white elephant, UNESCO. The story of how UNESCO is helping to promote Metropolitan Government is a story in itself.

Finally, abrogation of the United Nations Charter, itself. When treaties no longer serve the best interests of Americans, it is not against United States policy to negotiate terminations of such treaties.

American republican form of government is threatened now by con-

<sup>29</sup> SPX Report: Limitation of Appellate Jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court, Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Appendix IV to Part 2. A Study entitled, "The Supreme Court as an Instrument of Global Conquest," February 19-21, 25-28, March 3, 4, 1958, pp. 1076-1077.



solidated, or collectivized, Metropolitan Government, whose political, economic, and other collectivist features appear to operate under the mandate of the United Nations Charter.

America must not forget:

" . . . the unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity in every shape; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But . . . it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth. . . . In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels . . . I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish. . . . But if I may even flatter myself that they may . . . now and then recur . . . to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense. . . . The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is . . . to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. . . . Towards the preservation of your government . . . it is requisite . . . that you resist with care, the spirit of innovation upon its principles."

George Washington said that.

(From a speech delivered by the author at St. Augustine, at Florida State Conference on National Defense, D.A.R.)

## Urban Renewal Laws

MANY PERSONS in the United States pay no attention to Urban Renewal until they get hurt by it. In the new type of land grab, a public agency takes private property away from persons who own it. This shocking situation, unheard of in the United States until recently, has been made possible by ill-advised laws that have been passed in the United States.

Americans are losing houses, lots, businesses, and means of livelihood because an Urban Renewal project springs up in town, and proceedings are started that end with decent Americans being turned out of their homes—homes that they have worked for, paid for, and have been taxed for.

Persons who are hardest hit and who have the most to lose, generally, are the very last to learn that subsidized Urban Renewal has come to town.

For instance:

A Bunker Hill apartment house owner in Los Angeles stepped outside her front door one morning to sweep the steps. She saw several neighbors clustered under a canvas banner that was swinging above the street. The sign said that the neighborhood was an urban renewal redevelopment project. That was the first notice that the residents had.

The apartment house owner is a widow up in years, and the property is her means of livelihood. Today, she is engaged in legal battle against the public Community Redevelopment Agency, trying to prevent it from taking away her means of self-support.

An aged soldier living in the former city of Sawtelle, now a section of the city of Los Angeles, received a thick letter one day from a department of the city of Los Angeles. The letter listed all the absurd findings that public inspectors had found faulty with the soldier's modest home which was structurally sound.<sup>1</sup>

The soldier, who had fought with General Pershing in the first World War, vowed that he would fight to a finish the unfair urban renewal rehabilitation law which public officials were implementing to force the man out of his home and off his property.

The urban renewal rehabilitation operation in Sawtelle is a pilot experiment being sharpened into use by urban renewal promoters. If the public agency finds that the Sawtelle Plan provides machinery that will work when a public agency wants to seize private property, the

<sup>1</sup> "Bulldozer At Your Door," by Jo Hindman, *American Mercury*, September, 1958. Description of "The Sawtelle Plan" is included in the article.

Plan will be widely used in other neighborhoods throughout the United States.

Last time I called upon the old soldier, his tiny gray-haired wife told me that he was not able to see anyone. He was bedridden. A heart attack had felled him. Oh, yes—the “Sold” sign was posted out front, meaning that the aged couple had sold their valuable property for a song and had given up the fight.

Similar tragedies have occurred or are now in the making in other parts of California: San Diego, Benecia, Calexico, Fresno, San Jose, Santa Cruz, Pasadena, South Pasadena, Sacramento, Oakland and other places.

Similar instances have occurred or are now in the making in other parts of the United States: Phoenix, Arizona; Kalamazoo, Michigan; Detroit, Michigan; New York; Massachusetts; even Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico have urban renewal projects going, or slated to get started.<sup>2</sup>

In fact, every state in the Union, with the exception of eight, operate urban renewal laws, and California has possibly one of the most vicious sets of urban renewal laws enacted anywhere.

I shall name the main urban renewal laws, outline the steps usually taken by an urban renewal agency, and describe some of the worst cases happening in cities which have fallen into the trap of subsidized urban renewal promoted by tax-paid subsidy.

I shall point out why everybody is the loser under subsidized urban renewal, except possibly the profiteers who walk off with the money.

I shall name influential Americans and organizations throughout the United States that are opposed to the unfairness of subsidized urban renewal.

Lastly, I shall mention a solution which is being used to prevent subsidized urban renewal from gaining a foothold in town or city.

First, let us take note of the manner in which a good label, the words “urban” and “renewal,” have been placed upon a situation which reveals itself as foolhardy and unwholesome.

Basically, the renewal of anything that is worn out is commendable providing it is renewed in a sensible manner. But rebuilding a city under subsidized urban renewal at taxpayer expense is not sensible. The action goes against the tried and true laws of economics and common sense. Subsidized urban renewal defies the intent of the laws of this land that safeguard the right of a person to own property free from the fear of seizure.

Urban renewal is traveling under the disguise of slum clearance which it is not, for urban renewal is demolishing buildings and homes that are perfectly sound and in good shape.

---

<sup>2</sup> Thirteenth Annual Report, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., pp. 275-281.

## TERRIBLE 1313 REVISITED

## URBAN RENEWAL LAWS

Subsidized urban renewal was put into effect nationally in 1954 by an amendment<sup>3</sup> to the Federal National Housing Act.<sup>4</sup> You may remember the early workings of that particular law—socialistic public housing—and how Americans turned against public housing after the bad effects began to show.

Urban renewal added a new twist to the original housing law, in the form of misleading terminology to the effect that private enterprise would participate in urban renewal.

Actually, true private enterprise—ethical private enterprise—has no connection with subsidized urban renewal that we are facing today—no connection at all. Certain individuals *do* latch on to subsidized urban renewal for big profit, and these profiteers are attempting to pass themselves off as ethical American businessmen. In this way, the profiteers are giving ethical “American business” a bad name. The profiteers are giving ethical American citizens a bad time.

## STATE

However, even though the 1954 urban renewal amendment stood on the Federal statute books, the states were required to say whether or not they wished to take part in Federal urban renewal. If a state wished to participate—which is another way of saying that the cities of the state had their hands out reaching for Federal money—the state passed a law in its own legislature giving permission for urban renewal to enter the state.

California passed such a law. It is called the COMMUNITY RE-DEVELOPMENT LAW.<sup>5</sup> Through it, the state gives permission to the cities and counties of the state to enact legislation which allows cities to go directly to the Federal government for the money to start a city urban renewal project. After giving permission by law, the state steps aside, and cities are given Lesson No. 1 on how to run to the Federal government for handouts. Other states have similar urban renewal laws; we will cite California merely to illustrate.

## CITY

In order to go to the Federal government for money, each California city must pass a municipal urban renewal law. Usually, the legislation takes shape in a city ordinance which fulfills all the requirements laid down by Federal and state law.

What happens when a city council in California passes the ordinance which creates a local urban renewal agency?

<sup>3</sup> Title III, Housing Act of 1954.

<sup>4</sup> Title I, Housing Act of 1949.

<sup>5</sup> Community Redevelopment Law, Div. XXIV—California Health and Safety Code. (Check your state's urban renewal law.)

The Mayor then appoints five prominent citizens to act as members of the agency.

In time, the agency becomes more powerful than the city council, under practical workings of the law—and this, many city councilmen may realize too late. Once a free-wheeling urban renewal public agency has been created, the city council finds itself almost powerless to restrict the agency in the full use of its sweeping powers.

In Scene I of subsidized urban renewal, private property is taken from its owners by the public agency. The agency then decides what to do with that property which is no longer on the tax rolls. Property taken by a public agency pays no taxes for the upkeep and running of city government.

The public agency can do three things, or a combination of all three: (1) The agency can keep the land for public use, in which event the property will never again pay taxes for upkeep of the town, (2) The agency can lease the property to redevelopers, (3) or the agency can sell to redevelopers.

The property owner has practically no say in the proceedings at all. If he is equipped with business sense, and wishes to hold his property, to sell at another time or on a better realty market—that makes no difference to the public agency which wants the land.

If the property owner wants a price higher than the agency offers, the owner cannot set his price. The public agency holds the power to set the price both when it buys and when it sells.

Furthermore, the law is so written that the agency can go "over the head" of the private owner and acquire the property by condemnation.

Here are some of the typical activities of a public urban renewal agency:

To declare a neighborhood "blighted," and to mark it as in need of urban renewal, to issue bonds without going to the voters for approval, to incur indebtedness, to decide the type of urban renewal project to be used on the target neighborhood.

There are several varieties of urban renewal: the rehabilitation type, conservation type, and the redevelopment type.

#### REDEVELOPMENT

The redevelopment type of urban renewal perhaps is the swiftest of all methods of taking private property from the property owners.

Many of the steps are made quietly by the agency, without the knowledge of the persons whose property is to be taken. When the plan is all ready, the agency may spring it upon the public through the newspapers, or by posting a sign as I have already described, or by sending a letter through the mail.

Under law, the agency declares a neighborhood "blighted," the city planning department dreams up a plan to redevelop the neighborhood, the plan is sent to Washington where it may be approved.

The city then is eligible for a Federal loan or grant to go ahead with the project. The property owners may learn about it at this late stage.

Public agents then come to property owners to offer them prices for their houses and lots, or business properties. The owner may regard the price as too low, especially if the city has grown and expanded, causing former residential property to become valuable as industrial or commercial sites. The price offered by the agency may be too low because the sum offered could not possibly buy a comparable place to live or do business at today's inflated prices.

Cut-rate prices do not satisfy the owners; sometimes they refuse to sell. Many owners may have invested in the real estate hoping that the city would grow in that direction and cause them to reap a profit for their business foresight, and also as a recompense for paying taxes on the property for practically their entire lifetimes.

Subsidized urban renewal does not allow a property owner to name his own selling price. Under the law, the agency can reserve the license to tell what it will pay when buying the property and later, at what price it will sell, if it does sell.

Generally, urban renewal laws contain a provision that requires the public agency to sell the acquired property at a price lower than what the agency paid for it. The loss in the transaction, of course, is written off at taxpayer expense.

While all this is going on, the taxpaying public is paying rental, salaries, and overhead expenses of the local agency staff. In the meantime, the local agency has pledged to pay one third of the total urban renewal project cost.

The Federal Agency pays two thirds.

That is the notorious Federal urban renewal cost formula:  $\frac{2}{3}$  Federal funds,  $\frac{1}{3}$  local tax funds.

By this time, the local agency may have issued bonds, merely upon the say-so of the five men who head the public local agency.

Tax-allocation bonds are a favorite type of financing in urban renewal. Under the tax-allocation plan, the local agency authorizes the bonds. They are sold. Revenue in the form of taxes from the redeveloped property is pledged to pay off the bonds. In other words, taxes are *allocated* to pay off the bonds. This is the notorious "Sacramento Plan" of urban renewal financing. This is described as a no-cost-to-the-taxpayer plan, and I wager that you can see through it!<sup>6</sup>

Under the tax-allocation bond plan, taxes collected from a newly built redevelopment neighborhood bypass the city treasury and land in a fund which is pledged to retire the bonds. The original bond debt has swollen in the meantime, grown big with accrued interest; therefore the bonds may not get paid off for many, many years.

Meanwhile, taxpayers in other sections of the city are left paying

---

<sup>6</sup> Mechanics of the Sacramento Plan is contained in California Constitution, Art. XIII, Sec. 19.

to run the city government; they are also paying to furnish services to the redeveloped neighborhood—street upkeep, police protection, garbage and trash pickup, and so forth.

The plan just described is sometimes called "The Hatfield Amendment" because the identical language of the legal section in the Community Redevelopment Law, was copied and voted into the California State Constitution (Art. XIII, Sec. 19) and a legislator named Hatfield was instrumental.

California will not come out from under the menace of urban renewal until that state constitutional amendment is repealed, and along with it, the California Community Redevelopment Law which permits a city to create a public agency to take away land and private property from California citizens. (CRL: Div. XXIV—California Health and Safety Code)

The overriding policy of urban renewal law is at fault. The fault applies to Federal statute and to the laws of several states. I'll let you be the judge— Here is a composite of typical sections of community redevelopment law:

"Necessity of redevelopment." All that an agency needs to do is to declare redevelopment necessary and, in the language of the law, to "find and declare" that blight exists in an area. Thus, a weather-worn exterior of one or two houses in a neighborhood—under the sweeping interpretation of the law—can be an excuse for an entire neighborhood to be declared blighted. In fact, presentable homes in just that manner are being swept into urban renewal projects. And that is why urban renewal reveals that it is not slum clearance, as some persons would lead others to believe.

California Community Redevelopment Law states the "impracticability" of private assembly of scattered parcels of land, and declares that the "practical" remedy is by public acquisition, clearance, and planned redevelopment.

This part of the law operates as an outright free service to profiteers who use the public urban renewal agency to do the legwork and to stand the expense which goes into a deal to acquire land for store, factory, housing, or apartment house sites.

One of the greatest arguments to blast urban renewal was the ruling of the Florida State Supreme Court which has decided that urban renewal is unconstitutional in the act of taking private property from one citizen to turn over to another citizen.<sup>7</sup> California and other states would go far in protecting the rights of citizens if a similar State Supreme Court decision were written *and upheld* in each state.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Adams v. Housing Authority of City of Daytona Beach, Supreme Court of Florida en Banc. 60 So. Reporter 2nd Series, 663, August 12, 1952. Rehearing denied October 21, 1952.

<sup>8</sup> Grubstein v. Urban Renewal Agency of City of Tampa (Case

Force-bargaining works against a healthy situation. It sets the stage for corrupt business dealings. In a certain city, a group composed of prominent citizens holds a parcel of property within a redevelopment project. They can sell to the agency with the reassurance that they can buy back their own former property at a price lower than they sold it—after the land had been improved at taxpayer expense.

#### ZONING

City zoning laws do not stand a chance against urban renewal "planning laws" in event of conflict. Ordinances which establish a local urban agency sometimes carry provisions which plainly state that the urban renewal *plan* supersedes all city zoning laws.

When zoning laws are used correctly, they protect the property owner in his use and investment in the land he owns. Urban renewal "planning laws," on the other hand, often override and nullify previously established protective zoning laws, and can actually cancel out pages and pages of local zoning laws.<sup>9</sup>

Easy-going Americans are apt to dismiss potentially dangerous situations, such as subsidized urban renewal, with a shrug and a remark such as, "It's been that way for some time." This remark is sometimes uttered in connection with eminent domain.

Traditionally, the police power of eminent domain in the United States has been used sparingly and reluctantly, parcel by parcel, in cases where action had to be taken against certain property to safeguard the health or safety of the neighborhood in general.

The eminent domain of urban renewal is quite different. Eminent domain as invoked in urban renewal situations is police power unleashed on a wholesale scale. In other words, entire neighborhoods can be declared "blighted" by an urban renewal agency if one or two houses are found with some infringement of a code; or, if the property isn't bringing in as much taxes as a city official would like.

If a public agency runs into opposition from owners of well-kept property who do not wish to sell, the private property nevertheless can be condemned under the police power of urban renewal eminent domain.

Is that justice—or license? Is that law, or abuse of law?

Each city urban renewal ordinance contains phraseology legally necessary to describe conditions which cause a neighborhood to be declared

#29,949) Supreme Court of Florida (1959) in a hair-splitting opinion found a way to circumvent the Daytona decision.

For vigorous dissent to the legal travesty of "The Tampa Case" (vote 4-3) see opinions of Justices Thomas, Drew and O'Connell—text of Case #29,949.

<sup>9</sup> Recent zoning scandals indicate that the concept of zoning needs an overhauling. If zoning law is to be interpreted as merely a permit system slapped on private property by legislative action and to be juggled thereafter according to officialdom's caprice, then property owners might be better off without zoning laws.



"blighted." For example—the allegation that the property is not yielding enough in taxes actually has been written into a recently passed city urban renewal ordinance.<sup>10</sup>

This brings to the surface one of the hidden purposes of urban renewal—to dress up the property so it can be assessed higher and taxed higher. This is why city officials sometimes are misled into giving the stamp of approval to subsidized urban renewal; it looks like a good way to get more money to run the city.

The idea of rebuilding a worn-out section of any city isn't bad at all, if done correctly by private money. Urban renewal redevelopment, however, is being financed by the public's money.

Remember the formula: two thirds Federal funds, one third local financing—that's 100 per cent tax money.

Citizens who pay the Federal income tax help pay the two thirds; citizens whose city governments have created urban renewal agencies pay the two thirds along with their city's one third; citizens of states which have barred urban renewal from entering their boundaries—and there are approximately eight such states—are in the position of paying for urban renewal in other parts of the country without getting any returns. Recheck of urban renewal records, as of July 31, 1959,<sup>11</sup> indicates no urban renewal activity in Florida, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

Yet, citizens of those eight states are better off than citizens whose states have fallen into the urban renewal trap.

Basically, urban renewal is artificial busy work—reminiscent of the New Deal "make work" projects, except that subsidized urban renewal is artificial "busy work" for the benefit of a self-seeking few.

Buildings and rental units constructed under urban renewal are glutting realty markets that might have been all right if urban renewal had not created a surplus in the realty business.

Listen to this newspaper report: "LOTS OF APARTMENTS VACANT—15% of units empty. (*Detroit Free Press*, August 21, 1959). Detroit brokers who specialize in apartment building management report that the owners of older buildings are in trouble. One broker was bitter about competition from the FHA program. There are scores of apartment house owners in Detroit who are in bad trouble, and the

<sup>10</sup> Ordinance #1296, Tentative Plan, Monterey Hills, section of South Pasadena, California (1958). See Note 9, Chapter VI.

<sup>11</sup> As of 1962, it is virtually impossible for citizens to obtain periodic Federal releases that formerly were obtainable upon request. The mailing list for *Urban Renewal Project Directory* (which gives detailed financial information) was discontinued circa 1959-60; the publication is now available only to departments and officials of the Federal government. Another restricted periodical, *Urban Renewal Project Characteristics* (describes proposed use of the land by acreage) has not been issued to citizens since 1958. Needless to say, suppression of information concerning urban renewal activities makes easier execution of the scheme in defiance of public opinion.

FHA continues to insure mortgages for new apartment units which will make these older buildings even harder to rent."

Now, *that* pertains to the rental business in Detroit where private realtors are up against public agencies which are using taxpayer money to create a surplus of rentals.

Here is another headline:

"SHOE IS ON THE OTHER FOOT (*Detroit Times*, July 26, 1959). The public is doing to Frank W. Lindemann what he has been doing to the public for the last 14 years . . . and he doesn't like it. As the chief condemnation attorney for the county road commission, Lindemann has condemned millions of dollars worth of privately owned property . . . Now, the City of Detroit . . . (is) . . . attempting to condemn property Lindemann owns. The proposed condemnation of his property—for redevelopment with new apartment buildings—is unnecessary, he feels . . . he purchased the property more than 20 years ago as a real estate investment. And now, when he foresees the prospect of its increasing value in the next few years . . . the city wants to take it away from him.

"What makes him particularly angry is that the city has had its eye on the general area as a redevelopment project since 1941. (He said) 'Since that time, we couldn't have mortgaged or sold that property if we wanted to . . . Once it is publicized as a redevelopment area, lending institutions won't give you a loan on it nor will the public buy it. NOBODY WANTS TO BUY A LAW SUIT.'"

There are many, many cases to illustrate the various troubles that breed under discriminatory urban renewal law. Hardship cases. Heart-break cases. Loss of life savings, loss of property, loss of means of making a livelihood.

Property owners who are losing homes in redevelopment areas, go out to try to buy another place to live. Often, they find they cannot afford to buy anything as good as the property which urban renewal is taking. You be the judge.

Is urban renewal the wrong fork in the road to take?

A district court of appeals in Washington, D.C., was considering an urban renewal case in which the owner of a department store was objecting to the demolition of his perfectly sound building, condemned just because the Redevelopment Land Agency sat in session and declared that the neighborhood was in "need" of redeveloping.

The language of that particular court decision is compelling and arresting, and it proves that high justices of the land are not satisfied with subsidized urban renewal. (*Berman v. Parker*, U.S. District Court of Appeals, decided November 22, 1954.) The opinion of the court reads: (The situation)

. . . "is an urban area which does not breed disease or crime. Its

fault is that it fails to meet what are called modern standards. . . . Suppose its owners and occupants like it that way? Suppose they are old-fashioned, prefer single-family dwellings, like small flower gardens, believe that a plot of ground is the place to rear children, prefer fresh to conditioned air, sun to fluorescent light? In many circles, all such views are considered 'backward and stagnant.' Are those who hold them therefore 'blighted'? Can they not, nevertheless, own property?

"Or suppose these people own these homes and can afford none more modern? The poor are entitled to own what they can afford. The slow, the old, the small in ambition, the devotee of the outmoded have no less right to property than have the quick, the young, the aggressive, and the modernistic or futuristic. Is the modern apartment house a better breeder of men than is the detached or row house? . . . Are such questions as these to be decided by the Government? And if the decision be adverse to the erstwhile owners and occupants, is their entire right to own the property thereby destroyed?"

An unthinking person may answer in the affirmative by saying that business will be improved, or that the city will be improved. The falseness of such reasoning is easy to see: No real progress is made when one segment of the American population has to suffer in order that another segment can reap commercial gain. Both are entitled to fair gain.

Let us look at it from a purely business angle. Does business in general actually gain from the pump priming of subsidized urban renewal?

By just glancing at the newspapers, it is plain to see who is walking off with the gains.

A certain firm of redevelopers which is national and international in scope, every year sends its lobbyists to Washington, D.C., when Congress is considering whether or not to vote money to continue urban renewal another year or two. The big land redeveloper never fails to ask for continuance of the urban renewal program. It means big profits.

This same firm, and other firms of its type, are always found present wherever government money—tax money from taxpayers—is ready for an urban renewal project. In Denver, in Washington, in New York—in Southern California.

So influential are certain of these half-dozen building empires that in California's capital, the Sacramento Redevelopment Agency granted a *nine month delay* to one of them—the "New York real estate investment firm of Webb & Knapp" which wished extra privilege of time in submitting land purchase offers and architectural plans for three blocks earmarked for multi-million dollar commercial development in the State capital.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> *Sacramento Bee*, May 5, 1959, p. C-1.

It is a matter of public record that Congress discovered that speculators were reaping "windfall" profits by seeking loopholes in the older housing laws (See p. 12—Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal, Report No. 1, Committee on Banking & Currency—1956)—"608 program."

#### URBAN RENEWAL REBUILDING

Now, under present urban renewal law, FHA can issue a commitment to insure a builder's loan for 90 per cent of the estimated replacement costs—meaning the cost of putting up a project in urban renewal's second stage on property sites leased or sold by the public agency.

It is possible for profiteers to run that financing up to 100 per cent by figuring in the remaining 10 per cent as their investment in equity—equity being such intangibles as "knowledge," or "services," or "professional time," and so forth. (*Ibid.*, p. 13.)

Under a true private enterprise redevelopment, a builder would put up 100 per cent of his own capital, or borrowed capital insured by his own private credit rating.

Occasionally, even a local firm will use subsidized urban renewal as a quick way to get valuable property below market price. This is the sort of operation that is "news behind the news,"—the little-known activities of influential and prominent persons who have wriggled themselves into the ringside seat, so to speak. By word of mouth or privileged information, they know beforehand what is going to happen to a neighborhood and are therefore able to place their chips on the number that is certain to win.

These same persons, or corporate officials, can even throw weight to cause research reports to be written up on a neighborhood and cause it to be selected by public officials as a redevelopment project. Such dealings are matters of record and are known to be facts by many persons in addition to myself.

You be the judge.

Is this sort of collusion and collaboration unfair to the property owner whose property is at stake?

But why are so many prominent people to be found involved in urban renewal? Perhaps the following newspaper story will throw some light on the answer.<sup>13</sup>

The article reads:

"American cities will decay unless their central downtown business districts 'thrive and grow and prosper,'" (so said) Mayor H. Roe Bartle of Kansas City, Missouri, addressing the 48th annual meeting of the National Retail Merchants Association. 'Any plan that will bring people to the downtown core will aid the whole city,' he said and 'credited Kansas City's merchant-sponsored downtown development committee with pushing a long range program of urban

<sup>13</sup> *San Diego Union*, Jan. 14, 1959 (Wire Service).

renewal aimed at revitalizing the city's business core.' Earlier, the retailers were told that the Federal government must take the lead in rehabilitating downtown business areas."

In other words, businessmen are being panicked into backing Federal urban renewal to do the job of rebuilding for them.

Actually, many a taxpayer has remarked that it seems foolhardy to send 100 cents to Washington in taxes in order to get 50 or 60 cents back. It looks now as though even those few cents may not come back.

Cities have had to halt urban renewal projects when Federal money has run out. This can leave unsightly spaces lying idle in the center of town—taken off the tax rolls and paying no taxes, of course—land that formerly paid taxes into the city treasury. Way things look, more and more city officials may be caught in that dilemma—no money to rebuild the section of town that they have helped knock down. So you can see—city treasuries are losers along with property owners and other citizens under urban renewal when subsidized by taxpayer money.

Part of the trouble is: American business has had to hand over too much in taxes and that has dried up venture capital and made it difficult for business to expand on its own power. But trying to get some of the money back in the shape of subsidy doesn't cure—it has brought great and present trouble: We—as a nation—are said to be at the bottom of the barrel—*no more money*. Urban renewal's mad building spree has helped American economy outrun the money supply.

Does business really profit under such circumstances?

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States does not think so.

Some local chambers of commerce do not think so.

A financial writer in New York did not think so (*Wall Street Journal*, September 10, 1959). He warned:

"This country has spent money like the proverbial drunken sailor. We have poured out billions to make life more pleasant for farmers . . . to give ourselves a luxury of houses . . . and any sort of 'welfare' that came happily to mind.

"And we have done all this with a blatant disregard of the deficit the billions accrued in our accounts. (We spent our heads off.) Many politicians led us on by dangling before us all the wonderful things we could buy with these billions. Worse, many learned economists reassured us that all those deficits were of no consequence; the supply of money was endless . . . Well, now . . . the bottom is not far away . . . the barrel is running dry not only for the Treasury of the United States but for everybody."

We've got to pay the price—*cut back*. As part of that giddy spending, urban renewal not only needs cutting back, urban renewal needs to be *cut off*.

Intelligent taxpayers knew this long ago. So did levelheaded lawmakers in Congress. Therefore, during the Eighty-fifth Congress of

1957-58, the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate seriously investigated the financial condition of the United States.

The top brains of the nation went before the Senators, hundreds of thousands of words were written and spoken before the committee which was headed by Senator Harry F. Byrd (Committee on Finance, Analysis, Part 7, Aug. 18, 1959).

An analysis of those hearings has been made public, saying in effect, that the result of mad spending—and that takes in Federal spending, state spending, city spending, all spending—including urban renewal—the spending has driven our country to its knees facing possible bankruptcy.

Please hear these words well; they appear on page 2,239 of that Senate report which criticizes the madhouse spending, including urban renewal:

“When we try to give help without costs . . . special privileges for special groups, we are not creating something out of nothing. Rather, we are being political Robin Hoods in reverse, creating inflation which robs the poor for the purpose of rewarding political supporters. . . . Once we intervene for one group, we are soon called upon to equalize this inequity by another intervention. Thus, we are always giving, but seldom counting the cost.”

The Senate report went on to observe:

“The ordinary people have been quietly going about their individual and personal programs, putting their own economic houses in order. These people have been . . . stretching out the life of their cars and other durables. By these policies and by exercising caution, prudence, and self-reliance in their buying of consumer goods, they are using the safest and most powerful kind of inflation control in the world. PERHAPS WE MIGHT CALL THEIR ACTIONS THE ONLY TRUE AND EFFECTIVE METHOD.”

So said the Senate about thrifty, sensible Americans.

Now:—*the very people who can save the United States from inflation are being used as expendable targets by subsidized urban renewal.*

Spendthrift forces which are instrumental in driving our nation deeper into inflation are condemning humble homes and businesses of hard-working Americans, upon the alibi of unfounded charges of “blight.” Spendthrift forces are causing the destruction of modest family dwellings in order to seize the land on which they are built.

The silly luxury of “keeping up with the Joneses” has been exalted to promote the foolish purpose. Sensible saving for future investment has been made to appear stupid and outmoded. Thrift has been made to appear a crime to be punished.

In Washington, a Senator believes that the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency should be abolished, and has publicly said so. (Homer Capehart, *Indianapolis Star*, August 4, 1959.)

More and more John Q. Citizens are piling opposition against urban renewal; civic-minded organizations are coming out in the open against the fallacy of urban renewal—nationwide organizations, such as the D.A.R. Also a businessman's group in San Diego which petitioned the city council to reject a proposed new building code that was instituted under the urban renewal program.<sup>14</sup> Also a downtown merchants group<sup>15</sup> in Bessemer, Alabama, which contended that it would be unfair to use their tax money to subsidize businesses that would be in competition with them. They said they feared a relocation of the business district of Bessemer.

The American Legion also raises a powerful voice against subsidized urban renewal.<sup>16</sup>

And listen to Congressman Harold R. Collier of Illinois talking to other Congressmen (*Congressional Record* of May 21, 1959). He said:

"It just seems to me we have embarked on a binge to create surpluses of every nature and description, from the farm to the cities and most everywhere in between, and with each ambitious program we create greater fiscal deficits in the Federal Treasury. Now, if one of these days we dedicate our legislative activities to creating a little surplus in the Federal Treasury and applied it against the astronomical national debt, I am sure that many good folks in this country would enjoy a feeling of gratitude and security and, particularly, the folks on pensions and fixed incomes whom we stroke gently on one side of the face while firmly bashing them on the other."

What about those folks who are driven off their property by an urban renewal program?

I wish that legislators would leave their desks momentarily. I wish they would come and sit in modest American living rooms grown strangely quiet because the home has been condemned and marked for destruction under urban renewal. Condemned because some lawmaker who never saw the house, passed a law saying that it had to be wiped off the face of the earth.

I wish well-meaning do-gooders would leave their committees for a little while, to stand on a pile of splintered wood that had been a

---

<sup>14</sup> Hillcrest Business Association, San Diego, California. For text of the association's resolution opposing urban renewal housing code, see *Star-News*, a legal newspaper, 3922 Fourth Avenue, San Diego 3, California, January 15, 1959.

<sup>15</sup> The Bessemer Improvement Assn., Inc., reported in *Birmingham News* by Jack Deaver, *News* special writer.

<sup>16</sup> Resolution 59-100: Opposing the Seizing of Private Property by Public Agencies Under the Color of Eminent Domain for Resale to Private Persons, June 25, 1959, The American Legion, Department of California, 117 Veterans Memorial Building, San Francisco 2, California.

home in the morning—by nightfall, a heap of firewood due to public agency meddling.

I wish those with hands full of power would look twice at their handiwork.

Even though the situation is dark, citizens are safe from the demolition of urban renewal as long as their city council keeps urban renewal shut out.

The city council of any town can be the mightiest force against destructive urban renewal today. Because a city council can say "no" to urban renewal.

To sum it up—members of city councils throughout America at the present time can be heroes. . . .

There are thousands of hamlets, villages, towns, big and little cities in America. Many of them are guarded tonight by elected men of honesty and great courage.

We sing the praises of America, and from childhood we recite American proverbs and mottoes. Persons whose ears have grown dull from the destructive thunder of urban renewal should listen once again to a motto and a song. . . .

"Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home." I hope you can keep yours—always.

(Published in *Vital Speeches*. Vol. XXVI, No. 2, New York, N.Y., November 1, 1959.)



## “Sacramento Plan” Pitfalls

COMMUNISM IS HAMMERING a coffin for the private ownership of property in the United States, and planners, politicians, and profiteers are passing the nails.

A ghoulish session occurred during the Eighty-fifth Congress, when a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee considered slum clearance and related housing problems in the light of urban renewal and redevelopment subsidies.<sup>1</sup>

Current redevelopment programs, through the police power of eminent domain, are seizing private property and making the sites available to builders at considerably less than acquisition costs.<sup>2</sup> This writing down of land prices naturally creates a deficit. The loss is pushed off onto American taxpayers who provide government subsidy which makes up the difference. In cases where the taxpayer happens also to be a dispossessed property owner, his forced contribution becomes even more appalling.

At the Washington housing hearings, numerous politicians and planners begged for a billion-dollar expansion of the Federal socialized urban renewal program. So-called business interests added unbusiness-like words, bringing to pass the ironic prophecy of the socialists who say, “Capitalists will dig their own graves.”

The spectacle, of course, fulfills the timetable written specifically for the United States by Communist William Z. Foster and contained in his book, *Toward a Soviet America*.<sup>3</sup>

Shocking though it was, worse may be expected in the present Congress, for the same collectivist forces that jammed the 1958 Congressional hearings picked up portfolios and went on the road to become vocal at various lay and professional meetings and national conferences held throughout the United States. The full force of the practised propaganda is coming to bear upon the Congress each year.

Redevelopment objectives are set forth in two of the national “needs”

<sup>1</sup> *Slum Clearance and Related Housing Problems*—Hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, January 7, 8, & 9, 1958.

<sup>2</sup> Actual practice as set forth in agreements of Community Redevelopment Agency, Los Angeles. Also, *Model State and Regional Planning Law*, Introduction, p. 2, by National Municipal League, 1955, New York (See Bibliography).

<sup>3</sup> For additional quotes from *Toward a Soviet America*, by William Z. Foster, a Communist, see *Congressional Record*, Monday, January 15, 1962, Speech of Hon. James B. Utt in the House of Representatives, “None Is So Blind As He Who Will Not See.”

as pledged by the current Democratic Congress, namely a "bold" housing program, and a "courageous" urban renewal program.<sup>4</sup>

Pressure is renewed to broaden the Federal "residentially related" program. Profiteers who want subsidy to remodel their commercial and industrial areas have been, and still are trying to rewrite the Federal law which stipulates that properties to be redeveloped must be predominantly residential either before or after redevelopment, in order to qualify for Federal subsidy—two thirds of the site acquisition cost.

Urban renewal laws have put bureaucracy into real estate, where politicians are playing Santa Claus to unscrupulous profiteers; taxpayers are standing the cost of property markdowns and of extravagant squanderings.

Standing ready on the sidelines is another shameful scheme of financing that is becoming nationally known as the "Sacramento Plan," geared to operate at State and local levels. "Planners" and politicians are attempting to hoodwink citizens into approving this shakedown which provides the local one-third divvy through tax-allocation bonds, a gimmick that political hucksters promise "won't cost taxpayers a dime."

*Actually, taxpayers pay twice under the "Sacramento Plan."*

The tax-allocation bond financing idea originated in California and appears to be spreading rapidly to other states. The scheme was allegedly introduced at the Washington Banking and Currency hearings by the president of a New York firm, Webb & Knapp, Inc., largest land development organization in the world, and one which has inked substantial contracts in redevelopment projects in Washington, D.C.,<sup>5</sup> and Los Angeles, and claims the doubtful credit of having "redeveloped" the United Nations site.

President of the firm, Mr. William Zeckendorf, said:

"I think the city of Sacramento blazed a brand new trail in city finance. I am told that they got a bill through the Legislature of the State of California which permitted them to issue bonds to the extent of their contribution to the writedown of urban renewal projects . . . the bonds to look to the increased tax revenues from the same space, the same land, to be amortized according to a schedule as forecast."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> "12-Point Program of New Democratic Congress," page A-2, *Los Angeles Herald & Express*, Nov. 7, 1958.

<sup>5</sup> Editorial in *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., February 16, 1959, questioned favoritism shown to Webb & Knapp, land redevelopers, and cautioned: "It should be remembered that under the rules set up by RLA (District Redevelopment Land Agency) in this case, development rights never were intended to be up for grabs to the highest bidder. . . . It is understandable that RLA officials feel a 'moral obligation' to Webb & Knapp, but it is important that this obligation be documented with facts in any such dollars-and-cents challenge of the expenditure of public funds."

<sup>6</sup> *Hearings, op. cit.* Note No. 1, p. 333.

His description has resulted in the financing gimmick becoming known as the "Sacramento Plan." It exists in the identical language of Article XIII, Section 19 of the California Constitution, and Sections 33950-54 of California's Community Redevelopment Law. A bond sale under this provision was consummated in Sacramento in 1956.<sup>7</sup> It is invokable by any bonding district in California.

In brief, bond holders of community redevelopment tax-allocation bonds will be paid off by the pledging of all *anticipated* increase in tax revenue *expected* by redevelopment. Taxpayers already hooked through the subsidized Federal two thirds will not only be meeting the local one-third cost via tax-allocation bonds, but, on top of all that, are left bearing the cost of running the whole city government and furnishing the "new" neighborhood with municipal services, such as street upkeep, lighting, garbage and trash disposal, and water mains.

The "new" neighborhood's tax contribution, under the "Sacramento Plan," bypasses the municipal treasury and goes to the redevelopment agency. In other words, the taxes are *allocated* to the agency treasury, the city getting nothing.

The "Sacramento Plan" has cast suspicion upon urban renewal in California and, now that the scheme has been given national recognition backed by powerful interests, citizens everywhere should remain on guard to defeat the radical scheme as it raises its ugly head in other states, counties, and cities.

The tentative draft revision of the California Community Redevelopment Law, which contains the "Sacramento Plan," was prepared by the League of California Cities<sup>8</sup> which is affiliated with the Committee for International Municipal Cooperation.

The long, surreptitious history of 1313 was noted sharply in 1954 by the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (Reece Committee, House Report 2681, p. 221; Hearings, Part I, pp. 894-96) which recommended for investigation The Public Administration Clearing House.

Other features of the League-authored California Redevelopment Law are onerous, such as the fact that taxpayers are denied the right of protecting themselves from unwanted debt. Citizen hands are tied by a provision by which the redevelopment "authority," or agency, is empowered to authorize the bonds in any amount desired, yet apparently is not held liable for the debt created.

In Los Angeles, where a redevelopment project called "Bunker Hill" has been fought fiercely by citizens, the "Sacramento" tax-allocation

<sup>7</sup> Mimeographed release dated July 11, 1958, from Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency, explaining application of tax-allocation bonds to Bunker Hill Project, "Bunker Hill Urban Renewal Project—Financial Information."

<sup>8</sup> See MetroChart for League of California Cities' hookup with Committee for International Municipal Cooperation.

gimmick is referred to as the "Hatfield Amendment," meaning the referendum which froze the feature into the state constitution.

In the state of Oregon, voters balloted on the "Sacramento Plan" as ballot measure No. 5 in the November, 1958, election and flatly turned it down.<sup>9</sup>

There is every reason to expect that the "Sacramento Plan" will continue to receive ballyhoo wherever "Planners" and professional politicians gather.

Speakers at the Washington Banking and Currency Subcommittee hearings included officials from municipal leagues, many savings and loan associations, public housing pressure groups, AFL-CIO, mayors, Congressmen, public redevelopment agencies, a nationwide interlock of building contractors and land developers, National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) which maintains an office in Washington, also ACTION (American Council to Improve Our Neighborhoods) which receives aid from the Ford Foundation.<sup>10</sup>

A three-point program to expand the activities of ACTION was announced by one of its top officials, including a "leadership study course" financed by a \$25,000 grant from Ford Foundation.

Illustrating further the far-reaching effect of Ford Foundation influence in this housing and redevelopment field, is the practice of ACTION in circulating a *Fight Blight, Inc.* booklet whose publishing costs have been underwritten by the Fund for Adult Education, still another Ford Foundation adjunct.<sup>11</sup>

Also aided by Ford Foundation,<sup>12</sup> 1313 sent to the Washington Banking and Currency Subcommittee hearings representation from its AMA (American Municipal Association), and NAHRO (National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials), which boasts of considerable influence upon Washington legislators.

Another "1313" adjunct, the U.S. Conference of Mayors,<sup>13</sup> spearheaded the drive that brought to the subcommittee a flood of pro-subsidy mail bearing the signatures of mayors from throughout the United States. An idea of the interlocking web of collectivist apologists can be guessed by observing that many of the mayors who wrote, and those who appeared personally, are members and officials of 1313's AMA.

<sup>9</sup> Per Mr. Freeman Holmer, December 23, 1958, Director, Elections Division, Department of State, State of Oregon, State Capitol, Salem.

<sup>10</sup> "Ford Foundation Gives 'ACTION' Aid," from *Detroit Times*, Sunday, October 26, 1958.

<sup>11</sup> ACTION brochure, Fall-Winter, 1956-57, Box 462, Radio City Station, New York 20, N.Y.

<sup>12</sup> Ford Foundation contributes to National Municipal League, 1313 parent body, to support a three-year project to "improve" state constitutions. NML brochure.

<sup>13</sup> See MetroChart. U.S. Conference of Mayors membership link through CIMC (Committee for International Municipal Cooperation).

Still another pro-subsidy mayor sits upon the special ACTION committee that implements the Ford Foundation grant.<sup>14</sup>

The same pro-collectivist forces drew together again at Berkeley in July, 1958, to compare notes upon their progress. Luther Gulick, whose word it appears is weight among many pseudo-liberals, was a key speaker.

Scope of Soviet Activity in the United States (a Congressional Publication) Part 14, page 780, identified Luther Gulick as the War Production Board official who introduced a Soviet NKVD agent to Laughlin Currie who later was identified as having collaborated with agents of the Soviet Intelligence apparatus.<sup>15</sup> Professor Gulick's name threaded through the investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations.<sup>16</sup>

In September, the same forces, and in some cases, the same personages, checked in at the Colorado Springs Conference of the National Municipal League, parent body of 1313, and promoter of collectivist "metro" government.<sup>17</sup> In fact, one of the NML speeches was dusted off and repeated before another national conference less than two months later.

Next on the junket of collectivist gatherings was the conclave at San Francisco in October, 1958, when NAHRO (1313) marked its twenty-fifth anniversary conference. Elements came from Federal, state, and local governments; HHFA (Housing and Home Finance Agency), an "authority" type body attached to the Federal executive branch.

Also represented was Ford Foundation's notorious Fund for the Republic with its interests in Race and Housing; and AMA, the 1313 adjunct with strings tied to an international branch at The Hague, Holland; also representatives of Webb & Knapp, the largest land re-developing firm in the world.

It was at the First International Seminar on Urban Renewal held recently at The Hague, that the idea of destroying cities was proposed. "Disposable cities" would be done away with following brief usage, after which the knock-down would be followed by build-up, similar to present urban renewal tax-supported operations in the United States. The idea shocked delegates from many countries, as it was proposed by a professor from Columbia University in New York.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Mayor of New Orleans, deLesseps S. Morrison, *Detroit Times*, *op. cit.*

<sup>15</sup> *Institute of Pacific Relations Report, Committee on the Judiciary*, 82d Congress, 1952, Senate Report No. 2050, p. 148.

<sup>16</sup> Luther Gulick, IPR Hearings, 82d Congress, pp. 432, 857, 4973, 5002, 5050.

<sup>17</sup> Brochure, 64th National Conference on Government, National Municipal League, September 14-17, 1958.

<sup>18</sup> Professor J. Marshall Miller, Columbia University. *Christian Science Monitor*, "This World . . . Town Planning Compared," October 24, 1958; *Indianapolis Times*, October 20, 1958, UP International, The Hague.

Still another national get-together was achieved by the collectivists, again in Washington, D.C. This meeting in November, 1958, was taken over by the pseudo-liberals, in spite of its sponsors, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

NAHRO (1313) and NAHB officials were praised from the platform of this conference, National Conference of Metropolitan Growth,<sup>19</sup> and a checklist was circulated from International City Managers Association (1313) that posed questions concerning urban renewal and "metro" promotion.

Luther Gulick reportedly startled the assembled business leaders by his critical remarks about the republican form of American government, when he said:

"If the Devil had looked for a technique to prevent the people who live in a metropolitan area from agreeing among themselves as to how they will solve their metropolitan problems, it is hard to see how a more effective and disruptive instrument of governmental chaos could have been invented than the fractionalization of local governments and local leadership we have now evolved for ourselves in these United States."<sup>20</sup>

The ideology is rampant, of course, in pro-world government circles, and Gulick allegedly repeated it twice for effect.

Gulick really shocked the businessmen, also reporters from the press, by stating that the "metro" undertaking, which includes urban renewal and redevelopment, would cost trillions of dollars within the near future. Urban renewal's "Sacramento Plan" fits into the Gulick-drawn picture.

Seemingly aware that the meeting had been sabotaged by radicals, an official of the United States Chamber of Commerce which upholds competitive private enterprise, jumped to his feet to comment. He said: "Chicago had a fire—and a new Chicago grew from the ashes. San Francisco was leveled to the ground—and a new San Francisco emerged from the rubble. No one had ever heard of national treasury funds for urban renewal in that day and age. The present challenge calls for abiding confidence in the spirit of American voluntary action."<sup>21</sup>

The high-handedness of radical promoters and public officials exploiting unconstitutional features of contemporary urban renewal projects, including the "Sacramento Plan," disqualifies the movement as an action in voluntarism. All storm warnings point to the fact that urban re-

<sup>19</sup> Proceedings of National Conference of Metropolitan Growth (the speeches), sponsored by U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, November 24-25, 1958.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.* Speech of Luther Gulick, Institute of Public Administration, New York.

<sup>21</sup> From the address by Arch N. Booth, Executive Vice-President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., *loc. cit.*

newal and its reprehensible and unconstitutional features, if promoted, will help to sink the United States into economic and social bankruptcy.

Signs of citizen revolt against the urban renewal and redevelopment movements are evident, expressed in citizen disgust against urban renewal's mass evacuations of American citizens from their homes, as occurred in Detroit's Corktown,<sup>22</sup> Los Angeles' Sawtelle,<sup>23</sup> and which is currently being attempted at Bunker Hill in California.<sup>24</sup>

Intelligent opposition to redevelopment, subsidy-style, is active in North Tonawanda, N.Y.,<sup>25</sup> and in Benicia,<sup>26</sup> San Diego, and South Pasadena, California. In Arizona, a mimeographed letter written in Spanish is warning Spanish-speaking homeowners of the urban renewal encroachment.<sup>27</sup> In Plymouth, Michigan, a citizen has challenged the city council's request for urban renewal funds; he objected to the Federal government's becoming the mortgager in the construction phase, and reminded that the first plank in Karl Marx's Manifesto is elimination of private property.<sup>28</sup>

Federal government now owns 22 per cent of the land in the United States, more than 50 per cent in California, and substantial percentages in other states.

Further reaction against urban renewal and redevelopment continues. In November, 1958, voters of Arlington County in Virginia *did not* approve a proposed County Redevelopment and Housing Authority.<sup>29</sup>

In New Orleans, Federal urban renewal was tossed out a few years ago; in its place operates a locally sponsored improvement program.<sup>30</sup>

An equally stern rebuke issued from a high tribunal recently: The Supreme Court of Florida declared the Florida Slum Clearance and Redevelopment Law unconstitutional in the case of *Adams v. Housing Authority of City of Daytona Beach*. (Reported in 60 Southern 2nd 663).

<sup>22</sup> Corktown, *Detroit Times*, October 10, 1958, p. 5; second front page, *ibid.*, "Way Prepared for Corktown Industry."

<sup>23</sup> "Bulldozer At Your Door," by Jo Hindman, *American Mercury* (New York), September, 1958.

<sup>24</sup> See Chapter VI, following.

<sup>25</sup> Publication release from Arnold C. James, alderman—Fifth Ward, 363 Division Street, North Tonawanda, N.Y.

<sup>26</sup> Benicia, California, various issues from 1958-60 of the *Benicia Herald*. Mr. Michael F. Walsh, chairman of citizen's committee, 865 West K Street, Benicia.

<sup>27</sup> Letter, December 19, 1958, provided by Mrs. M. Conan, Phoenix, Arizona.

<sup>28</sup> "City Seeks \$638,000 for Urban Renewal," Thursday, November 20, 1958, front page of the *Plymouth Mail*, Plymouth, Michigan.

<sup>29</sup> Letter, dated December 21, 1958, by Jeane D. Simmonds, Clerk to County Board, Arlington County, Virginia.

<sup>30</sup> *Christian Science Monitor*, July 29, 1958, p. 3.

These and other evidences of citizen awakening may serve to slow down the attack upon ownership of private property in the United States. Review of Communist William Z. Foster's book, *Toward a Soviet America*, reveals that the United States is appallingly far down the path on which the trickery of urban renewal, including Soviet-style community redevelopment, is one of the stepping stones.



## The Battle of Bunker Hill—1959

THE BATTLE OF BUNKER HILL, in 1959, is more than a hassle over 130 acres of land on the top of a Los Angeles hill of that name.

Opportunists battle for government subsidy on the one hand. Subversive interests seek for land-usage control on the other. The combined forces of the two, abetted by the City Redevelopment Agency, besiege property owners on the hill.

Basic issue of the strife now, as at Bunker Hill, 1775, is freedom; specifically, the American freedom of owning private property free from unconstitutional seizure and control.

Bunker Hill project-plan of the City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) is but one of countless hundreds of federally okayed Urban Renewal Administration (URA) projects which are underway throughout the United States and extend from Alaska to Hawaii and Puerto Rico.<sup>1</sup>

The project plans to wipe out 5,087 dwelling units, displace 1,342 families, and red-tape 129.8 acres of fabulously valuable land with redevelopment restrictions, and to force taxpayers of the nation to pay for two thirds of the impudent scheme, estimated at \$22½ million in the Bunker Hill Project.<sup>2</sup>

Plans for the downtown acropolis call for multiple-housing of the luxury apartment type, a music center, trade mart, institutional office buildings, hotels, parking lots, retail shops, motels, parks, bridges, and even escalators leading to street levels below. This, the second phase, is expected to run between \$200 and \$300 million.

The north half of Bunker Hill was condemned and edifices demolished by the County of Los Angeles. Public buildings are being raised on portions of the land; the balance may be transferred to the Los Angeles CRA to be added to the South Bunker Hill section as replanned by the CRA.

Redevelopment operations in any locality are handled by a local group called an "authority," or an agency, created to comply with Federal law. Such agency "authorities" are free-wheeling autonomies since, in effect, they are not subservient to state, city, or Federal power.

<sup>1</sup> *Urban Renewal Project Directory*, June 30, 1957, 26 pp.; *Urban Renewal Project Directory*, June 30, 1958, 31 pp., published by Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA) and URA, Washington 25, D.C.

<sup>2</sup> Redevelopment Plan *Bunker Hill* Urban Renewal Project, by The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, California, 37 pp. 1958 (CRA address: 617 South Olive Street, Los Angeles). "Method of Financing," pp. 8-12.

Legislation to create the "authority" differs from state to state. In Virginia, the electorate holds the power. In California, a governing body—city council or county board—is invested with the power to create the agency under California's Community Redevelopment Law.<sup>3</sup>

Los Angeles CRA closed in upon Bunker Hill private property in 1950 by filing with the Federal URA preliminary plans based upon forcible acquisition of private property by public CRA.

A redevelopment project passes through phases including acquisition of private land by the public agency; clearing and readying the site; sale or lease to builders; retention of land for public use; supervision to see that redevelopment restrictions are complied with, such as land-use controls applied by *covenants running with the land and extending in perpetuity*.

Financing of the local one third that matches the Federal two-thirds subsidy, can be accomplished by fleecing the taxpayers through "tax-allocation" bonds, as explained in "Sacramento Plan' Pitfalls" (See Chapter V preceding).

Law is not always mandatory upon a public redevelopment agency to sell the land that it has "acquired." In California, the agency may choose any, or a combination of three courses: it may lease the land, may retain it for public use, or may sell it. All three courses push additional assessment and financial burden on taxpayers.

Bunker Hill property owners were denied the right of bargaining in a free competitive market. CRA has priced both the buying and selling markets. In the Los Angeles situation, an association of civic leaders who hold a parcel of land included in the Bunker Hill Plan stand an excellent chance of selling it to the CRA at one price, then buying it back from the same agency for a lower price.

Urban renewal redevelopment schemes cannot escape the law of economics. The movement will produce two economic outcomes: the short-trend and the long-trend.

The short-trend attracts the greedy who covet quick profit regardless of who gets cheated through the knock-down, build-up "busy work," reminiscent of the make-work jobs of the National Recovery era. The short-trend outlook provides the disgraceful spectacle of one segment of the American public being forcibly divested of property which is turned over to another segment by the political novelty called the Agency "authority," which might easily become a dishonest referee siding with a privileged few.

---

<sup>3</sup> Community Redevelopment Law of California, amended in 1951 (California Health and Safety Code Div. XXIV, Pt. I). The amendment language, placed into the State Constitution, became known as the "Hatfield Amendment" that repeats the language found in a certain section of the Community Redevelopment Law. Found its way into the Constitution of California in 1952 (Article XIII, Sec. 19). Enacting clause carried by the Constitutional amendment approved in 1952, activated Article 4, 33950, etc. of the CRL (Sacramento Plan).

The long trend of urban renewal redevelopment can result in land-use controls that saddle the land for centuries to come with restrictions imposed by transient bureaucrats holding power.

Directives published by Public Administration Service, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, of the 1313 network, outlines the procedure. Here is one that relates to long-term leases:

"Leases would be to privately financed redevelopment corporations, or to private housing groups whose projects fit into the general plan of rehabilitating certain areas of the city. Such leases serve a double purpose. Lands suitable for private uses would be returned to private hands, but the city would retain the necessary land-use control over such sites. This would be more effective in the long run than zoning ordinances or even restrictions which run with the land. When replanning would again be necessary, 40 or 50 years hence, the city would not have to go through a costly and tedious process of again acquiring title."<sup>4</sup>

Important to note is the time span of forty or fifty years *when replanning would again be necessary*, especially when coupled with the idea of "disposable cities" as introduced at the international urban renewal meet at The Hague in 1958.

The 1313 source goes on to state, this time in relation to land that is sold:

"The municipality might exercise control over future uses by establishing restrictions which run with the land. This important angle has been stressed by National Resources Planning Board.<sup>5</sup> . . . Land, in other words, can be passed through a period of public ownership during which the public agency can replat the land, clear the title, and adjust the land-use pattern. But the city can go one step further. It can limit the future use of the land sold back into private ownership. Deed restrictions and other covenants will accomplish much more than zoning, building laws, or any other exercise of the police power. Only *temporary* (italics in original 1313 text) public ownership is necessary to effect long-term land-use plans."

The commissar-like mutter runs through the laws of several states

<sup>4</sup> *Tax-Reverted Properties in Urban Areas*, by Hillhouse and Chatters, published by Public Administration Service (PAS) 1942, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, p. 110.

<sup>5</sup> *Tax-Exempt Foundations Report* (Reece Committee) House Report No. 2681 of the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 1954, pp. 130-31. Economic policy and "New Bill of Rights" of National Resources Planning Board discussed critically.

already,<sup>6</sup> including Illinois, Michigan, and Minnesota, but California has produced the most virulent scheme to date. In Los Angeles, urban renewal redevelopment contracts now being signed bind the purchasers and lessees with restrictions which, if violated, cause the property to revert to the totalitarian entity of the agency.<sup>7</sup>

Significant is the fact that Luther Gulick, present-day Metro government promoter, has been associated with the National Resources Planning Board that has stressed land-usage control.<sup>8</sup> Urban renewal is part and parcel of Metro policy.

An agency must declare "blight" present in a neighborhood in order to mark it for redevelopment. This is done by ordinance, and tightening is in evidence in the legal mill which grinds out urban renewal law. Early in 1959, a redevelopment ordinance was written which provided an agency with powers that override city zoning ordinances. And: Sections automatically stop issuance of building permits and repair orders to homes lying within proposed redevelopment areas.

A recent ordinance has listed as evidence of "blight," conditions such as non-contoured lots, inadequate recreation facilities, lots of inadequate size and shape, a stagnant and unproductive condition of potentially useful land, and a *reduced capacity to pay taxes*.<sup>9</sup> Also purchasers and owner participants are obligated by means of "covenants running with the land for a period of 25 years, except for the covenant respecting restrictions upon the basis of race, religion, color and national origin which covenant shall run in perpetuity."<sup>10</sup>

Underlying URA redevelopment is the Federal principle that condemns private property on claims of public "need." Actually, the result is a disgraceful land grab by selfish interests causing property owners to lose their land while profiteers walk off with the spoils and bureaucrats slap on land-usage controls that run in perpetuity.

A canvas banner erected over Bunker Hill during the night notified the householders that their property had been designated as a rede-

<sup>6</sup> (Illinois) Revised Statutes 1957, Chap. 67½, Sec. 81(1); Sec. 82. (Michigan) Statutes, URA Corporation Law 125.921 (4). (Minnesota) Statutes, Neighborhood Redevelopment Corporation Law, 462.41-462.81, 1945, C. 493. U.S. Federal Code, Title 42, Chap. 8A, Sec. 1455 (b) (i) (iii). (California) Health and Safety Code, Division XXIV, Part I, Chap. 4, Sec. 33741.

<sup>7</sup> Ann Redevelopment Project 1A, by Ordinance 103,941 of September 3, 1954, City of Los Angeles. "Agreement for Sale of Real Property by and between the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles and \_\_\_\_\_." Restriction No. 5.

<sup>8</sup> Luther Gulick, *IPR Hearings*, loc. cit., p. 432 (See Notes, Chapter V).

<sup>9</sup> Ordinance No. 1296, Tentative Plan, Monterey Hills section of South Pasadena, California, (1958), Section II A(1-7), according to newspaper posting of August 14, 1958. Ordinance passed in January, 1959. (See *South Pasadena Review*, August 14, 1958, Legal Notices Section.)

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, Section X(B).

velopment neighborhood. Los Angeles CRA has mapped 110 additional projects to follow Bunker Hill.

Consider the staggering burden of taxes necessary to support this grandiose scheme, and multiply the California situation by the hundreds of plans waiting throughout the United States. Projected result is utter bankruptcy for the economy of the United States and ultimate extinction of every individual American right to own property.

As early as 1937, Federal policy unleashed political and economic erosion in the housing field by a declaration that competitive private enterprise was derelict in meeting the public housing "needs." Interim developments included the 1949 National Housing Act and its amendments, including the mis-named "private enterprise" clause. This does not attract true private enterprise, merely profiteers who operate on near-100-percent government-insured loans or subsidy.<sup>11</sup>

Taxpayers of the United States, therefore, are losing private property while they underwrite the subsidies of the nationwide URA community redevelopment scheme that is ousting them and their fellow Americans from houses and lots.

When URA community redevelopment programs are reviewed and the forces identified, the apparent paradox of private enterprise teamed with public enterprise vanishes. It is seen that taxpayers are putting up the money that insures the business risks of speculators who are dishonestly posing as private initiative.

Reappraisal of URA community redevelopment under Title III, the 1954 amendment of the 1949 National Housing Law, throws a searchlight upon a tendency to stress *in theory* the part played in economic life by individualism, while at the same time having recourse *in practice* to governmental aid and collective action.

Contemporary URA activities appear to be the counterpart to a complete program started in the United States during the Russian experimental five-year plans in the U.S.S.R.

In 1933, the National Planning Board was formed in the United States to encourage planning by advisory economic council. Dominant leftist influence in this and the later National Resources Planning Board which stressed the land-usage control feature, since has solidified the socialistic promulgations into schemes like Bunker Hill and other URA community redevelopments.

Social engineers who steer the bureaucrats, such as those in 1913, the radical Chicago political core, believe it is their duty to regiment Americans by force. The farce of prominent citizens in the agencies, promoting and participating in the dictatorial scheme is almost unbelievable, but their short-sightedness—or arrogance—ties in with a dominant theory of Marxism in which certain persons entertain the

---

<sup>11</sup> *Report No. 1* of Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, 84th Congress, "Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal," 1956, pp. 12-14.

notion that only a few persons possess the expertness to engineer the citizens of the whole country into a so-called "better way of living" whether they like it or want it or not.<sup>12</sup>

A few URA projects have been terminated, abandoned, or not allowed to get started, due to: (1) Invalidation of the proposed project as a result of an adverse ruling by the State Supreme Court on the constitutionality of the State statute under which the project was initiated.<sup>13</sup> Example: Ruling of the Florida Supreme Court in the case of ADAMS v. HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH, reported in 60 Southern 2nd 663, (2) Local decision to abandon the proposed project,<sup>14</sup> (3) Local decision to refuse sanction of a proposed Agency,<sup>15</sup> (4) Cutback in Federal funds.<sup>16</sup>

In Los Angeles, the idea to seize Bunker Hill was a covetous agency idea back in 1948, and a signed ordinance and contract in April 1958. Today, the Bunker Hill bullet has struck at the heart of private ownership everywhere in the United States. In between those dates, strange laws were written, expanded, enacted, and are working now.

To the incredulous citizen, the tampering explains why totalitarian dictatorship *can* and is now happening throughout the United States.

<sup>12</sup> *Relocation Report*, 4 pp., November, 1958, of the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Calexico, California.

<sup>13</sup> *Urban Renewal Housing Project Directory*, June 30, 1957, *loc. cit.* See inside front cover under Administrative Management Branch, program analysis section, "Explanatory Notes."

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> Voters of County of Arlington, Virginia, *loc. cit.*

<sup>16</sup> Mr. Herman Weinkrantz, Legal Aide to Mayor Wagner of New York, in a letter dated September 18, 1958, stated that the "Delancey Street Project" was not "terminated" as reported by Urban Renewal Administration. From New York's viewpoint, the Delancey project was merely "delayed" due to "the cutback in Federal funds."

## Urban Renewal Search and Seizure

A SHADOW HAS FALLEN across the hearths of America, the shadow of urban renewal bulldozers. Under the guise of city rebuilding, tax-supported urban renewal is warring upon property owners.

Americans whose decent thrift and investment have built the cities of the United States are horrified when urban renewal strikes their homes, their businesses, and their property.

Normal life is upset by the news that the neighborhood is to be "modernized," to be brought into a new shape decided upon by "experts," and to be designated as an urban renewal project. Public officials begin to lay down decisions concerning the disposal of privately owned property.

When urban renewal enters a neighborhood, public inspectors and appraisers knock on doors; official writs are delivered to property owners ordering them to do this or that. House-leveling bulldozers, in time, usually arrive on the scene.

The telephone rang several weeks ago. A noise rumbled over the wires as I lifted the receiver. "Can you hear that?" the caller questioned. A crash sounded. "That is the house next door going down—urban renewal!" The voice of Mrs. Gray—we'll call her that—sounded cynical and on edge.

Mrs. Gray had been living amid months of demolition in a section of Los Angeles. There, several years ago, the area had been designated as a "blighted neighborhood." That paved the way for a face-lifting operation called urban rehabilitation.

Mrs. Gray had watched apprehensively as neighbor after neighbor had given way under pressure applied by housing inspectors, appraisers, and "survey chasing" land dealers. Some property owners sold out at a song, took the cut-rate prices dictated by the urban renewal authority, and moved away to cheaper houses. Some of the men and women died brokenhearted, literally crushed by the humiliating treatment and the loss of their lifetime investment.

Others lived to see homes emptied of cherished possessions, such as the new sink unit which a junk dealer carried out of a condemned house. The owner died of urban renewal shock, unsung, unpitied.

Public urban renewal usually takes Americans by surprise. For more than 175 years, people in the United States have been living in freedom and independence, secure in their homes. Our United States Constitution reserves to American citizens the right to own private property free from seizure.

It is small wonder that present-day Americans are bewildered and

unable to believe that anything as disgraceful as the urban renewal atrocity could possibly be happening in the United States.

A clubwoman, newly introduced to the facts of urban renewal, took a vacation trip. She returned loaded with newspapers she had picked up in Chicago, Kansas City, Bloomington, Indiana, and other places. She exclaimed, "Why, urban renewal is everywhere!"

Sadly enough, urban renewal's ugly force and violence is stalking property owners throughout the United States.

Worse, the process of separating people from their homes and businesses and property is being sharpened into a deadly weapon. When an urban renewal experiment in a selected city is deemed a working success by urban renewal bigwigs, the features of the experiment are compiled and published for the use of urban renewal specialists, and the methodology is circulated throughout the United States.

What do these bold directives say? Following are excerpts from an experiment considered so vitally important to subsidized urban renewal that an agency of your Federal government has seen fit to spend your tax money to circulate the findings.

The publication was released during September, 1960. Entitled *Oakland Mobilizes for Urban Renewal*, the booklet is published in the form of a field and office manual. It gives instructions to inspectors who someday may knock on your door and enter, to rummage through your home or place of business.<sup>1</sup>

In this manual it is explained that urban renewal inspectors have been given a sweet-sounding title; they are notified that they will be called "Urban Renewal Representatives." Reason for this, according to the field manual, is because the word "inspector" might have an adverse reaction on the average citizen.

The manual tells the urban renewal inspector, "From the first knock on the door and thereafter . . . [you] . . . shall be the direct liaison between the people and the City. . . ."

At another point: "Comprehensive renewal . . . is *NEW* to our City. Your assignment is *NEW* to our City. This is all *NEW* to the property owner." (Italics in original.)

A letter to the inspector from the urban renewal supervisor explains: "The attached Manual has been prepared . . . to better assist you in the tremendous task of performing your duties. . . ."

Urban renewal administrative directives have the effect of law. Now, in the following quote, watch the ever-changing curse of law that is being laid out for Americans to live under; observe also the prospect of never-ending, perpetual urban renewal demolition:

"We . . . must anticipate revising our thinking and our pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Oakland Mobilizes for Urban Renewal*, Bulletin 1, Urban Renewal Service, HHFA, Urban Renewal Administration, Washington, D.C., September, 1960. Pp. 36. 35 cents. For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.



cedures from time to time to better the program. We have been assigned these positions to help find the 'bugs,' from the local to the Federal levels; and to establish a great deal of the criteria necessary to make Urban Renewal and Housing Maintenance a permanent function of our City Government. . . . Keep in mind that the following objectives can be used for your explanations to the property owner when he asks you 'why' by 'what authority,' etc. . . ."

The manual goes on to brief the urban renewal inspector on what kind of backyards to allow, on the placement of furniture and equipment inside the rooms of private homes, and how "to provide an appropriate setting for the dwelling."

"Paint every three years," is compliance inspection order No. 16 relating to the outside walls of a house.

That is not all. The urban renewal inspector is impressed with his power over you, the property owners. He is told, ". . . the whole program, so far as the public is concerned, is in your hands."

Following is a composite of instructions in the lengthy manual for inspectors:

"You will be going into all the intimate rooms of people's homes, measuring, prying, observing. . . ."

"It is inevitable that in Urban Renewal work we will run into many controversial arguments from the subject of the 'sanctuary of the home' . . ."

"Always make it a point to show the person how he is included in the letter of the law and in Urban Renewal. . . . During the surveys or thereafter, you will be faced with informing the owner he MUST alter certain items. He then wants to know why. . . . His worry at the moment is: extra costs for enlarging the windows or rebuilding the stairs. . . ."

"With respect to . . . property owners [manual, page 23] who still refuse to correct violations after having been given every reasonable opportunity to do so, the Codes provide certain penalties. In the main, these penalties take the form of a criminal proceedings on a misdemeanor charge for violation of particular provisions of the Code."

At this point, the manual refers the inspector to the penalty provisions of the various Codes: building, electrical, plumbing, heating and ventilating codes, and the zoning ordinance.

Quoting again, "The penalty provisions above cited provide that any one failing to comply with the provisions of the Code shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and if convicted shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500.00, or by imprisonment in the City prison for not more than six months, or both."

In practice, the penalties are stiffer than that. In Phoenix, Arizona, you can be fined as high as three hundred dollars *per day*.<sup>2</sup>

If your city operates under one of the building codes published by the 1313 adjunct, ICBO (International Conference of Building Officials) fines run as high as three hundred dollars per day or more, depending on number of owners, each of whom is charged separately; punishment by imprisonment up to ninety days, or by both fine and imprisonment.<sup>3</sup>

The manual goes on to say, page 21: "It is therefore important to process all inspection as if it were going to be necessary in the future to present the results of such inspections to the District Attorney's Office for prosecution..."

Manual, page 23: "Care should be taken with relation to the securing of evidence where entrance to the property is gained for a reason other than that connected with the inspection of the premises. Recent Supreme Court cases have strictly limited the use of evidence obtained by what is known as an unreasonable search and seizure."

In other words, the urban renewal inspector is warned that search of private homes without a warrant is an unprecedented *new thing* on the American scene . . . it is *New* to the City . . . his assignment is *New* . . . it is all *New* to the property owner.

The American Constitution, for 174 years, *and now*, has forbidden search of private property without a warrant, a recent Warren Court decision to the contrary.

Of utmost significance is the fact that ghastly directives, such as the urban renewal manual, are being given wide distribution throughout the United States. Your tax money has been used to publish instructions that may relieve you of your home, business, and property. Remember, 1313 through its NAHRO (see MetroChart) claims authorship of this type of Metro-implanted legislation.

Your city hall probably has a copy of the Oakland plan manual. You may obtain a copy by writing to Urban Renewal Administration, Washington, D.C. Send thirty-five cents and ask for Bulletin 1, *Oakland Mobilizes for Urban Renewal*. The city of Oakland, California, acted as guinea pig in this experiment.

Before leaving the subject of the manual, for laughs I have picked out a little gem. Especially for women, although men will smile. Ladies, visualize the urban renewal inspector being briefed on how to fill in a questionnaire which he will bring when he inspects your home. The first question relates to race and national origin. The symbols given refer to Spanish-Mexican-Indian, Southern European, Other Caucasians, Negro, and Oriental. The inspector is supposed to decide what race you belong to by just looking at you.

<sup>2</sup> Ordinance No. G-293, April 3, 1959, City of Phoenix, Arizona.

<sup>3</sup> Uniform Building Code (Short form) 1958 edition. Based on Volume I of the Uniform Building Code, 1958 edition, copyright ICBO (International Conference of Building Officials), 610 South Broadway, Los Angeles 14, California, Section 204. Pp. 92.

The manual then tells the inspector. "The symbol A.H.H. in (the) second question refers to age of head of household. Do this also by observation without questioning. In those cases where you are talking to the housewife, estimate her age and *add three years.*"

Amazing Metrocratic interference into American living habits started around 1935 with the New Deal which led off with a policy declaration stating that private enterprise had failed to provide adequate housing.

Then the Housing Act of 1949 brought in public housing. That got a black eye when graft and corruption rocked the program. When put to a vote in some cities, public housing was rejected by the voters.

Public urban renewal next came into the picture, by way of the 1954 amendment to the original legislation.

There are three types of urban renewal, at present: (1) Redevelopment (2) Rehabilitation (3) Conservation.

Distinctions between these types may vary, due to the influence of the various state constitutions and local charters and laws.

Generally, No. 1—urban renewal *redevelopment* follows the  $\frac{2}{3}$ - $\frac{1}{3}$  formula of financing, with Federal funds matching the city's  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the total project cost. In urban renewal redevelopment, property goes from private to public ownership, buildings are torn down, the land is improved (using taxpayer money), and the sites are resold to private redevelopers for less than cost.

No. 2—urban renewal *rehabilitation* envisions a redeveloped neighborhood, also, but the land bypasses public ownership. Pressure is applied upon the property owners. Prying inspectors are one example of pressure. Unreasonably stiff code requirements are another.

Unable to stand the expense of costly property improvements and driven to desperation by bullying methods, the original owners usually are forced to sell. The property then is rebuilt by redevelopers who have been standing by, waiting for the forced transaction to be completed. Many of the firms enriching themselves on subsidized urban renewal are nationwide and worldwide in operating scope. Urban renewal, you see, is not geared to profit the so-called "little man," even if he is a land redeveloper.

No. 3—urban renewal *conservation* is aimed at buildings which may be old, but which still are satisfactory and comfortable to live in or do business in. The term "blight" would hardly stick. Owners of land are forced to go to the expense of repairing, refurbishing and redecorating their real property in order to conform to punitive codes. The artificial consumer-market stimulated by urban renewal conservation causes many cash registers to ring.

The *Model State Constitution* of 1913 includes a "snob" clause whereby 1913 is to decide whether your home or business edifice is "sightly" or "unsightly." If considered "unsightly" to the Metrocrats, your prop-

erty must be altered to conform with the aesthetic tastes of the 1313 overlord in charge.<sup>4</sup>

The inspection manual we are discussing concludes a description of this type of urban renewal with these words: "If the owner fails to comply with the orders and requirements . . . ultimately the city can repair, recondition, or demolish and assess the costs as a lien against the property."

By all means, do examine your city's housing code.

To identify Metro power, keep alert to the pressure flow—1313 codes/laws validated as Federal/state/municipal legislation causes you to knuckle under to Metro control.

The three types of urban renewal have fashioned an instrument of public (Metrocratic) control over private property to an extent never envisioned in free America. In given time, with unreasonable laws to implement, urban renewal can invade every home and business in the United States. Urban renewal laws, from the Federal level right on down to police-state municipal building codes, are clubbing private property owners, causing them to lose their property.

The point to keep in mind is, that:

*Before urban renewal*, a person in the United States was left alone to live as he pleased. If his property was reported by the neighbors, then he had a chance, because he had his day in court. *Now*, the public urban renewal program has precipitated a *nationwide mass inspection of private property*—hordes of hired inspectors have been turned loose to inform upon property owners.

Worse, petty officials are lying to property owners by stating that arraignment in an urban renewal office constitutes the citizen's "day in court."

I have talked with victims who lost property to public housing; I am in touch with worried property owners who are being bullied by contemporary urban renewal redevelopment and rehabilitation. How does it feel to be caught in an urban renewal project?

The following illustration is drawn from Louisville, Kentucky, which is located in Urban Renewal Region III. There are seven regions in the United States, at present. Visualize yourself as a property owner in Louisville's Southwick Redevelopment Project<sup>5</sup> where Louisville's urban renewal property acquisition plan is moving along:

First, you have received a letter<sup>6</sup> of notification which is sent to

<sup>4</sup> *Model State Constitution*, 5th edition (1948), National Municipal League, 47 E. 68th Street, New York 21, N.Y., Section 1006.

<sup>5</sup> Southwick Redevelopment Project, Louisville, Kentucky, Instructions to Bidders and General Conditions, 10 pp. with map, dated July 29, 1959.

<sup>6</sup> Letter (undated) Re: Project No. Ky. R-12, Block— Parcel— signed by Richard L. Beck, Urban Renewal Consultant.

each property owner in the neighborhood that has been designated as a Project area.

Next, a negotiator has arrived at your door and made an offer for your property. You turned it down as too cheap, because you felt that your house and lot—the sum total of your life's earnings, was worth more. Also, the price offered won't pay for one of the new houses to be built in the project; neither will the price allow you to purchase a house anywhere as good as the one you are living in. You refuse to sign the option sheet.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, in the mail<sup>8</sup> you receive the following letter:

(Dear Sir) Our agent, Mr.—— informs us that he has contacted you as to the price to be paid for your property on X Avenue and that he has met with no success to date.

Prior to entering into negotiations with you through our agent, we had your property as well as other properties in the A Redevelopment area appraised by competent and reliable appraisers. Their appraisals were subsequently reviewed by a representative of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and were found to be fair and reasonable.

It is neither the intent or desire of your City or the Housing and Home Finance Agency in Washington to be other than fair in negotiating with you. On the other hand, we cannot afford to be put to any further delay in acquiring the properties needed for this redevelopment. If, therefore, we cannot come to an understanding as to price, mutually satisfactory, on or before —— 19——, we shall be compelled to institute condemnation proceedings against your property in the local courts.

That sort of arrogant dealing is common practice in public urban renewal. All but completely ignored are the property rights of the owner. Rights *and* property are stripped from him, and his American neighbors are milked of high taxes to support the atrocity.

The situation could be corrected if city renewal in the United States could be accomplished soundly—as it has been accomplished successfully—by private initiative. In other words, a free market should prevail. Property owners should have the right to set the price at which they wish to sell. Redevelopers should be doing their own legwork, not asking for laws to *force* an entire neighborhood to move to please the builders. Redevelopers should be using their own money to keep in business instead of forcing the taxpayers to assume the risk. At present, in too many instances, tax money is acquiring building sites for urban renewal redevelopers; they build at no risk to themselves;

<sup>7</sup> Offer of Sale of Land (option form) City of Louisville, Ky.

<sup>8</sup> Re: Southwick Redevelopment Project, Ky. R-12, Block 2059, Parcel 5, signed by Richard L. Beck, Urban Renewal Consultant.

almost universally, urban renewal redevelopers are using publicly insured credit—your credit, as an American taxpayer.

#### Phoenix

You may recall that Phoenix urban renewal authorities accepted Federal money: \$51,800 to plan the East Jefferson project and \$143,484 to plan the Southwest Area project. The money was merely for *planning*; total costs of redevelopment in Phoenix are estimated to run into millions of dollars. (*Urban Renewal Project Directory*, March 31, 1959, page 30, HHFA, Urban Renewal Administration, Washington, D.C.)

In addition to the Title III method (foregoing example), another way has been opened for cities to obtain planning money from the national treasury. Known as the "701 program" because it is authorized by Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, the setup offers Federal planning assistance to cities, states, and regional planning bodies.<sup>9</sup>

A state must pass an enabling act to legalize acceptance of "701" money. The legislation usually creates a state planning agency which acts as a funnel for the Federal money to flow to the cities.

To the best of my knowledge, the state of Arizona, as of 1960, had not enacted such permissive legislation. By blocking any proposal of the sort, Arizonans and citizens of other states could save themselves from a measure of grief. I mention this in passing, because master plans being produced under the 701 program may, and often do, recommend urban renewal as a stimulant for the housing construction industry.

What about urban renewal in other parts of the United States?

#### Florida

For years, Florida had been the envied state; its constitution upheld property rights. A celebrated Florida Supreme Court decision protected Floridians from losing their property under urban renewal redevelopment. The case (*Adams v. Daytona Beach Housing Authority*) was decided in 1952.

During the passing years, personnel of the high court changed. Recently, Floridians were stunned by the "Tampa case," decided on November 18, 1959 (*Phillip Grubstein v. Urban Renewal Agency of Tampa, Florida*), by which the Florida Supreme Court paved the way for urban renewal in the city of Tampa.

Key finding in the Tampa case held that "Urban renewal, when tied to slum clearance, is a valid function of government."

Judge Stephen O'Connell wrote a blistering opinion disagreeing with the majority in the Tampa case. The final vote was a close four to three.

Today, in order to save property from the urban renewal onslaught, a property owner in Florida would have to prove that his property was not slum property. That raises the question: Who is to decide

<sup>9</sup> Title VII—Urban Planning and Reserve of Planned Public Works, 40 U.S.C. 461, Sec. 701 *et al.*, from *Federal Laws* authorizing assistance to Urban Renewal, as amended October 1, 1959. HHFA, Washington 25, D.C. Pp. 53. Obtainable from U.S. Government Printing Office.

what is, or what is not slum conditions? Standards differ from locale to locale.

Despite the court's ruling in the Tampa case, enabling laws at state or local levels are required in Florida, at present, to permit a city to proceed with so-called slum clearance.

#### *Alaska*

On the heels of the distressing Tampa case came the encouraging Alaska decision ruled on December 22, 1959 (Bridges v. Alaska Housing Authority, *et al.* [No. 16, Supreme Court of Alaska]).

The question for decision was whether the Alaska Housing Authority could use a declaration of taking in the exercise of its power of eminent domain.

In 1958, the Housing Authority filed a complaint for the condemnation of certain private property in connection with an urban redevelopment program in the city of Fairbanks, Alaska.

On the same day, the Housing Authority also filed an instrument entitled "Declaration of Taking," asserting that the right to take private property had been conferred by law. The matter was fought through the courts and decided in favor of the property owner. Urban renewal was forbidden to take private property in Fairbanks, Alaska.

A most significant aspect of the Alaska decision, aside from the fact that it upheld private property rights, was that the Alaska Supreme Court whittled the Housing Authority down to size. The court pointed out that the Housing Authority was merely a public corporate body, and not an agent or part of the (then) territory or state of Alaska.

Judge John H. Dimond correctly assessed the political oddity in the Alaska decision, and found that the Housing Authority did not possess the legal power it claimed—the power to use a "declaration of taking" private property.

This delineation of the Metro-type *authority* and the distinction drawn by Judge Dimond is a most important court finding, and one that goes far toward identifying as unconstitutional the agency/authority form of the political structure known as Metropolitan Government, or Metro. *The Metro authority/agency is not Federal, not state, not county, not municipal. It is a freewheeling oddity and, in practice, untouchable by the voters.*

The Alaska decision is the only instance that has come to my attention in which an American court has recognized the fact that American constitutional government is being threatened by the strange form of Metro.

#### *California*

In Colton, California, citizens forestalled urban renewal by blocking creation of an urban renewal "agency" for the city. Diehards then managed to get named a citizens' committee "to study" urban renewal. The task of the committee was to find less harsh methods than complete redevelopment to give the downtown area a costly face-lifting.

The curtain was rung down on urban renewal in Colton when the citizens abolished the study committee because it could not come up with a desirable solution.

Some cities which do not create housing agencies promote urban renewal under city auspices.

Well-meaning but mistaken persons often promote tax-supported urban renewal under the guise of "progress." True progress is never gained when one segment of the population is robbed and impoverished to benefit a privileged few.

Advisedly, the American people fear urban renewal. They are finding more and more similarity between urban renewal ordinances and the ex post facto laws which are forbidden by the United States Constitution. Frivolously-changed codes and ordinances plunge good homes into artificial obsolescence leading to demolition by urban renewal authorities. The kiss of death—artificial obsolescence—is brought on not by natural depreciation but by capricious unnatural man-made changes in codes and ordinances and by concepts such as the "snob clause" in the 1313 *State Constitution*.<sup>10</sup>

At first, cities may think they have done the smart thing by teaming up with public urban renewal. Civic leaders may hope to attract new business. Admittedly, manufacturing, industrial firms and private businesses of all kinds, are the vital means of livelihood for populations of cities. But when business firms eventually realize that urban renewal laws also condemn and demolish business properties, then business will relocate in cities where there is no public urban renewal and debt and high taxes.

To learn how urban renewal handles dispossessed businessmen, read the booklet published by the Urban Renewal Administration in Washington, D.C.: *Questions and Answers on Relocation Payments*, Technical Guide No. 2, published September, 1960.

Best method of winning over public urban renewal is the tactic used by the citizens of Colton—stop urban renewal before it gains a foothold.

In instances where urban renewal got in before its existence was of general knowledge to the public, the citizens are now engaged in delaying tactics. Property owners are taking their troubles to court. In trying to save their property, they also are persuading elected officials to rescind and repeal urban renewal legislation. As a last resort, citizens promote recall elections to retire unqualified and unresponsive elected officials.

In January, 1960, the city council of Benicia, California, rescinded resolutions that set up the machinery for urban redevelopment in Benicia.

The Signal Hill city council, in California, during August, 1960, blocked urban renewal by refusing Federal funds that had been offered under the "701 program" of federally assisted planning. Incidentally,

<sup>10</sup> *Model State Constitution, loc. cit., Sec. 1006.*



that particular Signal Hill city council was a fresh new body responsive to the electorate. The previous mayor and three city councilmen had been recalled and replaced because, ignoring protests of the citizens, the officials had handed over the municipal police and fire protection to the Los Angeles County Metro government.

There you have proof that urban renewal is being defeated at various stages and at different points in the United States. The high courts are registering disapproval of urban renewal; city councils are backing off from urban renewal; forewarned citizens are closing city gates against urban renewal.<sup>11</sup>

The disciplinary power of the ballot is making these victories possible. Citizens can vote against pro-urban renewal incumbents and candidates, or recall unqualified public trustees.

The ballot franchise, indeed, is ready for American taxpayers to use in shaping government according to their wishes.

Urban renewal "experts" are afraid of the taxpayer. Listen to this last quote from the HHFA field manual; it tells the inspector, on page 33: "Constantly remind yourself that the tenant or owner are 'persons' (not taxpayers)."

The foregoing passage reveals that the so-called experts know their place; they realize that the American voting taxpayer still is the sovereign ruler of his own governmental destiny.

<sup>11</sup> The state of Indiana is providing a stunning example of 1962 rejection of urban renewal, as follows:

*Plymouth, Indiana.* "Plymouth Drops Urban Renewal After Spending \$18,770.00 in 2 Years." Reported in *Indianapolis Star*, April 8, 1962. To make certain that Federal urban renewal rests in repose, the Plymouth Improvement Association has been organized to combat:

"The initiation, construction and maintenance of improvident or unnecessary public improvements and works and such that infringe on the property rights of citizens and property owners of the city and its environs."

City Planning Associates, Inc., which promoted the urban renewal proposal includes two brothers of Congressman John Brademas of South Bend: T. Brooks Brademas, president, and D. James Brademas, director of community organization. Patricia Miller Brademas, sister-in-law of the Congressman, is secretary-treasurer of the urban renewal planning firm.

*Elkhart, Indiana.* City Planning Associates, Inc. (Brademas firm) also is under urban renewal contract with the city of Elkhart, Indiana. Opposition to urban renewal has arisen in Elkhart, per *Indianapolis Star*, April 9, 1962.

*Logansport, Indiana.* The city council "yields to protests, votes to kill federal urban renewal project," according to *Indianapolis Star*, April 3, 1962. Vote: 6-0. City Planning Associates, Inc. (Brademas firm) had the Logansport contract.

*Marion, Indiana.* "Urban Renewal Plan Booted Out at Marion, Indiana." Last December 19, 1961, the city council terminated a \$1,600,000 Federal urban renewal project. City Planning Associates of Mishawaka (Brademas firm) presented the urban renewal plan. Source: *Indianapolis Star*, April 6, 1962.

Yet—remember! 1313's well-organized movement is working to strip American citizens of their right to elect and to dismiss public officials.

"Short ballot" is the name that designates the movement. The ballot, of course, becomes "short" when spaces for candidates' names are eliminated, when elective offices are abolished to make way for appointive offices. The "short ballot" eliminates your right to vote.

The National Municipal League, parent body of the Metro 1313 network originated and promotes the "short ballot."

The National Municipal League also sponsors the "All America Cities" contest which confers awards to cities that promote urban renewal, among other things.

The National Municipal League promotes the job occupation known as *city manager*, an European concept which our Founding Fathers disdained and left behind when they departed from Europe. City managers can be instrumental in bringing urban renewal to cities they rule.

A key man in the NML organization, Luther Gulick, has gone on public record estimating the cost of urban renewal as somewhere between \$80-\$160 trillions during the next twenty years.

The National Municipal League also promotes the Fruin-Colnon contest, financed by a grant from a contracting company. One of the 1958 prizes was awarded to the Metropolitan St. Louis Survey, compiled by a team of so-called university "experts." Recommendations of the survey, including a type of public urban renewal, were followed closely by the now-defeated Metro charter proposed for St. Louis.

The National Municipal League—the "short ballot" and "city manager" organization promoter, has vigorously approved and furthered billion-dollar urban renewal. Exhibiting monumental indifference to the staggering cost in human tragedy, material waste, and debt to be shouldered by taxpayers, the National Municipal League also expresses no concern regarding private property rights that urban renewal destroys.

At the 1958 Colorado Springs NML Conference, National Municipal League members applauded a convention speaker who said: "Urban Renewal laws and programs should be amended so that a city could gear itself to a continuing program of so many square blocks a year for an indefinite period . . . and then proceed to acquire it [property] by condemnation on the basis of so many blocks a year. . ."<sup>12</sup>

For a partial listing of NML officers and members, please refer to Appendix IV.

Most elected officials want to respond to the wishes of their constituents. (That's the only known way to stay in office.) Therefore, it is squarely up to the taxpayers to guard their state constitutions, their county charters, their city charters, and the protective features

<sup>12</sup> *National Civic Review*, National Municipal League, *loc. cit.*, April 1959, p. 182.

within each, from the onslaughts of NML-Metro teams of revisionists. It is squarely up to the taxpayers and voters to make absolutely clear what is wanted.

This is best accomplished, events show, by letters or written instructions to elected representatives, placed on public file and backed up by the personal appearance of taxpayers in (1) delegations which pay calls upon elected officials, and in (2) large groups of determined taxpayers in attendance at public meetings and hearings. Be present. Give your name and address. Express your convictions.

If you are a member of an organization which delegates a spokesman to address your elected officials, back him up by your presence.

Nothing more impresses public officials than a show of citizen strength. It has been thus throughout all history. Sight of the peasants outside the palace holding rake handles for clubs has more than once caused crowned heads to think correctly.

However, American citizens are not "peasants." Our matchless Constitution has reserved to us the sovereign right to self-rule. If we don't rule—then whose fault is it?

Also, who will stand *for* you between urban renewal bulldozers and *your* home?

(Text from address delivered in Phoenix Public Library auditorium, Phoenix, Arizona, in November, 1960.)

## Metro Testing Grounds

THE DAY WAS PLEASANT IN Miami-Dade, Florida. Cocoa palms along Bayshore were whipping in a high layer of sea breeze. Sunshine lay in a warm mantle upon crowds in downtown Miami.

A boy and a girl started to cross a street, talking, joking, laughing. She was blonde, pretty, and lighthearted, even though she was out of work and looking for a job.

It is presumed that a police whistle pierced the air—sudden, shrill, authoritative. Traffic slowed, and pedestrians stopped.

Another moment, and the street scene flowed on, same as before—except for the cute blonde and the boy. A policeman had arrested her. She had failed to obey his hand signal—she hadn't seen it. Nevertheless, for jaywalking, three choices faced her: post bond, produce identification, or go to jail. She went to jail. The boy was bound over to Youth Hall.

That illustrates *Metro police power* in action.<sup>1</sup>

A neat five-room house on Sangster Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, was threatened with demolition *because the front yard was too big*. The home was purchased in 1949 by a man who *wanted* a big front yard.

He worked weekends and nights for ten years improving his home: he added two bedrooms, a tiled bath, a basement, a new roof, hardwood floors, storm doors and windows, enclosed a back porch, built a new front porch, purchased an automatic oil furnace, remodeled the kitchen, bought new furniture for the entire house, wall-to-wall carpeting for the living room and hall, even consented to change the color of the roof to comply with a suggestion originating from the Indianapolis Redevelopment Commission, a public agency.

Then, when the homeowner wanted to build a two-car garage on his homesite, he was unexpectedly refused a building permit. Worse, he was notified that he would have to sell his home and vacate.

The public agency claimed that the spacious yard "might make it difficult to obtain mortgages for new homes to be built on the street." By that time, the neighborhood had been marked as part of the commission's redevelopment project.

That public agency wanted to destroy the man's private property because it did not conform to *future* agency plans. That—if you please—is the same agency that had encouraged the homeowner to improve the property and even to change the color of the roof.

<sup>1</sup> *Miami Herald*, p. 1-C, July 3, 1959.

The incident illustrates what happens when a private individual comes up against *Metro master planning*.<sup>2</sup>

Another example: A farmer in Michigan was being prosecuted for his refusal to pay one dollar for a permit to erect a pole-type roof for housing hay. The farm lies out in the open, sixty miles from Detroit, Michigan, twenty miles from Flint, forty-five miles from Lansing, in a township that is zoned residential-agricultural.

Previous to passage of the rural ordinance, the farmer did not need to ask permission to erect buildings on his farm. The unprecedented ordinance, at the time, contained no building standards; it merely forced farmers to ask permission and to pay for permission "given" by a public agency.

Hauled into court by public officials, the farmer felt that ordinances of the type are for the purpose of "softening up" farmers to the point where they will be conditioned to ask and pay for permission before they dare do anything at all. The farmer foresees in the ordinance a forerunner of a direct effort to lay the groundwork for a degree of regimentation over American agriculture never known before.

Ranchers in California have felt the breath of similar regimentation, including "land-use" restrictions by which public authorities are reaching for the power to compel owners of private farmlands to knuckle under master planning devised by a new type of public *authorities*, or *agencies*.<sup>3</sup>

Where are these strange laws coming from? Who is writing the punitive police powers of Miami-Dade, the unconstitutional master planning in Indiana, the forerunner of regimentation in Michigan?

What force lies behind the pressure that is seeking to control Americans on farmlands and in cities and elsewhere throughout the United States?

The finger points toward Metropolitan Government, or "Metro."

Promoters of Metropolitan Government have not come forth with a clear-cut definition of their type of government, although spokesmen repeatedly paint the scheme as a "new" type of government fitted to the "changing times," a Power whose charters and laws would replace time-honored American constitutional statutes which Metro agents ridicule as the "horse-and-buggy" type.

Perhaps the reason a clear-cut description of Metro has been withheld is because the definition might furnish a candid "mug shot" of Metro, causing its totalitarian scheme to become instantly recognized for what it is: a vast web of political consolidation and economic collectivism which is to be financed by tax extortion through hiked taxes.

So secret and carefully cloaked has the Metro movement been kept

<sup>2</sup> *Indianapolis Star*, October 8, 1959.

<sup>3</sup> *San Jose Mercury*, January 26, 1959.

that the entire operation suggests itself as an outrageous conspiracy being implemented *legally*, albeit unconstitutionally, by enactment of Metro laws under which Americans are being forced to live.

The American public has become aware of the odd cluster of organizations housed in a building in Chicago, Illinois. A busy hardcore of persons is observed within that four-story Gothic-type structure, a group promoting a program of political and economic collectivism under the name of Metropolitan Government, or "Metro."

The address of that building now is notorious—1313 East 60th Street—a corner location on the University of Chicago campus. Many an American, since, has traced the source of numerous troubles in government today to that mysterious capital at "1313."

Key organizations headquartered at "1313" are further connected with organizations on the outside: several in the immediate campus neighborhood, hundred scores in various cities,<sup>4</sup> and even in far locations in the Western and Eastern Hemispheres of the globe.

The various chairmen or presidents of each of the Metro-cell 1313 organizations constitute a closely-knit interlocking directorate, a monopoly of political and economic radicalism; they sit on each other's boards and committees, trade about their office forces—or *secretariats*, as Metro calls them—and send Metro agents into sensitive governmental situations, or on Metro's numerous "missions," which are dedicated to the disruption of constitutional check-and-balance government and the substitution of collectivized Metro to take its place.

Leaders at "1313's" Chicago capital and in the "parent body" headquarters in New York (National Municipal League) are steering various Metro programs, such as the subsidized Federal urban renewal movement; subsidized mental health projects, in which public agencies compete with private medicine—and run up the taxes; and state and regional master planning through public agencies which hatch schemes by which to regiment Americans—and raise the taxes.

Metro master planners realize that their soak-the-taxpayer regimentation can be more quickly saddled upon Americans if Metro holds the reins. Therefore Metro leaders presently are pushing programs of governmental reorganization, leading toward concentration of irresponsible Metro political power, in order to control the many under a few.

The present nationwide movement to reorganize state governments is an example of Metro; proportional representation is another; the mental health movement, still another.

Generally, Metro's reorganization of public personnel and departments is teamed with Metro's basic attempt to merge governmental units, or geographic political areas—from city to county to district to state to region to national and to ultimate international consolidation. Result: one giant governmental unit controlled by—Metro.

<sup>4</sup> Public Administration Organizations (1954 Directory), PACH, 1313.

The Metro mentality hopes to dominate each umbrella of power expanding over each greater geographic area through Metro-trained elite, some of whom, even now, have taken the place of elected officials in instances where Metro forces have victoriously abolished elective offices.

As evidence mounts, we see Metro influencing and controlling uncounted numbers of trainees, public affairs interns, civilians, Federal bureaus, state commissions, college and university students, businessmen, American legislators, county, state, and municipal and Federal governments—in a web so vast that a new word has been coined for the spectacle by its own press agents. "It" is being described as the "Metropolitan complex,"<sup>5</sup> actually a radical revolutionary movement which reveals itself as merely a new twist to an old enemy—dictatorship.

The Metropolitan complex—or dictatorship—is referred to commonly as "1313." The label is the actual nickname long ago applied to the hardcore dictatorship by itself; the "1313" numerals appear often in Metro's own literature; and the term, of course, stems from the numbers in the street address of Metro headquarters at 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago.

Recently, 1313's parasite Metro government has been uncovered functioning within state governments. 1313 was assisted with Carnegie and Rockefeller money—more than eight million from the Rockefeller Spelman Fund. Tax-exempt Ford Foundation has been and still is pouring money into 1313 operations.<sup>6</sup> You, as a United States citizen, are feeding tax dollars into 1313 also, if yours is one of the many states that contribute to 1313's Council of State Governments through a state commission on interstate (or intergovernmental) cooperation.

#### *Council of State Governments*

CSG is part of a linkage that leads into Red Russia (refer to the MetroChart), as follows:

CSG interlocks with the Committee for International Municipal Cooperation which transmits funds raised in the United States to the International Union of Local Authorities, the organization that commingles with Communist Yugoslavia and Communist East Germany, the latter through the International Federation for Documentation, an international information pool. Records further reveal that IFD collaborates with the USSR, through the International Committee Social Sciences Documentation in sharing legal information, including an annotated up-to-date bibliography on law in the United States of America.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, re: "Metroplex" radio series during Metro campaign ending November 3, 1959.

*Salt Lake Tribune*, September 12, 1959, re: "era of the metropolitan complex."

<sup>6</sup> Tax-Exempt Foundation Hearings (1954), 83d Congress, House of Representatives, Part I, p. 894.

<sup>7</sup> Appendixes 24 and 39 of UNESCO, 10c/41, Paris, June 30, 1958. (Copies obtainable from the United States Department of State, UNESCO Committee, or your Congressman.)

1313's Council of State Governments describes itself as an agency "created by the States." From 1933 to 1936, the CSG was merely a title on a letterhead. In 1936, the state of New Jersey passed a 1313-fabricated law that established the New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation, joining CSG.<sup>8</sup> This gave the 1313 Council the start it needed. The New Jersey Secretary of State "memorialized," or notified, the other states that New Jersey had joined CSG. Each state that joined thereafter usually "memorialized" the remaining nonjoining states. This practice of "memorializing" hastened CSG propagation.

The Constitution of the United States of America, Article I, Section 10, paragraph 3, states that no state shall enter into any compact with another state without the consent of Congress. Certain authorities regard the interstate cooperation legislation as a "compact"; if it is, then has the 1313 Council of State Governments been reviewed by Congress?

Further, Article I, Section 10, paragraph 1, of the Constitution expressly forbids states from entering into *any alliance or confederation*. Certainly, either term would aptly describe the 1313 Council of State Governments. Is the entire CSG alliance of sovereign states a direct violation of the Constitution of the United States?

Is state money that is being channeled to the CSG an illegal transaction? Remember also, CSG interlocks, through 1313, with Communist comingling adjuncts described in the foregoing text. The CSG influences approximately one half of the entire 1313 complex within the United States.

Each state "commission on interstate cooperation" constitutes the coupling that connects the sovereign state to 1313's hidden government. Through the "commission," 1313 activity flows into and out of the state, including taxpayer money. Check the Table in Appendix I to learn how much your State is paying the CSG.

Citizens receive a lot of trouble in return for their money. 1313's Council of State Governments has sent into the states platoons of agents, newsletters, directives, and a flood of 1313 periodicals. The most amazing of all is an annual book of prefabricated laws, drafted at 1313 headquarters by a ghostwriting staff of 1313 legal minds.<sup>9</sup>

The 1313 law factory publishes the prepackaged laws in form convenient for copying, with a blank space for insertion of a bill number. The whole thing can be handed to a legislator to be introduced to the state legislature. The state of Texas received a mental health bill in just that manner.

When Metro draft legislation is considered ready for publication in *Suggested State Legislation*, the catalog of mail-order laws, the process

<sup>8</sup> New Jersey's entrance in 1935-36 as Council of State Governments' first member state has been verified (1959) officially by CSG's 1313 research staff.

<sup>9</sup> *Suggested State Legislation for . . . (year) . . .* by CSG's Committee on Suggested State Legislation.



is handled by 1313's Committee on Suggested State Legislation, a subcommittee of the Council of State Governments.

Take California, for an example. California is one of 1313's important testing grounds. What happens in California, Metro-wise, can happen in any other state.

Typical legislation which emanated from 1313 and appeared in bill form in 1959, Metro's big testing year in California, were: Assembly Bill 922, leading toward abolishment of certain elective offices; AB 2488 which would establish the office of an appointed county executive or "county boss"; and AB 1896, the attempt to plaster the state with Metropolitan multipurpose districts.

#### *Metro Multipurpose Districts*

The multipurpose district attempt was made in this manner: A commercial firm of 1313 researchers which maintains offices in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and in Sacramento and Palo Alto, California, and which is a division of an internationally known firm, conducted the so-called interim committee study from which came AB 1896, the Metro multipurpose district bill. The legislation would merge counties under a Metro district or region.<sup>10</sup>

That hired firm of 1313 experts wrote the state report; it was Metro jargon from beginning to end; practically every recommendation was based on points of authority straight from 1313 sources. The bill called for multipurpose Metro districts empowered to levy taxes, incur indebtedness, condemn private property, and so forth—all in the name of Metro districts covering the areas of many counties, and administered by a 1313 appointee or manager invested with sweeping executive power.<sup>11</sup>

To such a disgraceful extent have certain California elected officials yielded their entrusted offices to serve the purpose of Metro that the paid staff of commercial 1313 researchers was allowed to write even the initial draft of AB 1896, the multipurpose district law.

The legislators may not have read the report prepared by the Metro firm, but California citizens did—after seeing the shocking text of the bill. Thanks to the efforts of those citizens, AB 1896 and its dictatorship were defeated, temporarily.

#### *State Planning by Metro*

California's SB 597—state planning—contains the idea and indeed

<sup>10</sup> Pacific Planning and Research, Sacramento and Palo Alto, California, and Tulsa, Oklahoma (a division of internationally known firm of Ebasco Services, Inc., 120 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California).

<sup>11</sup> AB 1896—A Metropolitan Multipurpose District for California, Vol. 13 (1957-59) No. 24—Subcommittee, Assembly Interim Committee on Conservation, Planning and Public Works, Thomas M. Rees, chairman. Advertised in *National Civic Review* (1313 publication).

some of the identical language found in the 1313 legislative publication entitled *Model State and Regional Planning Law* (1954).<sup>12</sup>

In spite of the telltale Metro hashmarks borne by the measure, the State Senator who introduced the bill preposterously insisted that the legislation was the result of his own thinking and that of the governor's office and the League of California Cities.

The Senator's ostrichlike remark overlooked the fact that California's present governor is currently manager-at-large of 1313's Council of State Governments, and that the League of California Cities is one of the biggest 1313 operators in the state.

The state planning measure encountered opposition, including vigorous protest by a Senate committee that intelligently foresaw that the legislation would lead to "more regulation of the farmers of California."

Unfortunately, the bill was passed.

#### *Mysterious Pressure*

Should you be dismayed by the stubbornness of public officials who cling to, and refuse to repudiate Metro legislation and their personal allegiance to 1313, perhaps it will help to learn about the groundwork laid by a 1313 pressure group that began forming away back, between 1943-46, in Washington, D.C.

The Washington group called itself the Council on Intergovernmental Relations, and Rockefeller money financed it.<sup>13</sup> That council of the 1940's was headed by five Federal officials and four other persons, including influential 1313 leaders.<sup>14</sup> That council selected counties in different states for research and experimentation. Included were Colquitt County in Georgia, Henry in Indiana, Blue Earth in Minnesota, Skagit in Washington, and Santa Clara in California. That was more than ten years ago.

Skip to 1959 and consider the plight of one of these Metro testing grounds: Santa Clara County in California. This county produced the State Assemblyman who introduced a battery of pro-Metro bills in 1959, the crucial year; the same legislator headed the 1313-influenced Municipal and County Government interim committee. Vice-chairman of that same committee is a member of the California Commission on Uniform State Laws, offshoot of the National Uniform State Laws Commission, headquartered on the University of Chicago campus and

<sup>12</sup> *Model State and Regional Planning Law* (1954), published by the National Municipal League, 47 E. 68th St., New York 21.

<sup>13</sup> 30th Report of Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations (1958), House of Representatives, p. 66.

<sup>14</sup> Frank Bane, then executive director of 1313's CSG. (Mr. Bane now is chairman of the Federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations created in September, 1959); Luther Gulick, current (1962) 1313 official, National Municipal League, and Director of Institute of Public Administration, New York.

working closely with 1313's Council of State Governments and its transmission belt that disseminates "mail-order Metro laws."

These 1313 henchmen, plus others which space prevents mentioning, are responsible for dumping Metro legislation upon California for testing.

This hapless Metro testing ground is hosting "committees" which are promoting Metro. Various 1313 departments actually are established within California, now, under the California Commission on Interstate Cooperation. These Metro committees are staffed by elected representatives *who are taking assignments* from 1313; they serve Metro in the puppet Metro departments that bear names identical with official State departments, such as Agriculture, Conservation, Transportation, Legislative, and so forth.<sup>15</sup>

Their reports are sent out of California to Chicago headquarters. How do you like that? California senators and assemblymen serving two masters in the departments of two governments: The state of California and 1313's Metro.

#### *School Textbooks and Lectures*

If you wonder why small fry, our boys and girls, sometimes turn up "soft" toward Metro-type concepts, such as rule-by-appointees, merging of governmental units, regimentation imposed by a self-appointed "elite," and the "short ballot," look to the textbooks. To name just two (they are found in certain school districts): *The People Govern*, Pacquin-Irish (Scribner's, 1954 and 1958) and *This Government of Ours*, Jack Allen and F. P. Wirth (American Book Company, 1953). Both books serve the experimental 1313 purpose and boldly promote various Metro concepts.

Students of the Fresno (California) High School are receiving Metro treatment, according to a Federal government bulletin which is given intensive distribution throughout the United States. The November-December, 1961, issue of HHFA's *Urban Renewal Notes* released by the Urban Renewal Administration, Washington 25, D.C., reported:

"The (Fresno) High School's Social Sciences Department decided that local affairs should get higher billing in its curriculum. 3 staff members from the city government were recruited to lead discussions in 6 sessions, on 3 topics. The first series was led by the Traffic Engineer; the second by a representative of the Fresno Redevelopment Agency, discussing *urban renewal* and the Workable Program for Community Improvement; and the third by the City Planner."

#### *Unlabeled Metro*

Metro is being slipped in piecemeal in many states, often without the Metro label. More and more Americans, when in doubt about

<sup>15</sup> *Report of the California Commission on Interstate Cooperation, 1957-59*, published by the Senate of the State of California, 62 pp. (See pages 40-62.)

strange-sounding proposals, are measuring them against the Constitution of the United States. It is often found that the proposals are Metro, and not in accordance with constitutional check-and-balance government.

#### *Cow Counties*

Metro is scornful of voters in lightly populated areas where sensible voting has often saved the day. Fearing what it cannot control, the Metro complex has stooped to name-calling. Thus we hear about "the pork chop belt" in northern Florida, about the "cow pasture dreamers" in Missouri, and in California—"the backward cow counties."

The clear thinking of rural areas has more than once saved the day. From the gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, and from the East Coast to the West, Americans are thankful for the sensible voting logic of their countrymen on farm and on rangelands. Throughout history, the straight thinking of clearheaded minorities has upheld the right and proved that majorities do not always determine right or wrong.

*Metro's proportional representation plan is designed to wipe out the minority voice!*

What can Americans do?

At the state level, it is imperative that citizens watch 1313-dominated committees at work, expose the 1313 personnel, challenge the unsoundness of the biased reports and prevent passage of the Metro laws which stem from prearrangement and collusion.

Cut off the money going out of your state to 1313's Council of State Governments. Look to your Commission on Interstate Cooperation (or Intergovernmental Relations), which is the 1313 beachhead in your state government.

Abolish the above commission.

Metro-infested city halls need cleaning out. Many cities hold membership in the American Municipal Association, one of 1313's many lobbying bodies. Cities likewise belong to the statewide League of Cities.

#### *Remedies*

At the Federal level, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, that 1313 beachhead in Federal government, must be abolished.

Those are some of the tasks to be done. Who is going to help do the job, to prevent the conversion of our republican representative government into a totalitarian dictatorship headed by social engineers working through Metro?

Many a prominent voice has been raised against errors that are leading to folly, bankruptcy, and national suicide. Too many individual, prominent voices have been silenced, one by one, and by one method or another.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Congressman Scherer, speaking in regard to the Defense Facilities Protection Act of 1959, *Congressional Record*, July 8, 1959.

The best remedying power left lies in the voice of Americans who, up to now, have been merely standing by as idle spectators.

Rescue of our constitutional government of checks-and-balances depends on persons of principle who care enough to take the time to act, *now*.

Several states and many cities are being used as 1313 testing grounds. Subjugation of any one unit under vicious Metropolitan Government would discourage Americans elsewhere who likewise are engaging against Metro.

Losing to Metro is disastrous to householders already staggering under the profligate costs of all levels of government. Taxes are hiked even higher wherever Metro has gotten in. Ask the Floridians down in Miami-Dade! Each "called" election they come closer to defeating Metro, they're that determined to rid themselves of the mess.

Many, many Americans are battling against Metro, but more are needed for the battles yet to come.

(Text, exclusive of 1961 addenda, based on an address delivered in Bakersfield, California, in November, 1959.)

## Will Americans Surrender to the 1313 Dictatorship?

1313'S METRO IS MOST EASILY recognized at the city-county level because citizens can observe the change in government at close range. Also, because merging of those two levels of government constitutes Metro's first step in its total program of reorganizing American units of government into one giant collectivized whole.

A lesser-known Metro move usually has preceded that—an influx of city managers, and frequently through adoption of revised city charters unknowingly (to the citizens, that is) patterned after the 1313 *Model City Charter*.<sup>1</sup>

Complaints originating in cities which have adopted charters patterned after 1313's *Model City Charter* fall into typical categories.

Number One Complaint: criticizes the dictatorial power of the city manager. A 1313-type city manager is clothed with sweeping administrative powers, including hiring and firing. The double-edged weapon can carve a Metro empire; it can also bludgeon opposing opinion into silence. By inclusion of a 1313 provision that prescribes punishment, such as loss of office, the Metro-type city charter can sentence elected officials to unwholesome subservience to the Metro manager during their entire terms of office. Metro charters can see to it that an elected official is charged and convicted of "interfering" with the Metro manager's edicts.

Another complaint centers upon lack of representation in Metro "at large" elections.

Members of American governing bodies, heretofore, and individually, were and are likable fellows, elevated to seats of responsibility by their friends, neighbors, and citizen supporters. But when the ward or district system is eliminated and candidates are elected "at large," representing no specific area, a climate of civic irresponsibility is created. This can easily pay off in rudeness, impatience, and in indifference shown by elected officials toward citizens who present grievances for correction.

The "at large" election device also is an invention of political scientists who covet the power of deciding the outcome of elections. Control of the mass media of communication plays an important part. Generally speaking, the larger city dailies appear to be pro-Metro.

At the city level, under a councilmanic district arrangement, a can-

<sup>1</sup> *Model City Charter*, 5th edition (1941), National Municipal League, 47 E. 68th Street, New York 21, N.Y. Pp. 141. (Under revision in 1962.)

didate for office might stand some chance of winning in a ward where he is known, even if the leading newspapers took a stand against him.

But what chance would a candidate have against an unfriendly and hostile press that covers an entire city, county, or Metro district where the candidate was not known—a wide territory which he could not possibly campaign effectively in an "at large" election?

1313's *Model City Charter* (5th edition, 1941) presents proportional representation and an alternate election-at-large plan.

The charters of the cities of Riverside, California, and San Antonio, Texas, have been lifted word for word in many sections from the 1313 *Model City Charter*. Read "San Antonio Selects Socialism's Way," by Clyde Wantland, *The American Mercury*, April, 1960.

An introductory note carried by the *Model City Charter* under the City Manager Article states:

"A whole new profession has been built upon the city manager provisions of the Model City Charter since their original adoption in 1915, and its development has changed the course of municipal government. The provision requiring the city manager to be chosen . . . solely on the basis of his qualifications . . . has made possible a career in city management. It is to the interest of the manager to do a good job, because he may thus progress to a larger city with a larger salary."

That raises the question: Do a good job for whom—1313? To an unwholesome degree, city managers are beholden to 1313 because of their jobs, obtained through 1313's employment and job-placement service. Under this arrangement, citizens whose wishes run counter to the Metro program at the city hall not only are scorned but are maligned and punished. One subtle method is to approach the citizen's employer, requesting the employer to silence the citizen's expressions at city hall. The underhandedness is effective when firms are eager to curry city-hall favors such as contracts, easements, and other business necessities.

After installing city managers, Metro usually attempts city-county merging. Each instance appears to present a different quirk, due partly to the protective laws of each locale. Metro must circumvent or cancel out the safeguard laws to establish its dictatorship.

Another reason for the varying examples of Metro take-over lies in the fact that Metropolitan Government is a raw experiment on a wholesale scale. Metro leaders have chosen certain cities and counties as targets because of the untried experimental opportunities each offers.

St. Louis, Missouri, is one such target, yet on November 3, 1959, citizens were faced with a vote on a Metro district plan and voted it

down and out with decisive finality. The plan contained many features similar to Miami-Dade's Metropolitan Government.<sup>2</sup>

By perfecting various techniques in different situations, Metro hopes to acquire a bag of tricks that can be explored for a convenient Metro method to fit any given Metro "mission."

The St. Louis situation presented two experiments: the city-county district proposal and a sidecar—an interstate Metro area which buries a state boundary.

Two cities, St. Louis and East St. Louis, face each other across the state boundary line which is marked by the Mississippi River. While Metro had everybody confused over the proposed city-county merger in Missouri, 1313 forces working in both the Illinois and the Missouri state legislatures quietly slipped through an interstate compact that included the two cities in the district created. The Metro power thus created overlaps both sovereign states—there lies the spawn of the future—a hybrid Metro district, scar tissue upon both states, Missouri and Illinois.

It is instructional to look into situations where Metro has ridden to supreme power. In Miami-Dade, the city-county merger is a total flop. Don't let anybody tell you otherwise. Taxes in Miami-Dade have skyrocketed and assessments are still going up.

Down in Miami-Dade, Metro plunged into physical alteration and expansion of its governmental plant. Additional office space was acquired by renting and leasing properties surrounding the former county courthouse acquired by Metro in the take-over. Inside the courthouse, Metro knocked out walls and changed all the locks on the doors (somewhat psychopathic as an official activity) in order to remodel the former government buildings to suit the Metro purpose.

It will be interesting to watch some future target area impregnated by Metro-trained personnel to see if the Metro colonizers can hoodwink the citizens into constructing new civic centers built to fit Metro's mysterious needs.

Adoption of council-manager government is of such vital concern to Metro that each month the NML parent body reports on developments of the plan. Rejections, as well as adoptions, necessarily are listed. In issues of the *National Civic Review*, running from March, 1959, through April, 1962, no less than one hundred rejections by cities are noted. For the listing of cities which have turned down Metro plans and charters, see Appendix V. The list is by no means a total picture. Many years prior to 1959, citizens were rejecting city-manager government.

There still remains another category of Metro defeats at the city level—the cities that tried Metro city charters, then abandoned them. Illustrative of Metro's phobia for analysis, and searching determina-

<sup>2</sup> "St. Louis Defeats Metro Plan," by Jo Hindman, *American Mercury*, March, 1960.



tion to discover an unbeatable formula-for-victory, 1313 has published a book entitled *Manager Plan Abandonments* which analyzes and rationalizes sixty-six abandonments. The book is under continual revision.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to the sixty-six abandonments discussed and excused in the fifth edition (1959) of the subject book, more abandonments of council-manager plans have transpired,<sup>4</sup> including:

- Rosenberg, Texas  
- - - - - abandoned council-manager plan in May, 1960
- Randolph, Massachusetts  
- - - - - abandoned council-manager plan in March, 1961
- Lake Geneva, Wisconsin  
- - - - - abandoned council-manager plan in July, 1961
- Madison, South Dakota  
- - - - - abandoned council-manager plan in 1961
- Provo, Utah  
- - - - - abandoned council-manager plan in November, 1961

Interestingly, the town and village of Bennington, Vermont, adopted 1313's council-manager government in 1942, abandoned it in 1947. Both town and village readopted the plan in 1950 and for a second time found council-manager government unsatisfactory. The town abandoned it finally in 1953; the village in 1954.<sup>5</sup>

1313 has imbedded itself in various institutions. Key 1313 personnel hold professorships in departments of public administration which have burgeoned in various universities. The city of Phoenix, Arizona, runs a 1313 intern program in which bright young men are taught public affairs, Metro-style, then are dispatched to jobs in governments which Metro hopes to take over. California's legislature and the Federal government likewise are nurturing programs of legislative internships, state/federal money paying part, Ford Foundation paying another part.

Because more and more persons are making a living working for and promoting Metro, and because of the fabulous Foundation (tax-free) money behind 1313,<sup>6</sup> Metro almost has American taxpayers and citizens hanging on the ropes.

<sup>3</sup> *Manager Plan Abandonments* (5th edition, 1959), by Arthur W. Bromage, National Municipal League, 47 E. 68 Street, New York 21. Pp. 40. 50 cents.

<sup>4</sup> City-manager plan abandonment notices, *National Civic Review*: Rosenberg, Texas, July, 1960, p. 373; Randolph, Massachusetts, December, 1961, p. 602; Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, September, 1961, p. 431; Madison, South Dakota, September, 1961, p. 431; Provo, Utah, January, 1962, p. 29.

<sup>5</sup> *Manager Plan Abandonments*, *loc. cit.*, p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Ford Foundation, Report of 1958, payments to ASPA, ASPO, and NML, pp. 39, 116, 117, 119, 120. See MetroChart for full names represented by foregoing initials.

What are Americans up against?

Some persons of Metro mentality believe they are performing great service to mankind in promoting Metro. Leaders of Metro resort to methods of confusion to get their way, also to subterfuge. In some parts of the country, Metro is being slipped in piecemeal, without the label, and with the help of well-meaning but misled individuals.

Here is an excerpt taken from a 1313 publication, wherein a Metro leader reveals his contempt for the civic leaders that Metro exploits to serve the Metro purpose; the excoriation reads:

"The inside of a stuffed shirt is mighty scratchy for civic leaders with brains and a tender skin. Even so, leadership and hard work for community progress can be fun for busy business, professional and other men and women, provided they have the right tools with which to work. This is the functions of good community machinery and competent staff work. Without such help, leadership is a killing job, full of blunders and frustrations."<sup>7</sup>

In plain language, the Metro spokesman regards civic leaders as stuffed shirts who would make a lot of blunders without the assistance (100 per cent complete) of the Metro paid staff. This demotes civic leaders to the status of tools—actually, the ultimate prey—of the Metro paid staff which does the work (Metro style) and lets the local dupes strut the stage and take the bows. Comically, the proposal is similar to the method used in annual community chest drives.

Luther Gulick, 1313 leader, wrote that unflattering description of the civic leader bewitched by 1313; Professor Gulick also informed Americans that the cost of Metro city rebuilding would soar into trillions of dollars within the next twenty years.

Our government, indeed, is far from perfect. Spending is too high. But reshuffling governmental units into one pack held by Metro simply will not bring down taxes, no matter how loudly and noisily Metro advertises the false claim.

Actually, Metro is causing Americans to throw away the oar by which citizens can pull to safety—the ballot franchise. By vote, citizens can dismiss from office bungling or ignorant representatives who keep voting taxpayers into bankruptcy.

Every appointee that Metro is successful in substituting for an elected official cuts down on America's chance of correcting and disciplining officials who are responsible for extravagant government.

Every innovation of dictatorship, no matter how cleverly disguised, poses a threat to freedom. In this connection it is significant to note that during the debate in Congress concerning 1313's Federal Commission on Intergovernmental Relations,<sup>8</sup> which kicked 1313 into the

<sup>7</sup> "Operation Bootstrap," by Luther Gulick, *National Civic Review*, September, 1959, p. 401.

<sup>8</sup> "Who Are the Metrocrats?" by Jo Hindman, *American Mercury*, June, 1960.

Federal government, the Congressman who sponsored the bill (H.R. 6004—L. H. Fountain) admitted: "The Commission is a political innovation."

George Washington coached us on how to preserve the constitutional government that he and other great Americans gave to us. Washington warned: "Resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its (the Constitution's) principles."

Metropolitan Government is a present and dangerous innovation.

Metro embodies the spectre of regimentation. Metro master planning can hardly succeed without Metropolitan political power. It is toward the capture of power that the Metropolitan complex—1313—constantly strives in a complexity of twists and turns.

One twist to watch is the Metro practice of ripping off the label of Metropolitan Government when the program has been identified and rejected under the Metro name. In cases of desperation, 1313 promoters sometimes go so far as to publicly denounce "Metropolitan Government" while proposing Metro solutions, presumably their own, and to which they have lent their names.

*Cut off the public money which is feeding Metro.*

At the state level, we must insist that appropriations be stopped to the Council of State Governments.

We must see to it that the Commissions on Interstate (or Intergovernmental) Cooperation—1313's arm into the states, are disbanded.

We must observe the 1313-controlled state interim committees at work. We must expose the 1313 personnel which overloads the committee, and the 1313 staff members, and the 1313-packed lists of hearing witnesses called in. We must challenge the biased pro-Metro reports rendered to the legislatures by these 1313-loaded committees. Or better—insist that the *elected* legislators get back on the job and regain control in the name of the citizens they represent. 1313-identified elective officials should be dismissed from office on the grounds of divided allegiance.

At the Federal level, the 1313 Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established in 1959 (signed by the President of the United States on September 24, 1959), must be abolished, either by repeal or by cutting the appropriation to one dollar.

County governments must be cut back to size and prevented from swallowing the cities.

Metro-infested city halls need budgetary fumigating to drive out parasites attached to public payrolls. An audit should be made to see how much money is being spent from the city treasury on memberships in 1313 organizations, subscriptions, propaganda, and traveling expenses to 1313 annual conventions.

For instance, many cities belong to and pay dues to the American Municipal Association, 1313's lobbying organ which outdid itself in helping to pass the Federal CIR measure and which supported the Department of Urban Affairs legislation in 1962.

Many city managers belong to 1313's International City Managers Association. Other city personnel belong to other specialized 1313 organizations or associations affiliated with the 1313 program. If public employees wish to belong to the 1313 Metropolitan complex, let them belong at their own expense and at their own risk.

Why should taxpayers hire personnel unfriendly to the interests of self-ruling citizens? Why should taxpayers bear the brunt of miscellaneous nongovernmental expenses centered on 1313, an outlay of public funds which is bringing only grief in return?

In proof that the sleeping conscience of America is awakening to these questions, numerous organizations have passed resolutions deploring Metropolitan Government and portions of the 1313 program, including mental health and urban renewal. Such organizations include the Daughters of the American Colonists, businessmen's groups, homeowners, and taxpayers' groups. The Daughters of the American Revolution have blasted 1313's mental health program. The American Legion recently passed a resolution denouncing 1313's urban renewal movement in California.

The Sacramento Chapter of a California Home Owners and Taxpayers Association has drafted a ringing declaration hailing the great renaissance that is stirring:

"The spirit of America of 1776 should be revived for the preservation of the liberty, freedom, independence, and opportunity to progress that our ancestors fought for, and which should be recovered and preserved for ourselves and our posterity."

(Text, exclusive of 1962 addenda, based on a speech delivered at Riverside, California, in October, 1959.)

## “Social Engineering” for 1984

AT THE WHITE HOUSE Conference on Education in 1955, Americans were introduced to a technique known as “group dynamics,” whereby committees studying various educational subjects were manipulated into coming up with predetermined conclusions. Persons with a bias toward Federal aid to education, for instance, were favored as delegates at the state preliminaries which preceded the Washington meeting. On the eve of the conference, prevailing sentiment was reported by the Communist *Daily Worker*: “The demand for Federal aid is on the lips of every responsible thinking person as this Conference convenes.”

The predetermined conclusion favoring Federal aid was to be promoted, through “group dynamics,” by a corps of “planted idea carriers” who were all set to extract the pro-Federal aid recommendation from their respective subcommittees. News of this development was spread around at the time, and produced a sense of shock in some people who were unprepared for such advances toward “togetherness.”

“Group dynamics” would be disturbing enough if it were an isolated phenomenon. As it is, the technique is merely the best-publicized instance of an accumulating body of evidence—evidence which shows that a powerful movement is afoot to subject whole areas of American life to the sway of self-appointed “social engineers.” The result, according to available evidence, would be a world uncomfortably similar to that described by George Orwell in his famous novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

At work to achieve this goal is a whole array of individual “engineers,” government officials, planners, free-lance collectivists, and crackpots. The drive pops up in many different guises, occasioned by one or another legislative proposal at the state or Federal level. The much-agitated “mental health” issue, for example, in reality represents a dispute over one zone of the “social engineering” movement.

The principal danger of this “engineering” movement—and of such of its subdivisions as “mental health”—is that it equates certain political opinions with sanity and “right” thinking, and brands their opposition as sickness. Here, for example, is a classic definition of the symptoms of developing mental illness, new style. Dr. H. A. Overstreet, in his *The Great Enterprise—Relating Ourselves to Our World*, states:

“A man, for example, may be angrily against racial equality, public housing, the TVA, financial and technical aid to backward countries, organized labor, and the preaching of social rather than salvational religion. . . . Such people may appear ‘normal’ in the sense that they are able to hold a job and otherwise maintain their

status as members of society; but they are, we now recognize, well along the road toward mental illness."

Similarly, acceptance of "world citizenship" is linked with mental health by the following statement of the 1948 International Congress on Mental Health in London: "World citizenship can be widely extended among all peoples through the application of the principles of mental health. *Principles of mental health cannot be successfully furthered in any society unless there is progressive acceptance of the concept of world citizenship.*" (Italics added.)

In other words, a person adhering to conservative ideas is defined as mentally unbalanced. Similar formulae appear in such books as *The Authoritarian Personality*<sup>1</sup> and *The New American Right*,<sup>2</sup> which attempt to show that those who reject statism do so because of frustrations and neuroses. Thus, the so-called "normal" world is the world of pseudo-liberalism. Determination that those who reject it are simply "sick," of course, makes that much easier the job of engineering people, willing or unwilling, into living in it.

To cross the threshold of the "social engineering" fraternity is to enter a realm where pretentious gobbledygook passes as everyday speech.<sup>3</sup> Key words in the "engineers'" vocabulary include such terms as "sociogram," "sociodrama," "psychotherapy," "psychodrama," "telephenomena," "inter-personal relations" and other sociometric this-and-thats.

Sociometry compounds a variety of techniques and concepts from psychology, social and cultural anthropology, psychiatry and biology; it embraces a hodge-podge of activity suggested by its weird vocabulary, which is considerably more formidable than the things it represents.

For example, in spite of its high-sounding title, a "sociogram" is merely a chart resembling a maze of pool-table shots, diagramming such facts as whether "Helen chooses Frances," whether "Betty is Mary's first choice" and so on. Lines drawn between circles with people's names in them constitute a sociogram, and sociograms chart inter-personal paths between members of groups as small as three, as large as 250 people, or even more.

The object of sociometry is to apply all of its techniques to the activities of human groups with such scientific exactness that their behavior will be channeled along the paths desired by the planners.

Most influential of the "social engineers" is a man named J. L. Moreno, a Viennese social scientist who arrived in New York in 1925, forearmed with the "sociogram," the "psychodrama" and other

<sup>1</sup> *The Authoritarian Personality*, by T. W. Adorno, Harper & Brothers, N.Y., 1950.

<sup>2</sup> *The New American Right*, edited by Daniel Bell, Criterion Books, N.Y., 1955.

<sup>3</sup> *Who Shall Survive?* by J. L. Moreno, Beacon House, Inc., Beacon, N.Y., 1953.

sociometric techniques. Soon after arrival, Moreno teamed up with Dr. Bela Schick, who, as recently as 1957, was identified as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, a chief instrument of the Communist party in its conspiratorial attack against the processes of American government. Dr. Schick brought Moreno before a gathering of physicians and nurses at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, where the social engineer demonstrated the technique of psychotherapy, as described above. Moreno was on his way.

Over in Europe, Dr. Moreno apparently had been casting about for the best way of employing his new science. Ruminating on where to "plant" his ideas of reshaping human society, he rejected the idea of taking his plan to Soviet Russia, for the simple reason that a similar plan—Marxism itself—was already being tried there. So he brought his social engineering to the United States. He reminisced: "I preferred to be the midwife to an incoherent, confused, democratic way of life, than the commissar of a highly organized world." Moreno applauded the "dictatorship of the proletariat," but expressed distaste for Stalinist methods. He decided to replace the global socio-economic proletarian revolution with "small" sociometric revolutions.<sup>4</sup>

Dr. Moreno's views about the sociometric revolution and Dr. Schick's connections with one of America's most notorious Communist fronts<sup>5</sup> are not the only evidence of a strong affinity between the sociometry movement and those sympathetic to Moscow. The case of sociometrist Mark Zborowski, Soviet agent, is perhaps the most sensational revelation to date of the kind of people involved in this movement.<sup>6</sup> Zborowski, a self-confessed hireling of Moscow convicted of perjury in November, 1958, has enjoyed patronage and professional advancement into the most sensitive positions in America, all under the guise of mental health research. His progress along a chain of influence is so revealing an episode that it deserves its own sociogram.

Russian-born Zborowski, who spied upon the Trotsky entourage in Paris under orders from Stalin, entered the United States in 1946. He worked on a United States Navy research project at Columbia University, directed by Communist-fronter Ruth Benedict, where his im-

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, xxxix. Also, *Sociometry, Experimental Method and the Science of Society; An Approach to a New Political Orientation*, by J. L. Moreno, Beacon House, Inc., Beacon, N.Y., 1951.

<sup>5</sup> *Communist Political Subversion*, House Report No. 1182, released by Committee on Un-American Activities, August 16, 1957, p. 24.

<sup>6</sup> Resume of Zborowski case:

(a) *Report of Subcommittee to Investigate Administration of Internal Security Laws*, U.S. Senate, December 31, 1956, pp. 24-26.

(b) Testimony of Alexander Orlov, *Scope of Soviet Activity in the United States*, Hearings, Subcommittee on Internal Security Laws—U.S. Senate, February 14 & 15, 1957, Part 51, pp. 3421-29.

(c) *Scope of Soviet Activity in the United States*, *loc. cit.*, March 2, 1956, Part 5, pp. 117, 118, 119, 124, 126, 130, 135, 147-49.

mediate supervisor was the controversial anthropologist, Margaret Mead, who is a one-world mental health official and untiring supporter of the social engineering movement.

Helping Zborowski get Federal support was Lawrence K. Frank, mental health official. Zborowski applied for work on a sociometric project at a Veterans Administration hospital analyzing the reactions of hospitalized veterans "involved in the pain experience." Frank signed Zborowski's request for the job. The application was reviewed by the mental health study section and by the National Advisory Mental Health Council, where sat officials prominently identified with social engineering. Dr. S. Bernard Wortis was present on the National Advisory Mental Health Council at the time Zborowski's application was reviewed, and Margaret Mead and Leonard S. Cottrell, dean at Cornell University, held positions on the Mental Health Research Study section. Soviet agent Zborowski got the job.

Three years later, Zborowski sought patronage from the Russell Sage Foundation in New York, where Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. edits *Sociometry*, the magazine founded by Dr. Moreno.<sup>7</sup> The Foundation's board of trustees approved and advanced funds for Zborowski's continued study at the Bronx Veterans Administration hospital, with "greater independence as director of the project"—an unexplained adjustment that was effected simply by removing Zborowski's name from the Federal payroll and placing him on a Russell Sage grant. Zborowski was sentenced on December 8, 1958, identified as a henchman in a Soviet espionage ring in this country.

In 1955, with Margaret Mead and others of her ilk, Moreno backed a variety of one-worldism being advanced through something called "Children's International Summer Villages."<sup>8</sup> CISV assembles children of different nationalities and races and gives them practice in living together in summer villages; this experience supposedly is a sample of future one-world life. The children, moreover, return to their home groups as sociometrized "agents." Literature from CISV was distrib-

<sup>7</sup> "The Birth of a New Era for Sociometry," editorial by J. L. Moreno on occasion of transfer of *Sociometry* to American Sociological Society under editorship of Dr. Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. See *Sociometry*, Vol. XVIII, December 1955, No. 4, and Vol. XX, No. 2, June, 1957. (Russell Sage Foundation, 505 Park Avenue, New York 22, N.Y.)

<sup>8</sup> *Brochure: Children's International Summer Villages, Inc., 1955, Cincinnati's Second CISV.*

*Booklet: "The CISV—Steps Toward World Unity* by O. M. Gale, Manager of the Public Relations Division of Proctor and Gamble Company, Cincinnati; booklet reprinted from *Journal of Human Relations*, Central State College (Wilberforce, Ohio) Quarterly—Spring Issue, 1955. Reprint distributed by CISV, Inc., 634 Dixie Terminal Bldg., Cincinnati 2, Ohio.

Both the booklet and brochure were among literature displayed by the State Department as part of the Sixth National Conference (1957) of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO at San Francisco.



uted at a UNESCO gathering in San Francisco in 1957. UNESCO features Moreno-type sociograms in its teacher-training publications, included in the notorious booklet series, *Towards World Understanding*.<sup>9</sup>

Moreno tirelessly promoted his ideas in social science circles, and even succeeded in reaching the Nirvana of the collectivist planners: his plan was taken up by a government agency. In the early thirties, through his numerous contacts, he obtained an introduction to President Franklin Roosevelt. Subsequently, in a New Deal experiment called the "Centerville" project (a fictitious name supplied by the social engineers), American families were arranged in a neighborhood according to a chart laid out upon social engineering principles. A "key" family was strategically located so that its influence would have far-reaching effects in molding the attitudes of the entire community. The results of the experiment were checked out by secret ballot of the families and by quizzing children about family conversations.

Summing up the "Centerville" project in 1936, Dr. Moreno's magazine announced: "For the first time in 20 years, since Moreno began to develop the application of his sociometric technique in European resettlement programs during World War I, sociometric principles have been applied to an open community." The object of such experiments is to produce a predictable set of community attitudes, stimulated by "key" agents who have been placed in the community according to sociometric principles of influence and leadership.<sup>10</sup>

The "Centerville" experiment has by now lapsed into obscurity, but so-called "city planning" programs and the current gigantic "metro" government plan display many symptoms of the social engineering mentality. A rough estimate of how far the movement has proceeded may be formed upon inspection of the "urban renewal" and "community redevelopment" projects, which promote the knock-down-build-up craze that is evacuating U.S. homeowners by the thousands.

The parallel movement of "metropolitan government" also bears sociometric markings. "Metro" proposes to collect independent units of municipal government under a big super-government, and to maintain control of such bodies through something described as "appointed executive" administration. Since these proposed metropolitan districts frequently cross state lines, the very concept of government units

<sup>9</sup> This was the series that contained the famous statement: "As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should, therefore, use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism."

<sup>10</sup> "Centerville," *Sociometry*, Vol. I, July-October 1937, pp. 220-54. *Sociometry* (the book), *loc. cit.*, p. 73. Also, U.S. Resettlement Agency (1936), First Annual Report (a New Deal governmental agency). Moreno's magazine related that the report dealt with the "Centerville" project.

corresponding to them makes hash of our Constitution, which vests all reserved governing powers in the several states.

Similarly, the "guided minds" program in the public schools, which has been frequently discussed in the columns of *Human Events*, is a subdivision of the "social engineering" movement. Hidden sociometrists have been doodling in the schools for some time, unknown to the students or to the parents whose home life and socio-economic status come under close scrutiny. The "cum" files in school offices, containing cumulative information concerning pupils and their parents, provide information from which sociometrists perform research, write papers, and publish social engineering conclusions.

Not all schoolhouses are infested by the amazing snoopers, but in schools dominated by highly experimental practices, "cum" files, when opened unexpectedly to prevent file-stripping, reveal to parents an amazing sight. In a goulash of data are found transcripts of statements uttered by parents, students' autobiographies written as classroom assignments, and innocent remarks of children collected in notebook "logs" by teachers who are thorough agents of observation.

Apart from community planning programs and the "counseling" advocated at the school level by the engineers, there is the pyrotechnical subject of "mental health," which has been the most widely condemned aspect of the entire movement.

According to a publication of the University of Chicago, a person with a 100 per cent mental health rating would have no "defenses" at all and would simply agree to "adjust." Social engineers say: "This type of personality is very responsive to change in the outside world and within himself." And: "Good adjustment is attained when a patient leaves his pattern of socially unrewarded defenses for a pattern of socially acceptable defenses." (*Psychotherapy and Personality Change*, Rogers and Dymond; pp. 161, 162.)

When all the smoke has cleared, the central question involved in "mental health" is simply this: is mental illness a clinical disorder to be diagnosed on the basis of medical evidence, or is it a political matter to be decided by left-wing ideologues seeking to promote one-worldism and similar programs?

Because this is the important question, current "mental health" agitation should not be confounded with humanitarian legislation to deal with mental illness. The confusion between medically diagnosed mental disorder and politically diagnosed "frustrations" has allowed mental-health politics to ride the coattails of legitimate concern for the insane.

The roll of those who have been declared mentally "unhealthy" as an outgrowth of political controversy—in line with the Overstreet definition and the London manifesto—is a growing one. Some celebrated cases include the following: George Lichner, a student in Chicago who was sent to a psychiatrist because of deviationist behavior—George drew up a petition asking for segregated schools; Fletcher Bartholomew, the Radio Free Europe employee who was drugged, strapped into a

strait jacket and carried against his will across Europe and the United States, all because he criticized a number of RFE personnel; the Finn twins, who were committed to solitary confinement in a Federal prison, with their sanity discredited, because they accused certain public officials of engaging in illegal activity to deprive them of their property; Povl Hing-Jensen, the UN official accused of mental illness, and later believed murdered because he would not turn over a list of anti-Communist witnesses of the Hungarian Revolution to the UN Secretariat, where they might fall into the hands of the Communists; A. R. Fitzpatrick, a Californian who was arraigned for irrational behavior because he vehemently opposed America's swing to collectivism and because his protests incurred the dislike of a county supervisor; Whittaker Chambers, who was falsely accused, by innuendo, of being mentally unbalanced when he testified against Alger Hiss. Additional cases could be cited.

The "mental health" gambit has become so common that the forces of the left have even found it being turned against themselves. When Negro Professor Clennon King attempted to "integrate" the University of Mississippi by introducing himself there, Mississippi authorities decided that he must be unbalanced, and had him placed under observation!

Thus, in Chicago, to favor segregation is mental illness; in Mississippi the definition is reversed. This is the natural end result when political definitions of mental health are substituted for clinical ones; the political authorities can simply use the charge of mental illness to enforce their views on those who disagree with them.

The "social engineers," in addition to defining their opponents as sick, have developed a number of other techniques for getting their way. "Group dynamics," as worked up at the White House Conference, was one of these. Another technique is that of obtaining "canned" samples of public opinion, then presenting these to governmental bodies as the will of the people.<sup>11</sup> The State Department, which has been using this practice for a number of years to push its program, was caught red-handed at it in 1957. Poll "engineers" were striving for answers favoring foreign aid; in addition to slanted queries, a key question was worded so that answers to it would produce a biased finding.

Inspection of the State Department poll<sup>12</sup> discloses a striking resemblance to one detail of sociometry's political program, which calls for a Federal Department of Human Relations, tied to miniature sub-structures rooted in school, home, and workshop. The object of this

<sup>11</sup> George H. Gallup (Gallup Poll), American Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton, N.J., presently is chairman of the Council of National Municipal League, the 1313 parent body. Mr. Gallup also served on the editorial board of *Sociometry*, the social engineering magazine of J. L. Moreno. See Vol. VI, February-May, 1948.

<sup>12</sup> *Hearings* (June 21, July 1, 8, 9, 10, and 11, 1957), and Report (11th) Committee on Government Operations (August 14, 1957) House Report No. 1166, 85th Congress, concerning: *State Department Public Opinion Polls*.

apparatus, as described in Moreno's book, *Sociometry: An Approach to a New Political Orientation*, is to activate direct channels of communication with the "People" for the "dynamic" teaching of social integration. Public opinion, as in the State Department poll, would be shuttled past the elected House and Senate, direct to the Department of Human Relations.<sup>13</sup> With group dynamics in operation, and opposing opinion bludgeoned to conformity by group psychotherapy, or expelled as mentally sick, the resulting sociometric dictatorship would have easy sailing.

In the nature of the amorphous growth of the social sciences, it is difficult to determine the precise extent of "sociometry's" influence. Undoubtedly, millions have been spent on sociometric experiment to date, and billions more hang in the balance, as programs such as urban renewal and mental health await legislative decisions. Perhaps one of the most ominous notations concerning the advance of this new discipline was a remark dropped by Moreno himself. Writing of his ideas back in 1940, the chief sociometrist observed: "The fondest dream of my youth has come true, they are already used anonymously in many places."

Too long has this subject been obscured by hysterical charges and countercharges, and too often have its dangers been dismissed as the imaginings of the excitable. It is time that responsible men and women took a long, stern look at the phenomenon of social engineering. They must decide if it is molding the kind of America in which they want their children to live.

The foregoing article, previously published in *Human Events*, is included as Chapter X to illustrate a channel of control useful to Metro. By joining the nonclinical findings of mental health research with 1313's Interstate Compact on Mental Health, a political set of manacles is forged for the control of human beings. At the last count, twenty-two states had signed, *without Congressional consent*, 1313's Interstate Compact on Mental Health.

<sup>13</sup> "Function of Department of Human Relations" as a "nuclear structure of the Government of the United States," *Sociometry* (the book), *loc. cit.*, p. iii.

## 1313 Brainpicks the U.S.A. via the 1960 Census Household Questionnaire

PERSONS WHO WERE OUTRAGED by the prying Household Questionnaire of the 1960 Census<sup>1</sup> may be astounded to learn that 1313 was instrumental in that brainpicking of the American public.

Coercively, through threats of fine and imprisonment punishment, the unprecedented questionnaire reaped information dug from the recesses of human privacy. The H-questions (Housing) ran from number H 19 to H 46. Three of the questions concentrated upon the *whole building* in which the census answerer lived. Thus, tenants were placed in a position of informing concerning the property of their landlords.

Commercial map makers now are selling the questionnaire findings. On one such map, five levels of median home values are laid bare by census tracts.<sup>2</sup>

In another section of the controversial Household Questionnaire, the P-questions explored waitresses' tips, sick pay, personal habits, employment, layoffs, female fertility, romantic conquests, ancestors, schooling drop-out, residence for the past twenty-one years, current telephone number, and other queries so penetrating that thousands of Americans were stunned, offended, and reluctant to answer. Refusal to answer placed the citizen under threat of severe punishment. Penalty included stiff fine, jail, or both.

Most people answered.

Some did not.

The leviathan feat of brainpicking aroused Americans to such an extent that one mayor publicly pleaded with his multi-million constituency asking for cooperation in answering the census canvassers. In the census field offices, the census takers were called together in meeting and cautioned to "go slow."

High-handedness appeared early in events that led up to the 1960 Census. As far back as 1954, legislation was introduced to legalize the 1960 Census. Neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives conducted hearings on Bill H.R. 9729 which paved the way "to revise,

<sup>1</sup> Household Questionnaire for the 1960 Census of Population and Housing, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Form 00 PH-8, 12 pp. Budget Bureau, No. 41-5953, Approval expired December 31, 1960.

<sup>2</sup> Map—"Home Values—Los Angeles County—1960 Census," Brewster Mapping Service, 5110 Huntington Drive, South, Los Angeles 32, California, \$2.50 each.

codify, and enact into law Title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census." The revisions had been actively under consideration for years, yet the vital changes were left in the hands of back-office crews and were rushed to a vote in Congress virtually unchallenged.

Congressman William M. McCulloch, Ohio, submitted House Report No. 1980 on June 20, 1954. No hearings had been held by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Butler from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary submitted Senate Report No. 2497 on August 5, 1954. No hearings had been held by the Senate.

Both documents, products of staff personnel, laid out the radical Census of 1960 with its impudent and searching surveys. Section 221, relating to refusal to answer, received a complete revision by both the Senate and House revisionists. Offenses were defined and penalties prescribed. Constitutional safeguard embodied in the words "upon conviction thereof," were struck out as "surplusage."<sup>3</sup>

With its features of constitutional justice removed, Section 221, Title 13, as enacted now states: (precised) "Whoever . . . refuses . . . to answer . . . any of the questions on any schedule . . . shall be fined not more than \$100, or imprisoned not more than 60 days or both."<sup>4</sup>

It is upon this section that the son of Captain Eddie Rickenbacker, hero of World Wars I and II, was accused "guilty" during April, 1962. William F. Rickenbacker, thirty-four, had refused to answer the privacy-shattering Household Questionnaire during the 1960 Census.<sup>5</sup>

Acting Director, Bureau of the Census, A. Ross Eckler, has stated that the Bureau of the Census turns over to the Department of Justice information on refusals and that action has been instituted in a number of instances. Apparently, Mr. Rickenbacker's case is one of these instances.

The Department of Justice was requested to furnish data to complete the following table:

1. U.S. total of refusals to answer .....
2. Total of actions instituted against non-answerers .....
3. Total sentences imposed .....
4. Total other disposal of non-answering cases .....

In a letter dated May 1, 1962, Carl W. Belcher, Chief, General Crimes Section, replied:

"This will reply to your letter dated March 10, 1962, requesting statistics on criminal action taken against persons who refused to answer 1960 census questionnaires." (*sic*).

<sup>3</sup> Revision of Title 13, U.S. Code, entitled "Census."—Report No. 1980, House of Representatives, to accompany H.R. 9729, June 29, 1954, p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Code, Title 13, Section 221.

<sup>5</sup> *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, April 25, 1962.

"Your request will impose a very heavy burden on the Department to examine its records to ascertain the information desired. The Bureau of Census has indicated that it may be able to furnish the desired information more readily and accordingly a copy of your letter is being forwarded to the Director of the Bureau of Census for a reply."

The Bureau of Census answered on May 18, 1962:

"In the course of the census there were a number of instances where individuals failed to answer either part or all of the questions contained in the census forms. With few exceptions, failure to provide full information was inadvertent and was remedied through further contacts with the respondent by the original enumerator or by his supervisor. There were instances, however, largely because of misunderstandings, where individuals refused to answer some or all of the questions of the inquiries. Most of these cases were also solved by the Bureau's field staff . . . a few instances where our field staff informally requested the assistance of the local United States District Attorney who was able to negotiate the matter with the respondent to a satisfactory conclusion. . . .

"The action described above and the cooperation of the population resulted in the satisfactory conclusion of all the problem cases *except two* [italics added, Ed.] which required formal legal action. These two cases have been tried and both defendants were found guilty."

In a later letter, dated June 8, 1962, Mr. Richard Scammon, Director, Bureau of the Census, identified the two individuals, as follows: "The defendants were Mr. Victor Sharrow and Mr. William Rickenbacker. The cases were tried in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, at New York City."

At the peak of the 1960 Census, the *New York Times* reported in its February 14, 1960, issue, page 59:

"This flurry of census taking is part of the 1960 World Census program, a United Nations undertaking that began in 1955 and will end in 1964. So far, 68 censuses have been made. By the end of next year, all but a dozen of the estimated total of 202 population counts will have been completed."

"Taking many censuses at the same time permits comparisons between countries and compilations of over-all world totals that would not be possible if each country acted independently."

"There is more to it than timing, however. It is also necessary that the censuses produce comparable information. Western Hemisphere countries have coordinated their censuses in this respect through the Organization of American States [see MetroChart, Ed.]

for more than a decade. More recently the UN has taken over the project for all regions."

The *New York Times* article commented: "In Costa Rica . . . there has been a dispute over whether the money for this year's census should be used for a census or to buy lunches for school children."

It appears from the foregoing combination of facts that two Americans have been made to suffer under United Nations Charter law while Costa Ricans have gone out to lunch.

The sum total of two non-answerers sifted out of the millions of population seems slightly incredible in the face of existing facts. A number of persons in different sections of the United States have stated flatly they did not answer the Bureau of Census questions. Further, their separate testimonies converge on a description of bureaucratic treatment that consisted of threatening statements, by letter, telephone, and personal visitations by officials. In each instance, it is reported the harassment ceased suddenly and had not resumed, as late as summer 1962.

In the Rickenbacker case, Federal District Judge Richard H. Levet<sup>6</sup> ruled: "Since the census and questionnaire are clearly authorized by Congress . . . I fail to see how he (Rickenbacker) is protected here by the terms of the Fourth Amendment. . . ."

The Fourth Amendment pertains to the rights of search and seizure, a right which appears to be struck down under the UN aegis.

The lack of public hearings, the absence of Congressional debate, the premature vote aborted by the hurried efforts of senatorial promoters of the Census Bill weakens Judge Levet's congressionally-based opinion considerably. Further, the heavy concentration of 1313 advisors sitting en masse on lay committees that "advised" the Census Bureau on the 1960 census draft, poses the grave question: Is 1313 running the Federal census?

Official Census Bureau lists of the advisory committees' members provide the 1313 clue.

The *Congressional Record* reveals the drama of conscientious Senators overruled by 1313-serving peers. (See Vol. 100, Part 12, pp. 15095-16410, 83d Congress 2nd Session, August 19, 1954, Senate.)

On page 15121 of the *Congressional Record*, Senator Butler's railroad-ing of the 1960 Census Bill began. Hurriedly enacted, the legislation now allows mind-rummaging on an unprecedented and outrageous scale, with the information so openly available that the Census Bureau's promise of confidential restriction is laughable.

Formerly, the census laws permitted a governor or a court of record to obtain census records; also a private individual seeking genealogical information.<sup>7</sup> But now, after the 1954 tampering which has resulted in

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Congressional Record*, Vol. 100, Part 12, August 19, 1954, pp. 15122 & 15123.



the unprecedented 1960 Census, the following persons also can obtain sensitive census records: state officials, local officials, private concerns, and individuals.<sup>8</sup> This sweeping category which includes practically anyone and almost everyone, obviously opens census records to Metro governors, state and local Metro officials, commercial 1313 firms, research outfits, and sundry individuals.

1313 henchmen sitting on the lay committees that "advised" the Census Bureau should be called to account for this state of affairs.

Merely hours before the Senate vote, the late Senator Pat McCarran objected to the Butler railroading of the Census legislation. Senator McCarran requested additional time to study the pending bill and amendments.<sup>9</sup>

Likewise, Senator Millikin objected that Senator Butler wanted to rush the amendments through in "two minutes."<sup>10</sup>

Senator Langer got into the act, opined: "It should not require more than a minute to pass the bills . . . thousands of dollars have been spent in preparing this material."<sup>11</sup>

On August 19, 1954, the bill (H.R. 9729) was read the third time and passed, and that was that.<sup>12</sup>

Obviously, census data can be useful to marketing analysts, national advertising, chain stores and urban renewal experts, but it is unthinkable that citizens are to be punished, fined and jailed for refusing to yield answers for empirical purposes. The Constitution of the United States, if respected, upholds the freedom of any individual either to answer or not to answer questions that go far beyond the bounds of personal and spiritual privacy—and beyond the boundaries of good sense.

It will be remembered that Census Form 60 PH-6 (the short form) was mailed to households throughout the United States. Persons were to fill in the data and have the form ready when the census taker called.

Form 60 PH-8 was the twelve-page Household Questionnaire that was additionally presented to every fourth household.

In drafting details of the 1960 Census, permissible under the wide-open 1954 amendments, the Bureau of the Census consulted with advisory lay committees. Two of the advisory committees were so loaded

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15122. Also, Revision of Title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census," Report No. 2497—Senate, p. 1.

<sup>9</sup> *Congressional Record*, *loc. cit.*, p. 15122.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> History of H.R. 9729—from Index, 83d Congress 2d, Jan. 6, 1954, to December 2, 1954, p. 736: Mr. McCulloch, Committee on the Judiciary, 9249.—Reported (H. Rept. 1980) 9248.—Passed House, 9806.—Referred to Senate Committee on Judiciary, 9887.—Reported with amendments (S. Rept. 2497), p. 14922. Amended and passed Senate, 15123.—House concurs in Senate amendment, 15269.—Examined and signed, 15560, 15837. Presented to the President, 15560. Approved. (Public Law 740, 15564).

with Metro organizational personnel that 1313 influence was bound to prevail.

According to official lists of the Bureau of Census, represented on the Council of Population and Housing Census Users were the following 1313 core organizations and affiliates:

American Municipal Association—No. 13 on MetroChart  
 American Public Welfare Association—No. 11 on MetroChart  
 American Public Works Association—No. 10 on MetroChart  
 American Society of Planning Officials—No. 18 on MetroChart  
 Council of State Governments—No. 1 on MetroChart  
 International City Managers' Association—No. 14 on MetroChart  
 National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials—No. 16 on MetroChart  
 American Association for Public Opinion Research (affiliated with The World Association of Public Opinion Research)  
 American Council to Improve Our Neighborhoods (ACTION)  
 American Institute of Planners  
 Committee for Economic Development (steered by 1313 personnel)  
 National Association of County Officials  
 National Planning Association  
 Urban Land Institute, etc.

Many of the above are Metro ringleaders located at the 1313 PACH address, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Others, through interlocking personnel, organizational channels, and allied purpose identify with 1313 and Metro government. It is with these that the Bureau of Census consulted.

The Housing Advisory Committee, another consultant lay group "helping" the Census Bureau, included the big urban renewal operator, Webb & Knapp, Inc., 1313's American Municipal Association and ACTION (American Committee to Improve Our Neighborhoods), the latter two which were represented on the Population and Housing consultant panel, also.

A spot check of past Censuses<sup>13</sup> traces the growing invasion of personal privacy by the Census Bureau:

*Information required by:*

Census of 1790: Name of head of family, address, number of free white males, free white females and nonwhites attached to the household.

Census of 1830: Added to above inquiries were: number of deaf and dumb, blind, foreigners not naturalized.

<sup>13</sup> Inquiries Included in Each Population Census, 1790 to 1960. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (Robert W. Burgess, Director), 1960, 2 pp.

- Census of 1890: Questions asked tripled the content of foregoing years, went into detail on race, color, occupation, and ownership of private property.
- Census of 1940: Bore scars of the New Deal, queried as to employment in public emergency work (WPA, NYA, CCC, etc.), requested Social Security number.
- Census of 1960: Form 60 PH-6 (the short form) covered the points generally covered above, public emergency work excluded (the WPA categories). The Household Questionnaire (Form 60 PH-8) additionally was presented to every fourth household.

In summation, the Census of 1960 required: address; name; relationship to head of household; sex; race; month and year of birth; marital status; whether residence is on farm; place of birth—in which State, U.S. Possession, or foreign country; if born outside U.S., language spoken in home before coming to U.S.; country of birth of parents; length of residence at present address, where resided five years earlier; educational attainment; school or college attendance, and whether public or private school; times married and date of first marriage; of women ever married, how many children ever borne; employment status; hours worked in week preceding enumeration; date last worked; occupation, industry, and class of worker; place of work—which city or town (and whether in city limits or outside), county, state; means of transportation to work; weeks worked in 1959; earnings in 1959; other income in 1959; veteran status—which war and present service.

The more penetrating questions were elicited through the so-called 25 per cent sample (Household Questionnaire) which actually came close to being a 100 per cent survey-sample because four (4) persons in addition to the census answerer were covered by questions. The census taker wrote in the names of persons who were required to answer each "extra person" questionnaire.

The question relating to "place of work—whether in city limits or outside" is peculiarly interesting to public officials who wish to impose a *city income tax*, a piece of Metrocratic thinking.

If Metro can reach into a man's private life under the guise of the man's government, fine him, jail him, bankrupt him, enslave him to taxation, convict him upon the bar of Metro opinion through Metro judiciaries and their peers, then—where is freedom?

At what decade the Metrocrats climbed aboard the United States Census questioning is a topic for deeper research. Knowledge that the Metrocrats sit advising the Census Bureau now is a verified and disgusting fact.

The 1960 Census was a shocker. More alarming, census taking may be paced faster with shorter intervals between censuses. Presently spaced ten years apart, the Population and Housing Census (including the Household Questionnaire) may be back within three years, in 1965.

Before the results of the 1960 census were in, plans had been set in motion for a quick repetition.<sup>14</sup>

Metrocrats may try to amend the present Census law to reduce the ten-year interval to five and to gain acceptance for another Household Questionnaire. The 1960 brainpick expired December 31, 1960.<sup>15</sup> Americans need not be subjected to a reoccurrence of the ordeal if Americans refuse to be grilled in such manner. Representatives in Congress can correct the situation—if Americans insist.

Capture of the American Census by the Metrocrats adds additional proof that positions within American government have been preempted by radical social scientists bent upon harnessing all human affairs to subservience under the "New State." Including 1313's public administrators, the augmented crew of social engineers seem to be making headway toward their concept of "economic man" harnessed to the regimentation of a totally "planned world." Tax him, work him, analyze him for further exploitation.

The 1960 Census Household Questionnaire has provided history's most gigantic captive survey-sample for that purpose.

The insistent question again presses: Is Metro Communism?

Judged by its program, Metro definitely is collectivistic—the identical principle endemic to Communism. Further, the shameful brutalities of Metro's urban renewal strategies bear undertones brothered to scandalous programs that have erupted under Communism.

Metro's scorn for the human person, Metro's obvious attempts to subjugate individualism, cattle-like under the planned Metro State, certainly are strategies no less suffocating than the edicts of Moscow. *If there is a difference, it is merely deviation of degree, intensity, and timing.*

A Communist in New York predicted that the United States would move into Communism through the intermediate phase of socialism.<sup>16</sup> Metro's attempts to own property, to tool gigantic public works, to impose "land use" controls, to regiment the building industry (with other private industries presumably to be controlled, one by one) are but a few of Metro's socialistic hashmarks. To verify the indictment, a person needs only to trace socialism leading *from* Metro through its channels, or follow the traces of Metro socialism back to 1313. Either method will prove the point.

Too long has the socialism diseasing America been regarded *solely* as the amorphous fallout from Soviet thinking on the other side of the globe. Truth must admit another source: socialism in the United

<sup>14</sup> Statement by Hon. John Lesinski (D. Mich.), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, House of Representatives, release dated July 31, 1960.

<sup>15</sup> See Household Questionnaire, Form 60 PH-8, *loc. cit.*, p. 1.

<sup>16</sup> *Toward Soviet America*, author, William Z. Foster.

States includes the conscious guided effort of cell 1313. This facet, seen from the Communist timetable, embodies a phase of conversion described in the writings of William Z. Foster, the Communist who wrote *Toward Soviet America*.<sup>17</sup> The book, corroborated by the chilling disclosures of counteragents who have worked with and sat among Communists in Party buzz sessions, may provide a clue to the real nature of Metro.

Both Foster in his book and counteragents in their testimony state bluntly that the Communist hierarchy waits, watching the "big American plum" ripen to their Marxist taste.

When the Moscow take-over coup is rigged, according to Foster, the Communist proletariats (Workers) will evict Americans from their glittering (urban renewed, Ed.) apartments. Foster's detailed description predicted that the Workers would drive the "fleets of cars" formerly the property of private owners.<sup>18</sup>

Should a Metro take-over of the United States precede Foster's described Moscow conquest of America, the Communists would find the U.S.A. conveniently regionalized. In addition to being a Metro governmental unit, the region is a favorite U.S.S.R. unit of government, ten (10) regions presently being contained within the Soviet Union.<sup>19</sup>

At present in the United States, the TVA river-system "region" may be regarded as one of the freewheeling "authority" Metro governments. It is no accident that Metrocrats occupy key TVA administrative positions.

To strip the situation further: Metro and Communism are two entries racing for the same prize (wealth and the power to confiscate wealth and private property). Metro appears to be the domestic implementation of United Nations Charter law. The United Nations, in turn, strives for the complete regimentation of world government. Communism, of course, strives for world conquest.

Call it what you will—Communism or Metro—regimentation is a loathsome state of being for those regimented.

The regimentation by 1313 is taking place in a dollar-exchange economy. The regimentation of Communism proceeds in U.S.S.R.'s coupon-exchange economy.

Witness the contemporary paradox of anti-Communists who avidly support Metro (UN) government. Metrocrats gain prestige as "anti-

<sup>17</sup> *Toward Soviet America*, by William Z. Foster, copyright 1932, Coward-McCann, Inc., New York. Pp. 343.

"From capitalism to Communism, through the intermediary stage of Socialism; that is the way American society, like society in general, is headed. . .," p. 269.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 281.

<sup>19</sup> *Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1960. Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 128 pp. Obtainable through book shops selling Marxist literature in the United States.

Communists" while reaping wealth and power from the workings of Metro government.

It is pointless to argue over strategy. Whether freedom is bled by the Communist meat axe or the Metro stiletto makes little difference to the hapless citizen when oblivion is the final act. It is folly to cheer one of two bullies when the stronger will turn upon you, too.

From evidence at hand, it would seem that rank-and-file Americans are caught between two deadly pressures—one is Communism transplanted from abroad; the other threat is Metropolitan (Metro) Government which foolishly obliges the Communist trap.

## Metro vs. The American Individual

METRO, WE LEARN, is a monopoly of collectivistic, *unlimited* government that is attempting to unseat limited constitutional government at every level in the United States.

Merging of governmental units, abolishment of elective offices and rule by appointed executives typify Metro political aspects.

Master planning, including subsidized urban renewal, exemplifies Metro's economic side.

Metro works through a bewildering complex of forces, yet the basic principle of Metro—planned socialism—is recognized by those who look.

A socialist magazine, *Monthly Review* (April, 1959) took a look and endorsed Metro as No. 1 in a four-point socialist program. The socialist approval extends to public ownership of development land, a present Metro urban renewal practice.<sup>1</sup>

Public ownership of land was recommended in Detroit at the 1956 conference of the Michigan Society of Planning officials. A professor of Agricultural Economics at Michigan State reportedly stated that in order to get proper land use development, Americans must accent social rights by a broadening of the police powers and a diminishing of individual rights.<sup>2</sup> It was implied that private ownership of land was one of the individual rights slated to go.

From an economic viewpoint, Metro is a government of cowardice and despair. It is also an agency currently being used by freeloaders to loot the taxpayer. Some who promote economic Metro subscribe, by their actions, to the false belief that America's economy of private enterprise is inadequate and should cease. (Do not confuse true private enterprise with the type of freeloading business operation which poses as a private venture but which actually is backed by public funds or publicly-insured credit; that is the business type which supports Metro in the hopes of unfair gain.)

From a political viewpoint, Metro is a dictatorship under Metro law. Those promoting political Metro subscribe, by their actions, to the dangerous theory that ordinary people don't know what's good for them and must bow to the arbitrary decisions of Metro master planners.

To achieve control, at every level of government, Metro is forever

<sup>1</sup> *Monthly Review*, April, 1959, Editors, Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, 218 W. 10th St., New York 14, pp. 469, 486.

<sup>2</sup> *Community Planning Annual*, Michigan Society of Planning Officials Conference, Detroit, Michigan, April 21, 22, 1956, p. 37, "Regulations To Enforce Proper Land Use," by Raleigh Barlow, professor of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University.

amending, rewriting, and changing constitutional laws into Metro laws. So as not to inflame too many people, a few American symbols are left standing—the parchment of the Constitution, the red, white, and blue of the flag.

But somebody always asks, "Why Metro? Why would any intelligent being reject our form of constitutional government?"

That's a good question, because by our Constitution under God, the United States has been blessed with honor, freedom, and abundance as has no other nation on earth.

To better understand why certain people want Metro, envision Wealth and Power. In other words, the Desire-for-Money and the Political-means-to-get-it.

The Metro team appears to be composed of the fainthearted on the one hand and the predatory on the other. Plans of this ill-matched twain collide with traditional American faith, individual initiative, and self-reliance. The fainthearted, frightened by the ups and downs of competition, seek to "share the wealth." Predatory interests exploit the Metro situation and try to collect *more* than their share.

A variety of self-styled Metro experts are forcing 1313's total Metro program at every level of government.

In 1959, 1313 was discovered establishing a beachhead for Metro experts in the Federal government. I refer to the Federal Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a portable miniature of the Chicago 1313 clearinghouse.<sup>3</sup> ("Who Are the Metrocrats?" *American Mercury*, June, 1960.) Already, the Metro apparatus is anchored in the governments of the fifty states under the whip of 1313's Council of State Governments ("1313's Mail Order Laws," *American Mercury*, January, 1960).

CSG is not an official agency of government; in fact, the membership which our fifty states hold in CSG may, in time, be declared a violation of the United States Constitution (Article I, Sec. 10). CSG can be dissolved by Congress.

Through other sub-organizations, Metro is reaching for complete control of public welfare, urban renewal, town and city replanning, mental health, and many other Metro programs.

1313's powerful Federal lobbyist, American Municipal Association, influences mayors, civil service employees, county officials, master planners, welfare workers, city clerks, tax assessors, city attorneys, and public administrators, including city managers, in the United States and in foreign countries around the world.

The National Municipal League in New York, the executive "brain" of Metro, masterminds the entire 1313 clearinghouse. Behind NML is another shadow called the Institute of Public Administration, N.Y.

The most revealing Metro confession to date has come from an NML spokesman, John E. Bebout. In July, 1960, the NML assistant director spoke at the Con-Con Victory in Detroit, the celebration that

<sup>3</sup> H.R. 6904—Public Law 86-380, September 24, 1959.



marked a major step toward revision of Michigan's state constitution.

According to the *Detroit Times* (July 22, 1960) Mr. Bebout "said the basic wrong with most archaic state constitutions was the 'manacled' state and the handcuffing of government.'" United States history rings with the wisdom of the warnings: "Tie down government; put government in chains; *limit* government." Yet, here is a 1313 official complaining about constitutional limitations which keep American citizens free and put government in check.

I wrote to Mr. Bebout asking if he had been quoted accurately. Mr. Bebout replied,<sup>4</sup> insisting that the words attributed to him by the newspaper should not be quoted unless related properly in context. For context, Mr. Bebout supplied a personal three-page letter, a 1313 editorial, and a 1313 article. Against this background, Mr. Bebout's statement seems to imply that Federal government is growing stronger because "manacled" state government is kept weak. In so speaking, Mr. Bebout voices sixty-six years of 1313 ideology, boosted lately by CSG.<sup>5</sup>

At first glance, it might seem that both the Council of State Governments and National Municipal League were interested in helping state government survive. However, a recent occurrence indicates that their baby, like the tot held by Alice, is growing an ugly head.

The current malformation attracted attention in June, 1960, when the Port Authority of New York defied the Congress of the United States by refusing to submit PA records for needed examination and review. The Constitution charges Congress with review of interstate compacts.

The PA situation stems from an *interstate compact*,<sup>6</sup> an established, quite legitimate device which Metro is twisting to effect the eradication of states. 1313's CSG vigorously promotes *interstate compacts*. Metro's "agency/authority" type of government at any level of government has long been regarded as a political novelty—neither fish nor fowl, so to speak—not Federal, not state, not county, not municipal—but a free-wheeling untouchable.

At the interstate level, and in the instance of New York's Port Au-

<sup>4</sup> John E. Bebout letter, August 26, 1960.

<sup>5</sup> Books re: Interstate Compacts:

a. *The Administration of Interstate Compacts*, by Leach and Sugg. Copyright, Louisiana State University Press (1959). Author's credit acknowledgment given to 1313's CSG, *et al.*

b. *Interstate Cooperation*, by Vincent V. Thursby, Associate Professor of Political Science, Florida State University. Copyright, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C. (1953), 2153 Florida Avenue, Washington 8, D.C.

<sup>6</sup> PA—New York, bi-state compact with New Jersey. Port Authority Compact of April 30, 1921.

References contained in: *New York Times*, June 24, 1960; June 22, *Plainfield Courier-News*, June 24, 1960. *Daily News*, New York, July 1, 1960. *The Bayonne Times*, N.J., July 5, 1960. *Newark Evening News*, N.J., July 22, 1959. Re: Puerto Rican offices of the Port of New York.

thority, created by New Jersey and New York, the Metro oddity is attempting to elevate itself above the Congress of the United States. It comes as no surprise to find 1313's CSG in the thick of the fight *defending the insurrection*.<sup>7</sup>

The PA matter may land in the courts. If the courts decide that the PA can flout Congress, then Metro will have won another grim round against the freedom of the individual American citizen.

*State.* It will be interesting to see what sort of constitution Michigan and other revision states might get under Metro auspices. Metro is in the process of revising its own experimental state constitution (NML's *Model State Constitution*) because 1313 members have fallen into disagreement over what does comprise a good state constitution.

Man remains free in direct ratio to the extent by which he limits the power of his government. *Metro by practice and Metro by statement stands violently opposed to limited government.* It is this basic and ill-advised Metro policy which has plowed into the high seas of public disapproval.

*City.* Every month, numerous American towns and cities are beating down Metro's municipal program when voters reject schemes to establish Metro council-manager government.

*County.* In New Mexico county-level Metro took a beating in Albuquerque and in Bernalillo County. A proposal to consolidate the quaint old city and county governments was defeated by ballot.<sup>8</sup> The citizens were informed that a "few millions in bonds," if approved, would pay for the governmental merger.

An observer of the campaign stated, "The people didn't understand any of the fine print, nor had they ever heard of '1313' or Metro or anything of the sort, at the time. They just revolted at the mention of any more debt and interest, and up and beat tar out of the pink cloud gentry—about two to one."

That was in October, 1959. The lesson to be learned from Albuquerque is that you, facing Metro in your home town, can help your neighbors beat Metro, even if they don't know the history of 1313. Time enough to tell them between that round and the next, for Metro always returns in another guise.

In Georgia a Metro symbol-standing technique came to light last spring when a bill introduced to the legislature proposed a merger of

<sup>7</sup> *Proceedings Against Austin J. Tobin*, House of Representatives' Report No. 2117, August 23, 1960, "Minority View of Hon. John V. Lindsay, pp. 4-8.

See also: *Proceedings Against S. Sloan Colt*, Report No. 2120, House of Representatives, August 23, 1960. Pp. 75. *Proceedings Against Joseph G. Carty*, Report No. 2121, House of Representatives, August 23, 1960. Pp. 75. *Return of Subpoenas—Port of New York Authority Inquiry* before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, June 29, 1960. Pp. 75.

<sup>8</sup> *National Civic Review*, November, 1959, p. 593.

Macon city and Bibb county. Sections of the legislation would have reduced the office of *elected* sheriff to the status of process server (H.B. 1080, Legislature of Georgia, 1960, Secs. 46, 47). The law enforcement powers and duties of the elected sheriff were *shifted* to a police commissioner who was to be elected, not by the citizenry, but by the Metro governing *authority*, an action tantamount to appointment. When put to a vote in Macon and Bibb, the Metro legislation was defeated.

In Holland, Michigan, an annexation of farmlands to the city, for the purpose of imposing land use master planning, was followed by an election to disannex. The detachment proposal failed in June, 1960, but farmers readied plans to request another ballot.<sup>9</sup> This will be not the first nor last fight put up by farmers; as a force for good government, America's farmers and ranchers are alert to any threat of land control.

Legislators, too, speak out against Metro. Pinpointing Metro's attack upon county government, the Honorable Sheridan Hegland, member of the California State Legislature, commented in August, 1960:

"There appears to be a well-organized concerted effort to destroy traditional county government. . . . Many of those most active in this movement are recent 'public administration' graduates of our colleges and universities. A parade of witnesses appeared before a meeting of the County and Municipal Government Committee of the State Assembly in Sacramento. . . . A number of us were shocked at the strength of the movement and the frankness of the witnesses. We were told that county government was old-fashioned, hopelessly inefficient, and one witness compared it to an ox-cart. They wanted the Committee to recommend changing the rules so that nearly all county officers would be appointed. It is obvious that this will be one of the major issues of the 1961 legislature."<sup>10</sup>

The *Congressional Record*, June 28, 1960, page A-5620, carries a resolution condemning Metropolitan Government. (Extension of remarks of Hon. Donald L. Jackson, of California.)

Metro is smarting under the well-deserved flak. A professor briefing 1313's American Society of Planning Officials (ASPO) has conceded that America "isn't ready for Metro yet." Professor Gilbert Y. Steiner, director of the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, also admitted defeats for Metro in St. Louis, Cleveland, Nashville, Knoxville, Seattle. He attempted to excuse 1313's biggest blunder to date—Metropolitan Government in Miami-Dade, Florida. ("City Killers," *American Mercury*, September, 1959.)

<sup>9</sup> *Evening Sentinel*, of Holland, Michigan, various issues, June and July, 1960.

<sup>10</sup> *Los Angeles Daily Journal* (legal paper), August 1, 1960.

Subsequently, Nashville was "readied." On June 28, 1962, a Metro city-county merger was adopted in Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee. Steps toward transitional consolidation will be slowed pending outcome of a court test of the Metro charter early in 1963.

Metrocrats—those who promote Metro—unblinkingly accept the principle of police power as a way of getting things done. Metrocrats regard the domineering Miami-Dade Metro charter as the ideal approach: with political power, all else is possible to Metro by force.<sup>11</sup>

But seeing Miami-Dade's Metro taxation soar, other cities have shunned political Metro. While never abandoning the political approach, Metro has reversed its preferred procedure into the current method—seeking foothold through Metro master planning.

You will hear more and more outbursts from property owners when plans now in the making come for public hearings before city, county, and state governing bodies. Land is regarded by pro-Metro politicians as a commodity to be reassessed for higher taxation. By the housing industry, land is viewed as a base for rapid construction turnover. By pro-Metro merchants, high density population on the land is envisioned in terms of pocketbooks and of paychecks to be spent by prospective buyers. The ancient greed for land continues unabated!

1313's whip over master planning is held by ASPO (American Society of Planning Officials). Executive director, Dennis O'Harrow, also heads the U.S. Committee for International Federation for Housing and Town Planning (IFHTP) which connects with UNESCO, World Health Organization, United Nations and other international bodies, including the Communist-sprinkled IUA (International Union of Architects).<sup>12</sup>

Also linked to this worldwide planning organization are: American Institute of Planners, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO is quartered at 1313 headquarters), housing associations in Cincinnati and Philadelphia, and the New York State Division of Housing. Also, city planning commissions in Cincinnati, Columbus, Detroit, San Francisco; Universities of California, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Harvard.<sup>13</sup>

Federal financing has aided Metro master planning in the United States. Urban Planning Law, Title VII, was enacted by Congress in

<sup>11</sup> Recommendations of John T. Howard, head, Department of City and Regional Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass. Delivered address at the National Conference on Metropolitan Growth, Washington, D.C., November 24-25, 1958, "Land Use Panel," p. 5.

<sup>12</sup> I.U.A. (International Union of Architects) described in Moscow-published *Housing in the U.S.S.R.* (1960), by S. Tutuchenko. Pp. 135. Book is obtainable from book shops dealing in Marxist literature.

<sup>13</sup> International Federation for Housing and Town Planning brochure, available from 1313's ASPO.

the Housing Act of 1954, the same act that unleashed urban renewal bulldozers upon the American people. (Public Law 560, 83rd Congress.)

Sometimes dubbed the "701 Program"<sup>14</sup> because it is authorized by Section 701, the program provides twenty million dollars in Federal money to match state and local funds for master planning, even in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Federal grants also are available for *interstate* comprehensive planning, thereby furthering 1313's program to abolish the states in favor of Metro regions.

At the time the planning legislation was before Congress in 1954, 1313's New York brain, the NML, rushed to publication its version of a state planning law that would open the gate to Federal money. Today, certain passages of California's planning law (Title 7 of Gov. Code) enacted in 1959 (S.B. 597) are lifted bodily from 1313's *Model State and Regional Planning Law*. It is possible that other states have knuckled under to Metro in similar manner.

In rare instances, Metro planning may be financed 100 per cent by local funds, but then, with the expectation of crediting the amount toward a future urban renewal project.

If 50 per cent Federal planning money comes from Washington, the local newspaper usually publishes a release containing key words, such as "Federal planning assistance," "comprehensive plan," "land use masterplan," etc. President of the Regional Plan Group in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut region is Amory H. Bradford, who is also vice-president and general manager of the *New York Times*.

A master plan consists of maps, diagrams, and explanatory statement. Key elements are "land use," "traffic flow," "schools and recreational outlay." Public payroll planners or private consultants may draft the master plans.

Far from being the orderly process claimed, Metro master planning disrupts existing social and economic order. Master planning—on the drawing board—may change radically a city's entire character—change it from a garden city to cliffs of towering apartments, from spacious living to crowded high density congestion, or to any other purpose desired by the planner. Man becomes a statistic of interest only in how many square feet he should occupy.

"Experts" falsely equate Metro master planning with business planning. Any thinking person knows that there is a great deal of difference between the two: Business or industry plans with its own property; Metro planners plan with property belonging to others.

Zoning is the precise implementation of Metro land-use master plan policy.

Boston experimented with wide-scale zoning before World War I but

<sup>14</sup> Per HHFA (Housing and Home Finance Agency) news releases and publication, "the urban planning assistance program,"—6-page folder. Can be ordered from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. 5 cents.

it was Los Angeles, in the 1920's, which literally pioneered.<sup>15</sup> Used as a tool to space the postwar population influx of those years, zoning today has become the tool to relocate population.

Well-meaning persons argue, "Zoning is a good thing." True—if the zoning is upheld. But a Metro master-plan ordinance can be so written that the Metro rezoning overrides existing zoning against the property owners' wishes.

By-products of Metro replanning are frequently tragic:

(1) A businessman must go out of business or change his vocation because his business no longer conforms to the new Metro zone.

(2) Householders are thrown into the category of lawbreakers because their homes have become nonconforming or "substandard" due to the sudden enactment of a Metro building or housing or rezoning code.

(3) Property assessments are raised, taxes hiked.

(4) Property titles become clouded. A property owner whose land is caught under a proposed Metro park or street may run into no end of trouble. If he wants to sell, the master plan may act as a scarecrow in the face of the buying public. If he wants to improve his property, he does so at his own risk, and until time runs out and the Metro master plan for another planned use goes into effect.

(5) Enriched are a favored few. A feature of the replanning fad appears to be a gift of value—the promise of untroubled and insured land use for a specific period of time. The practice follows 1313 textbook formulas (*Urban Land Use Planning* by F. Stuart Chapin, Jr.) in which the guarantee of land use is created by rezoning. After 20, 30, 40 years, as determined by the planners, master planning is expected to start all over again.

*The present wave of Metro master planning, overthrowing plans made in the twenties, appears to be the scheme's first full-fledged replanning assault.*

Under the free economy, in which Metro master planning would not be tolerated, prospective land buyers would have to do their own legwork instead of calling on the government to furnish land in convenient large parcels at cut-rate prices. Metro master planning is geared to squeeze out small property owners for the benefit of large land redevelopers.

What is the Communist view of the situation? The following quote is based on the Fifth Congress of IUA, to which so many 1313 organizations are linked:

"The Congress convincingly confirmed that private ownership of land in West European and American countries is one of the principle obstacles hindering the successful progress of town-building. (*Housing in the U.S.S.R.* by S. Tutuchenko, Moscow, 1960.)"

<sup>15</sup> *Los Angeles Times*, May 24, 1960.

Tutuchenko, a Red architect, praised the Soviet Union for providing conditions for what he called "intelligently planned, beautiful human settlements." He wrote:

"The Socialist Revolution did away with private ownership of land. Architects much more easily transcend difficulties in the selection of lots for new housing development or in replanning and reconstructing towns or in building new residential districts. (*Ibid.*)"

In the United States, bold Metro planners admit that the conflict over land is taking place here, and that master planners now think in terms of large land areas, not in lot sizes.<sup>16</sup>

A city's future growth pattern can be set at will by a master planner; easy Federal planning money compounds the chances of more planning mistakes made faster in a shorter period of time. Conscientious realtors are disturbed by the practice of master planning, charging that Metro planning lends itself to shady dealings. Speculative profits can be thrown to persons or organizations capable of influencing the planners or able to acquire information in advance of the public release of the master plan.

Prudent citizens are rejecting hasty and ill-advised Metro master planning: In Illinois, a combined zoning-planning proposal, introduced to the Champaign county board of supervisors in 1958, languished throughout 1959. Sangamon County farmers (Springfield area) put up a spirited barrage in June, 1960, and stalled a regional master plan.

Signal Hill, California, rejected<sup>17</sup> a Federal planning assistance grant on August 15, 1960, becoming the first city, at this time, known to have disdained the Federal "pork barrel."

At the First International Seminar on Urban Renewal, held in Europe in 1958, a professor from the United States told the worldwide assembly that he was in favor of "disposable cities" made of structures built for short-term use.<sup>18</sup>

War ruin periodically has made city rebuilding mandatory in Europe. Not so, in the United States. Nevertheless, Metro's key man, Luther Gulick, has announced that the cost for all this during the next twenty years would approximate the staggering sum of \$80-trillion. (One editorial quotes him at \$250-trillions.)

Of the \$20-millions authorized by Congress, \$8.5-millions were expended at the end of 1959—just for planning, not for urban renewal operations. Forty-three states and 1,369 cities as of June, 1960, were slipping from the dangerous Federal planning flood. The following box score is typical:

<sup>16</sup> *Los Angeles Times*, May 15, 1960.

<sup>17</sup> *Signal Hill Tribune*, August 19, 1960. Also, letter from City Clerk Leonard Simson, dated August 19, 1960.

<sup>18</sup> *Indianapolis Times*, October 20, 1958.

## TERRIBLE 1313 REVISITED

<i>State</i>	<i>No. of Cities</i>	<i>1960</i>	<i>Federal Grant</i>
Tennessee	55	June	\$192,450.00
Pennsylvania	20	June	62,730.00
Pennsylvania	49	July	184,880.00
New Jersey	10	July	76,450.00
New Jersey	21	August	141,900.00

This free-flowing fountain of public money—your money—has attracted all sorts of survey firms, consultants, associations, institutes and conferences. For twenty-five cents, the Urban Renewal Administration in Washington will mail you a booklet telling how to choose a planning consultant.

In May, 1960, ASPO, 1313's society of planning officials, told its Florida convention of more than 1,500 planners, economists, and public officials from around the nation, that the central cities should be redeveloped.

National Planning Association promulgates the childish notion that planned economy in the U.S.A. is different in principle from the planning that is "made in the U.S.S.R."<sup>19</sup>

Most dangerous by-product of master planning is a city's vulnerability to urban renewal after adoption of a master plan. Urban Renewal Commissioner, David M. Walker, said (August, 1960):

"The urban planning assistance program is a most important adjunct of the urban renewal program."

In July, 1960, Commissioner Walker created another adjunct, the Federal Urban Renewal Council; he appointed ten lay citizens from banking, the steel industry, mercantile trade, investments and the construction industry.

There are millions of people in the United States; there are hundreds of thousands of businesses; yet even a quick glance at the new Urban Renewal Council shows several appointees and firms unmistakably linked with 1313.<sup>20</sup>

Commissioner Walker named to the council an official from the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company of Newark, N.J. The firm also is represented in 1313's National Municipal League.

Sears, Roebuck and Co. published a pro-urban renewal booklet entitled *ABC's of Urban Renewal* (1957). Personnel sponsoring the booklet likewise are prominent in the Federal Urban Renewal Council and in 1313's National Municipal League.

The Commissioner told the builders, investors, merchants and industrial leaders who comprise the urban renewal advisory body:

"Before us is a gigantic task—one involving a quickening of the

<sup>19</sup> *Los Angeles Times*, December 28, 1959.

<sup>20</sup> Membership in Urban Renewal Council listed in news release HHFA-URA No. 60-292, July 30, 1960. (Housing and Home Finance Agency, Urban Renewal Agency.)



translation of sound plans into steel and stone and cement. . . . I am convinced that our urban areas must meet the challenge of the 1960s and the 1970s not only by clearing slums and refurbishing older structures, but also by preparing for the impact of some 60 million additional inhabitants."<sup>21</sup>

Mr. Walker's 60-million figure was 30 million in December, 1959, when quoted by Associated Press. The population figure became 80 million in Mr. Walker's August 5, 1960, address to the summer graduating class of Duquesne University. A spokesman from the Commissioner's own Washington office since has set the figure back at 60 million. It just goes to show how Washington bureaucracy tosses millions around—whether dollars or people.

Now, if all the "translation" into steel and stone and cement were accomplished on private venture capital, sound prosperity would result. As it is, the debt-money financing and Metro laws are caponizing the housing industry into flabby overexpansion, tax paid.

The Building Officials Conference of America moved from New York to join 1313 at Chicago in 1959, bringing the Metro hardcore to twenty-three key organizations. BOCA attempts to regulate construction through building codes. 1313's Directory (1954) reports BOCA interlocking with American Society of Building Officials and Pacific Coast Building Officials Conference, lately renamed International Conference of Building Officials.

An article by a Pontiac, Michigan, attorney, George Cram, warned:

"Masterplanning can very easily become the 'regimentation of the use of real estate.' Such a possibility should never be allowed to grow in the hands of municipal governing councils, boards, bodies or bureaus, no matter how expert its planners may be, and no matter how worthy its objectives, nor how high its purpose may seem to be and no matter how sincere its advocates may appear—*Michigan State Bar Journal*, April, 1956."

A subtotal taken on the Metro revolution shows land "acquired" from many private owners becoming concentrated under public ownership (Metro agencies/authorities). Sometimes, after land-use restrictions have been tattooed land goes to redevelopers approved by Metro. Violation of contract can cause such land to revert back to public ownership. Meanwhile, dispossessed property owners live in public housing or other relocations as provided by Metro law.

If your home town blossoms with malls, cement "frills," and urban renewal projects laced with "steel and stone and cement"—and more lately, with aluminum—look closely. You may discover that while your attention was turned elsewhere, the local planning department launched into Metro master planning.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

What can you do?

Weed out injurious Metro laws; insist upon "due process of law" instead of the dangerous shortcut of master planning. Cut off the money. State, local, and Federal governments support Metro's various forms.

At the Federal level, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1313's task force, should be abolished. At the state level, legislators should withhold tribute to 1313's Council of State Governments. Injurious "land use control" must be denounced and prevented. Lastly, continue to expose all ramifications of 1313.

There is one word of cheer: After the ballot repudiation of Metro in 1959, NML called an emergency meeting that May, presumably to tranquilize alarmed Metrocrats. Early in 1960 Metro scolded its city managers, charging them with lack of enthusiasm;<sup>22</sup> (Why should they be wildly enthusiastic? Their jobs would be the first to vanish in Metro merging.) A financial journal has reported a falling-out between Metro fringe planners and the "payroll" variety, as the planner employed by the government is dubbed.<sup>23</sup>

Seems nobody, at this late date, wants to be blamed for the disgrace of urban renewal bulldozing! It is my personal conviction that many well-meaning but naïve persons are caught unhappily in the 1313 machine.

To explain Metro in the sense of partisan politics is impossible. Fact is, the Metro program is political witchweed that will blight both parties if they don't uproot it soon.

In the gaslit era, predatory interests vied with the political machines in fleecing the American public. At the turn of the century, a third crew intervened—the so-called Progressives. Events suggest that these forerunners of the New Deal and Fair Deal called an uneasy truce with the predatory elite. From that cease-fire, emerged the Fast Deal—Metropolitan Government.

The new Metro machine aspired to unseat elected politicians, or at least politicians who cannot be harnessed to serve Metro's purpose. 1313 became the interlocking directorate. A new breed of middlemen was sired—public administration "experts."

When the UN came along, the matter ceased to be domestic. Metro guidelines were flung into the UN, through UNESCO, also unilaterally through 1313's CIMC (Committee on International Municipal Cooperation) and now, through ASPO-IFHTP, the master planners.

The whole shabby Metro union of Progressive with Predatory is exhibiting signs of the doublecross to be expected of any such mismatch. Whereas Progressives idealistically advocate regulating monopolies for the benefit of the people, it appears now that the Predatory-within-Metro are regulating the interests of the people to benefit monopolists.

<sup>22</sup> *National Civic Review*, March, 1960.

<sup>23</sup> *Wall Street Journal*, June 3, 1960.

Metro apparently derives its mandate from the UN Charter (Articles 55-72, *et al.*). Charles Abrams, UN-Metro master planner, reportedly described New York City's housing conditions as being so deplorable that the UN ought to be asked to investigate THAT domestic situation.<sup>24</sup>

Old machine politics, indeed, corrupted weak men in government yet those nineteenth-century hooligans never tried to change the basic form of American government. It remained for the Metrocrats in the twentieth century to dare to do that.

When Americans realize the threat of Metro and its UN bodyguard, the great pendulum of public opinion will swing. Then, 1313's Metro, like all forces of oppression throughout history, will come to an end.

---

<sup>24</sup> *New York Times*, October 25, 1959.



## APPENDICES



# Appendix I

Table of State Funds Paid to Metro Treasury—Council of State Governments

(Based on official returns from a survey of the 50 States)

State	Year	Appr./Payment First Amount	Current Appr./Pmt. Amount	% Increase Rate	Cumulative Total June 1959
Alabama	x	\$	\$ 6,000.00 y		\$ x
Alaska	x		500.00 y		x
Arizona	x		2,500.00 y		x
Arkansas	1949	2,000.00	5,000.00	150	28,000.00
California	1942	6,000.00	31,250.00	420	349,000.00
Colorado	1939	500.00	5,250.00	950	37,593.17
Connecticut	x		7,500.00 y		x
Delaware	x		2,500.00 y		x
Florida	1940	2,000.00	14,000.00	600	103,000.00
Georgia	1937	6,000.00	9,000.00	50	162,000.00
Hawaii	1958	1,000.00	1,000.00		2,000.00
Idaho	x		2,500.00 y		x
Illinois	1937	850.00	31,000.00	3,547	342,200.00
Indiana	x		11,250.00 y		x
Iowa	1941		5,000.00		68,107.53
Kansas	x		5,000.00 y		x
Kentucky	1938		9,375.00		90,225.00
Louisiana	1941	1,100.00	9,375.00	752	76,313.98
Maine	1939		2,500.00		x
Maryland	x		7,500.00 y		x
Massachusetts	1940	1,000.00	17,500.00	1,650	184,500.00
Michigan	1944	5,000.00	15,000.00	200	195,000.00
Minnesota	1942	1,000.00	7,622.00	662	88,077.51
Mississippi	1944	750.00	5,000.00	566	45,500.00
Missouri	1941		15,750.00		157,500.00
Montana	1955		600.00		2,200.00
Nebraska	1941	250.00	6,650.00	2,560	68,390.30
Nevada	x		2,500.00		x
New Hampshire	1940	250.00	2,500.00	900	23,000.00
New Jersey	1936		19,250.00		x
New Mexico	x		3,500.00		x
New York	x		50,000.00 y		x
North Carolina	x		12,500.00 y		x
North Dakota	1947		2,500.00		x
Ohio	x		32,500.00		x
Oklahoma	x		8,000.00 y		x
Oregon	1943		3,750.00		44,500.00
Pennsylvania	1939	4,375.00	37,500.00	757	443,750.00
Rhode Island	x		3,000.00 y		x
South Carolina	1938		7,500.00		94,000.00
South Dakota	x		2,500.00 y		x
Tennessee	1943	750.00	9,375.00	1,150	80,000.00

## TERRIBLE 1313 REVISITED

State	First Appropriation/ Year	Payment Amount	Current Appropriation/ Pmt. Amount	% Increase Rate	Cumulative Total June 1962
Texas .....	x		22,500.00 y		x
Utah .....	1943	1,500.00	3,000.00	100	34,000.00
Vermont .....	1940	200.00	2,500.00	1,150	26,300.00
Virginia .....	x		9,375.00 y		x
Washington .....	x		3,500.00 y		x
West Virginia .....	1940	1,000.00	7,500.00	650	85,000.00
Wisconsin .....	x		7,500.00 y		x
Wyoming .....	x		2,500.00 y		x

x State unable/unwilling to supply information.

y Contribution rate-schedule furnished by secondary official source.  
May 1962.



\* \* \* \* \*

## Appendix II

### Lesson Plan for Study Groups

#### Suggested Procedure:

1. Call a pre-Session meeting
2. Choose a Moderator to set study group meeting dates
3. Write to 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, for the free publication lists. Address the particular Metro organization whose literature you wish to obtain. Each publishes an individual list. Or ask Public Administration Service (PAS) for the order blank that covers several 1313 organizations
4. Procure, well in advance of Sessions, materials that need to be ordered, or purchased, or borrowed from public libraries
5. Check the public library for Metro publications that may be available
6. Throughout your study of Metro, *evaluate*. Keep in mind the basic principles of U.S. constitutional government. Note how Metro Government deviates through collectivization and dictatorial rule
7. Read daily newspapers. Soon, you will be able to recognize and identify Metro organizations and projects that are in the news, also Metro officials, *and legislation*

#### Session No. 1 For General Information regarding Metro read and discuss the following titles (found in Bibliography)

The directory published by 1313, entitled: *Thirteen-Thirteen*  
"Terrible 1313 Revisited"—Chapter I of this book

*A Half Century of Municipal Reform*

*MetroChart*—Study and relate to the readings

*National Civic Review*—any issue

*Sociometry*, by J. L. Moreno

(For a better understanding of Metro's current promotion: Department of Urban Affairs in United States Government)

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962—To create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

*Hearings and Report of House of Representatives* (Report No. 1360), February, 1962—Committee on Government Operations

*Hearings*—Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, February 14, 15 & 16, 1962

*Congressional Record*, February 21, 1962—see debates on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, also pp. A1314-18

(If your library does not have copies of the *Congressional Record*,

your Congressman will send you a free copy of the date you specify, in this instance, the issue of February 21, 1962)

Session No. 2 Case History of Miami-Dade Metro Experiment

*The Government of Metropolitan Miami* (see Bibliography)

"City Killers," article in *American Mercury*, September, 1959

*MetroChart* (see front of this book)

*Model State Constitution* (5th ed., 1948)

*Public Management*, issues of April, 1959, p. 85; September, 1959, p. 209; July, 1960, p. 146; December, 1960, p. 273

*National Civic Review*, issues of January, 1959; December, 1959; January, 1960

Newspapers: *Miami Herald*, *Miami News*, *Allapattah-Edison Journal*, *North Dade Journal* (all in Miami, Florida); *Sarasota News*, Sarasota, Florida. The newspapers contain vivid news releases of Metro unrest, high taxation, punitive Metro police power, abuses of government

*The Charter of Metropolitan Dade County, Florida*, adopted May 21, 1957

Session No. 3

and Urban Renewal

Session No. 4

See NAHRO on MetroChart

"The Metro Monster"—Chapter III of this book

"Urban Renewal Laws"—Chapter IV of this book

"'Sacramento Plan' Pitfalls"—Chapter V of this book

"Bunker Hill—1959"—Chapter VI of this book

"Urban Renewal Search and Seizure"—Chapter VII of this book  
*Urban Renewal Notes* (free) from Urban Renewal Administration, HHFA, Washington, D.C.

"Bulldozer at Your Door," *American Mercury*, September, 1959

Check your daily newspapers for activities of Metro-associated organizations including NAHB, ACTION, NACO, etc.

*Slum Clearance and Related Housing Problems*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 2nd Session, January 7, 8 and 9, 1958. (Send to your Congressman for a copy)

Session No. 5 Metro abolishes check-and-balance in government—substitution of collectivistic Metro laws

*Government of Metropolitan Sacramento* (book)

*National Municipal Review* (now titled *National Civic Review*) issue of July, 1957, p. 362

"St. Louis Defeats Metro Plan," *American Mercury*, March, 1960

*National Civic Review*, February, 1960, p. 91, "Voters Reject St. Louis City-County District Plan"

*Model State Constitution*—1948 edition

*Model County Charter*, 1956

- Model City Charter*, 5th ed. 1941
- "Metro and Its 'Fronts'"—Chapter II of this book
- "Metro Testing Grounds"—Chapter VIII of this book
- "Will Americans Surrender to 1313 Dictatorship?"—Chapter IX of this book
- Henson No. 6 Intelligent Americans can save Freedom
- Model State and Regional Planning Law (1954) (see Bibliography)
- Your local land use plan (city, county)
- Your current State Planning Act (or law)
- National Civic Review*, selections:
- "Ithaca Plans on Regional Basis," June, 1960, p. 321
- "Milwaukee Land Use Planning," October, 1960, p. 495
- "Atlanta Area Has 5-County Planning Agency," November, 1960, p. 562
- "Planning—City to Nation," September, 1961, p. 417
- "Social Engineering"—Chapter X of this book
- "1313 Brainpicks U.S.A."—Chapter XI of this book
- Metro vs. the American Individual—Chapter XII of this book

\* \* \* \* \*

## Appendix III

### Action Plan for Individuals or Organizations

**Your Goal:** To preserve in the U.S.A. the basic concepts of freedom established by our Founding Fathers and projected through constitutions, city and county charters and laws validated under the Constitution of the United States of America

**Your Policy:** To present true facts, to expose false 1313 concepts that threaten to supplant the basic concepts of American freedom, to denounce programs and movements that are detrimental to individual Freedom

To repudiate United Nations Charter law and its ramifications implemented as Metro law

**Your Purpose:** To prevent/to delay/to correct undesirable changes or amendments, or revisions which would cause our American Constitution, state constitutions and charters, city charters and laws to deviate from the basic concepts of freedom

To insist upon respect for American rights, including private ownership of property free from seizure, personal privacy, freedom of movement, actions and decision when in accord with the Constitution of the United States of America

**Your Materials:** A. Constitution of the U.S.A. and, your state constitution, codes, statutes, laws

Your county and city charters, laws, resolutions, ordinances, and codes

B. 1313-published Metro Constitutions, Charters, "model" laws, ordinances, directives, etc.—for exhibition before county and city councils, citizen meetings, public hearings, person-to-person

**Steps:**

1. Define your Problem. Is it Federal, state, county, or municipal level? This may sound elementary, yet time and effort have been wasted by persons who appeal to the wrong officials or tribunal. For instance, it is fruitless to contact your U.S. Congressman on a strictly local county matter, if you are aiming at correction. Human nature being what it is, the Congressman would politely refer you elsewhere but the brush-off wastes your time, and he rejoices that the trouble is not in his jurisdiction to handle
  2. Obtain official proof of the change proposed, such as the actual copy of the proposed ordinance, or map of the land-use plan, or Metro-revised charters
- or—

If you wish to correct a Metro-made error already committed, such as a punitive building code, secure a copy of the code

or—

Any other tangible evidence of your problem as created by Metro forces

3. Compare documents. Compare the 1313 Metro "template" or proposed pattern, the existing law that would be changed, and the Constitution of the U.S.A. Decide which comes closest to following the intent of the American Constitution: the time-honored law or the proposed Metro law?
4. Isolate undesirable features; list them; be sure of your facts
5. Write the elected officials responsible, e.g. your councilman, mayor, senator or congressman, county supervisor. Do not waste your time on appointees, such as city managers, county appointed executives or Federal appointees. *Concentrate on the official who casts the vote that will alter your living conditions*
  - a) Mail your written objections/protests to the clerk of the official body, to insure that your opinion is properly and publicly recorded
  - b) Back up your letter/protest by your personal appearance at meetings, hearings, etc. and/or
  - c) Join a delegation of neighbors and fellow-citizens to pay a call upon the recalcitrant elected official who is responsible for the problem, or who can decide for or against it
  - d) Pinpoint 1313, the Metro complex. Pose the question: "Why should this self-appointed coterie overthrow check-and-balance government in the United States?"
    - (1) Speak out; make yourself heard
    - (2) Utilize letter-to-the-editor columns of newspapers, magazines, and other public forums of opinion. This method helps to magnify and to spread your sound opinion and to add to the sum total of public opinion in general
6. Keep up the good work! Let nothing you dismay.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Appendix IV

### Persons Affiliated with Metro 1313 (partial lists)

*AMA*—American Municipal Association, offices in Chicago and Washington, D.C.

George Christopher, mayor, San Francisco, California  
Anthony J. Celebrezze, mayor, Cleveland, Ohio  
Harold I. Baumes, League of Virginia Municipalities  
Jay T. Bell, Colorado Municipal League  
Gordon T. Butler, Florida League of Municipalities  
Gordon S. Clinton, mayor, Seattle, Washington  
Richardson Dilworth, mayor, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
Robert H. Fust, New Jersey State League of Municipalities  
James C. Gardner, mayor, Shreveport, Louisiana  
Don Hummel, mayor, Tucson, Arizona  
Louis C. Miriani, mayor, Detroit, Michigan  
Allen E. Pritchard, Jr., League of Kansas Municipalities  
Raymond R. Tucker, mayor, St. Louis, Missouri  
Ben West, mayor, Nashville, Tennessee  
Frank P. Zeidler, mayor, Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
Patrick Healy, Jr., executive director

*NML*—National Municipal League (1313 parent body), 47 East 68th Street, New York 21, N.Y. (Roster, as of April, 1962)

#### *Officers*

William Collins, president, New York  
John S. Linen, vice-president, New York  
Arthur B. Langlie, vice-president, State of Washington  
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., treasurer, New York  
Alfred Willoughby, executive director, New York  
Richard S. Childs, chairman, Executive Committee, New York

#### *Council*

George H. Gallup, Princeton, N.J., Chairman  
Frederick L. Bird, Newtown, Conn.  
Alan K. Browne, San Francisco  
L. P. Cookingham, Fort Worth  
Jerome K. Crossman, Dallas  
E. D. Dodd, Toledo  
Harold W. Dodds, Princeton, N.J.  
Alfred E. Driscoll, Morris Plains, N.J.  
Charles Edison, West Orange, N.J.  
Bayard H. Faulkner, Montclair, N.J.

Gerald W. Frank, Salem, Ore.  
 Ewart W. Goodwin, San Diego, Calif.  
 Luther H. Gulick, New York  
 Harry T. Ice, Indianapolis  
 Rev. W. Seavy Joyce, S.J., Boston  
 Betty L. Knox, Hartford  
 Harry J. Krusz, Long Beach, Calif.  
 Mark S. Matthews, Greenwich, Conn.  
 Cecil Morgan, New York  
 Vernon C. Myers, New York  
 Otto L. Nelson, Jr., New York  
 Mrs. Maurice H. Noun, Des Moines  
 John A. Perkins, Newark, Del.  
 Murray Seasingood, Cincinnati  
 Edmund B. Shea, Milwaukee  
 Harold S. Shefelman, Seattle  
 James A. Singer, St. Louis  
 Frank A. Vanderlip, Jr., New York  
 Wilson W. Wyatt, Louisville

*Regional Vice-Presidents*

Jac Chambliss, Chattanooga  
 Robert S. Cushman, Chicago  
 Charles R. Diebold, Buffalo  
 Ben B. Ehrlichman, Seattle  
 John B. Gage, Kansas City, Mo.  
 Carl J. Gilbert, Boston  
 Barry Goldwater, Phoenix  
 Lloyd Hale, Minneapolis  
 Arthur E. Johnson, Denver  
 L. E. Marlowe, Richmond, Va.  
 Norris Nash, Oakland, Calif.  
 H. Bruce Palmer, Newark, N.J.  
 Robert H. Rawson, Cleveland  
 Thomas R. Reid, Dearborn, Mich.  
 Thomas Graham, Louisville  
 Paul Schweitzer, Norfolk, Va.  
 Lee M. Sharrar, Houston  
 Edward C. Sullivan, San Antonio  
 H. V. Watkins, Jackson, Miss.  
 John F. Watlington, Jr., Winston-Salem  
 Winston W. Wynne, Miami

*On the magazine, National Civic Review staff, are:*

John E. Bebout  
 William J. D. Boyd  
 William N. Cassella, Jr.  
 Richard S. Childs  
 Samuel K. Gove

George H. Hallett, Jr.

H. M. Olmsted

Anne K. Stich

PAS—Public Administration Service (Washington, Chicago, San Francisco) 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois

*Governing Board*

Dennis O'Harrow, American Society of Planning Officials—ASPO  
Kenneth O. Warner, Public Personnel Association—PPA

Frank Bane (formerly director of Council of State Governments—CSG, now is on the Federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations)

Louis Brownlow

Joseph F. Clark, Municipal Finance Officers Association—MFOA

Charles F. Conlon, Federation of Tax Administrators—FTA

Loula F. Dunn, American Public Welfare Association—APWA (No. 11 on MetroChart)

Patrick Healy, Jr., American Municipal Association—AMA

Donald F. Herrick, American Public Works Association—APWA (No. 10 on MetroChart)

Lawrence A. Kimpton, University of Chicago

John D. Lange, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials—NAHRO

Robert J. M. Matteson, American Society for Public Administration—ASPA

Orin F. Nolting, International City Managers' Association—ICMA

Albert W. Noonan, National Association of Assessing Officers—NAAO

Clarence E. Ridley

Alfred Willoughby, National Municipal League—NML

H. G. Pope, executive director

Herbert A. Olson, Central Services Director (PACH)

NAHRO—National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials  
1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois (maintains Washington, D.C., office for on-the-spot coverage of Federal agencies)—1958 roster

*Officers*

Philip F. Tripp, president

Executive director, New Bedford Housing Authority

Charles L. Farris, first vice-president

Executive director, St. Louis Housing and Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authorities

M. B. Satterfield, second vice-president

Executive director, Housing Authority of the City of Atlanta

*Board of Governors—Regional Representatives*

*New England*

Robert T. Wolfe

Executive director, Housing Authority of the City of New Haven



Harland A. McPhetres  
Director, Massachusetts State Housing Board

*Middle Atlantic*

The Very Reverend Monsignor Leo A. Geary  
Commissioner, Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority

Ellis Ash

Deputy director, Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency

*North Central*

William N. Millich  
Superintendent of Operations, Detroit Housing Commission

McCinton Nunn

Director, Toledo Metropolitan Housing Authority

*Southeastern*

Frederic A. Fay

Executive director, Richmond Redevelopment and Housing  
Authority

Harold J. Dillehay

Housing Authority of the City of Charlotte

*Southwest*

Robert Badon

Executive director, Housing Authority of the City of New Iberia

Dowell Naylor, Jr.

Executive director, Housing and Land Clearance for Redevelop-  
ment Authorities of Columbia, Missouri

*Pacific Southwest*

John W. Beard

Executive director, Housing Authority of the City and County of  
San Francisco

Allen R. Reed

Executive director, Housing Authority of the County of San  
Joaquin

*Pacific Northwest*

Charles W. Ross

Executive director, Seattle Housing Authority

Mrs. Betty Bergerson

Administrative assistant, Housing Authority of the City of  
Tacoma

*Board of Governors—Members-at-large*

Louis Danzig

Executive director, Housing Authority of the City of Newark

Dr. Karl L. Falk

Chairman, Housing Authority of the City of Fresno

Paul S. Freedman

Executive director, Housing Authority of the County of Cook

Mrs. Edna Garrett

Executive director, Housing Authority of the City of Corpus  
Christi

Mark K. Herley

Assistant director, Detroit Housing Commission

Edmund Horwinski

Executive director, Housing Authority of the City of Oakland

Joseph H. Lyons

Executive director and secretary-treasurer, Housing Authority of the City of Providence

Mrs. Marie C. McGuire

Executive director, The Housing Authority of the City of San Antonio

Walter B. Mills, Jr.

Executive director, Greater Gadsden Housing Authority

William L. Rafsky

Development coordinator, City of Philadelphia

James D. Richardson

Executive director, Housing Authority of the City of Vallejo

Walter M. Simmons

Executive director, Memphis Housing Authority

Robert D. Sipprell

Executive director, Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority

Charles E. Slusser

Commissioner, Public Housing Administration

Richard L. Steiner

Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration

Oliver C. Winston

Director, Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency

*Board Members ex officio the Officers*

Knox Banner

Executive director, Housing Authority of the City of Little Rock

*U.S.C.M.*—U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1707 H Street, Northwest, Washington 6, D.C.

*Officers (as of 1958)*

Norris Poulson, president

Mayor of Los Angeles

Richard J. Daley, vice-president

Mayor of Chicago

Robert F. Wagner, immediate past president

Mayor of New York City

*Trustees*

W. Haydon Burns, mayor of Jacksonville

Anthony J. Celebrezze, mayor of Cleveland

Wm. B. Hartsfield, mayor of Atlanta

David L. Lawrence, mayor of Pittsburgh

Wm. McG. Morrison, mayor of Charleston, S.C.

*Standing Committee on Legislation*

Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., chairman

Mayor of Baltimore

*Advisory Board*

John B. Hynes, chairman  
 Mayor of Boston  
 Philip Bayt, mayor of Indianapolis  
 Neal S. Blaisdell, mayor of Honolulu  
 George E. Brunner, mayor of Camden  
 John J. Buckley, mayor of Lawrence  
 Gordon S. Clinton, mayor of Seattle  
 Joseph E. Dillon, mayor of St. Paul  
 E. J. Evans, mayor of Durham  
 James T. Hanlon, mayor of Scranton  
 Allen Street, mayor of Oklahoma City  
 Richard C. Lee, mayor of New Haven  
 Thomas A. McCann, mayor of Fort Worth  
 Louis C. Miriani, mayor of Detroit  
 J. W. Morgan, mayor of Birmingham  
 Walter H. Reynolds, mayor of Providence  
 Clifford E. Rishell, mayor of Oakland  
 John Rosenblatt, mayor of Omaha  
 Adiel F. Stewart, mayor of Salt Lake City  
 Allen C. Thompson, mayor of Jackson, Miss.  
 R. L. Thornton, Sr., mayor of Dallas  
 Frank P. Zeidler, mayor of Milwaukee  
 Harry R. Betters, executive director

*BOCA*—Building Officials Conference of America, Inc., 1525 East 53rd Street, Chicago 15, Illinois

*Officers*

S. Logan McConnell, president  
 Chief, Division of Regulatory Inspections, New Orleans, Louisiana  
 A. H. Schroeder, first vice-president  
 City Architect, St. Paul, Minnesota  
 Albert P. Backhaus, second vice-president  
 Director, Dept. of Public Improvements, State of Maryland  
 Norman E. Schmidt, secretary  
 Director of Building, Evanston, Illinois  
 S. B. Maple, treasurer  
 Building Inspection Superintendent, Wichita, Kansas

*Executive Committee*

Wm. G. Wharton, Building Commissioner, Richmond, Virginia  
 Arthur N. Rutherford, Code Consultant, West Hartford, Connecticut  
 Theodore H. Anderson, Chief Building Inspector, Greenwich, Conn.  
 William H. Guhman, Building Code Consultant, Clayton, Missouri  
 Stephen H. Harnett, Assistant Supt. of Buildings, Jersey City, N.J.  
 Verner L. Lane, Building Commissioner, South Bend, Indiana  
 O. M. Pushkin, Chief Building Inspector, Miami Beach, Florida  
 John Ed. Ryan, Director, Department of Building & Safety Engineering, Ann Arbor, Michigan

F. J. Veale, Building Commissioner, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

*Staff:*

Paul E. Baseler, Executive Secretary

Code Correlator—BOCA Codes

Joseph E. Bartell, Technical Assistant

*IPA*—Institute of Public Administration, 684 Park Avenue (at 68th Street), New York 21, N.Y.

*Officers*

Richard S. Childs, chairman (originator of council-manager form of government)

Otto L. Nelson, vice-chairman

John S. Linen, treasurer

Luther Gulick, president

Charlton F. Chute, director

*Trustees*

Francis W. H. Adams

Richard S. Childs

Luther Gulick

Herbert Hoover

John S. Linen

Otto L. Nelson

George S. Van Schaick

Delos Walker

Bethuel M. Webster

## Appendix V

### 100 City Elections Reject Metro Council-Manager Plan between March, 1959—April, 1962

City	State	Election Date	Official Notice in	
			National Civic Review	Page
Albion	New York	10/11/60	Nov. 1960	550
Altoona	Pennsylvania	11/3/59	Dec. 1959	58
Americus	Georgia	5/9/61	June 1961	316
Amherst	Ohio	1/17/61	Apr. 1961	199
Angleton	Texas	Nov. '59	Jan. 1960	29
Ashland	New Hampshire	3/14/61	May 1961	258
Athens	Ohio	11/3/59	Dec. 1959	582
Benton	Illinois	4/21/59	June 1959	304
Bloomington	Minnesota	7/26/60	Oct. 1960	489
Blue Ash	Ohio	not stated	Jan. 1961	34
Boca Raton	Florida	11/21/61	Jan. 1962	29
Boynton Beach*	Florida	6/13/61	July 1961	363
Bristol	Connecticut	not stated	Sept. 1961	431
Brockton	Massachusetts	not stated	Dec. 1959	581
Brooklyn Center	Minnesota	11/7/61	Feb. 1962	78
Buckhannon	West Virginia	3/5/60	Apr. 1960	195
Burlington	Iowa	9/23/61	Dec. 1961	603
Carbondale	Illinois	3/3/59	Apr. 1959	197
Caribou	Maine	not stated	June 1960	313
Castle	Pennsylvania	not stated	Dec. 1959	581
Centralia	Washington	6/20/61	July 1961	364
Clarksdale	Mississippi	3/27/61	May 1961	259
Constantine	Michigan	11/8/60	Jan. 1961	35
Conyers	Georgia	3/2/60	Apr. 1960	195
Crossville	Tennessee	10/24/61	Jan. 1962	29
Cumberland	Rhode Island	11/8/60	Dec. 1960	615
Danville	Kentucky	11/8/60	Dec. 1960	615
Derry	New Hampshire	March '62	May 1962	270
Des Plaines	Illinois	4/18/61	June 1961	317
Dowagiac	Michigan	4/14/60	June 1960	314
Downers Grove	Illinois	6/3/61	Sept. 1961	431
Edwardsville	Illinois	not stated	Feb. 1961	89
El Dorado	Arkansas	5/19/59	July 1959	357
Fairfield	Ohio	4/25/61	June 1961	316
Falmouth	Massachusetts	3/14/61	May 1961	258
Florence	Alabama	advisory vote 4/21/59	June 1959	304
Fort Smith	Arkansas	8/16/60	Oct. 1960	489
Fostoria	Ohio	6/16/59	Sept. 1959	419

## TERRIBLE 1313 REVISITED

City	State	Election Date	Official Notice in National Civic Review	Page
Gladstone	Missouri	2/23/60	Apr. 1960	195
Goffstown	New Hampshire	not stated	May 1961	258
Granite City	Illinois	10/24/60	Dec. 1960	615
Great Bend	Kansas	4/3/62	May 1962	270
Hibbing	Minnesota	3/29/60	May 1960	255
Hilliard	Ohio	5/2/61	June 1961	317
Hubbard	Ohio	10/11/60	Dec. 1960	615
Huntington	Pennsylvania	11/7/61	Jan. 1962	29
Ipswich	Massachusetts	not stated	May 1962	270
Juneau	Alaska	not stated	July 1961	364
Kenosha	Wisconsin	4/3/62	May 1962	270
Keokuk	Iowa	9/22/59	Nov. 1959	531
Kirksville	Missouri	not stated	May 1961	259
Kirkwood	Missouri	11/3/62	Dec. 1959	582
Lake Geneva	Wisconsin	7/17/61	Sept. 1961	431
Lebanon	Missouri	10/6/59	Nov. 1959	531
Lewiston	Idaho	6/8/59	July 1959	357
Lima	Ohio	7/25/61	Sept. 1961	431
Madison	South Dakota	not stated	Sept. 1961	431
Marinette	Wisconsin	4/5/60	June 1960	314
Markham	Illinois	4/23/60	June 1960	314
Marshall	Minnesota	8/16/60	Oct. 1960	489
Milford	Connecticut	6/15/59	Sept. 1959	419
Milton	Florida	6/14/60	Sept. 1960	430
Milton	Washington	3/14/61	May 1961	259
Morrilton	Arkansas	6/6/61	July 1961	363
Newington	Connecticut	11/8/60	Jan. 1961	34
Newport	Vermont	3/3/59	May 1959	253
Newport	Vermont	again 5/12/59	July 1959	357
Northbridge	Massachusetts	3/14/61	May 1961	258
Norwalk	Connecticut	council vote	Sept. 1959	419
Olathe	Kansas	11/3/59	Dec. 1959	582
Oshkosh	Wisconsin	4/6/59	June 1959	304
Ottumwa	Iowa	4/5/62	May 1960	255
Pahokee	Florida	5/3/60	June 1960	314
Paragould	Arkansas	11/3/60	Dec. 1960	615
Parkersburg	West Virginia	9/13/60	Oct. 1960	488
Parkersburg	West Virginia	again 1/18/62	Mar. 1962	153
Pecos	Texas	12/8/60	Feb. 1961	89
Pikeville	Kentucky	not stated	Feb. 1960	88
Pilot Rock	Oregon	5/20/60	July 1960	373
Placer County	California	5/16/61	July 1961	364
Portland	Connecticut	10/5/59	Dec. 1959	581
Provo	Utah	11/7/61	Jan. 1962	29
Pulaski	Tennessee	1/10/61	Feb. 1961	89
Randolph	Massachusetts	March '61	Dec. 1961	602
Richmond	Kentucky	11/7/61	Dec. 1961	603

City	State	Election Date	Official Notice in National Civic Review	Page
Richmond	Missouri	3/6/59	May 1959	254
Ridgewood	New Jersey	11/8/60	Dec. 1960	615
Rosenberg	Texas	5/21/60	July 1960	373
San Anselmo	California	council vote 9/16/59	Nov. 1959	531
San Jose	California	2/20/62	May 1962	270
Sioux Falls	South Dakota	7/17/61	Sept. 1961	431
Treasure Island	Florida	11/21/61	Jan. 1962	29
Treasure Island	Florida	recount 3/6/62	May 1962	270
Tullahoma	Tennessee	11/8/60	Dec. 1960	615
Vernon	Texas	3/3/59	Apr. 1959	197
Vernon	Texas	again 7/7/59	Sept. 1959	420
Vienna	West Virginia	11/28/60	Jan. 1961	34
Waldwick	New Jersey	11/8/60	Dec. 1960	615
Washington	Missouri	Feb. '59	Apr. 1959	197
Watertown	Wisconsin	4/5/60	June 1960	314
Willoughby Hills	Ohio	10/24/60	Dec. 1960	615
Wilton	Connecticut	8/15/59	Sept. 1959	419
Winslow	Arizona	10/16/61	Jan. 1962	29

NOTE: In addition to the above defeats, some council-manager proposals never get off the ground, as the following account illustrates:

In mid-April, 1960, possibility of a county-manager form of government for Dawson County fizzled during a public meeting. Apparently, it had been planned that if the proposal for the new form of government were well accepted, petitions would be circulated to place the issue before the voters. Persons attending the meeting opposed the move. The chairman of the group promoting the council-manager notion resigned and no future meetings were planned.

—taken from a news release, *Great Falls Tribune*  
Dawson County, Montana, April 18, 1960.

\* Although Boynton Beach, Florida, rejected a council-manager proposal on June 13, 1961 (see NCR, July, 1961, p. 363), 1313's International City Managers' Association—ICMA, added Boynton Beach to the council-manager city list in 1961 (see NCR, February, 1962, p. 78).

# Appendix VI

## Abbreviations

Abbrev.	Complete Title	On MetroChart	(Core No.)
ACTION	National Association To Improve Our Neighborhoods		
AMA	American Municipal Association	x	13
APWA	American Public Works Association	x	10
APWA	American Public Welfare Association	x	11
ASBO	American Society of Building Officials	x	
ASPA	American Society for Public Administration	x	20
ASPO	American Society of Planning Officials	x	18
BOCA	Building Officials Conference of America	x	23
CCJ	Conference of Chief Justices	x	4
CIMC	Committee for International Municipal Cooperation—U.S.A.	x	22
CIR	Commission on Intergovernmental Relations		
CSG	Council of State Governments	x	1
FTA	Federation of Tax Administrators	x	19
GC	Governors' Conference	x	3
HAC	Housing Advisory Committee of U.S. Bureau of Census	x	
HHFA	Housing and Home Finance Agency		
HOG	House of Governors		
ICBO	International Conference of Building Officials	x	
ICMA	International City Managers' Association	x	14
ICMH	Interstate Clearinghouse on Mental Health	x	9
IFD	International Federation for Documentation (U.N.E.S.C.O.)	x	
IFHTP	International Federation of Housing and Town Planning		
IMO	Inter-American Municipal Organization	x	
IPA	Institute of Public Administration		
IUA	International Union of Architects		
IULA	International Union of Local Authorities	x	
LCC	League of California Cities	x	
LWV	League of Women Voters	x	
MFOA	Municipal Finance Officers Association	x	15
NAA-G	National Association of Attorneys-General	x	6



## APPENDICES

161

Abbrev.	Complete Title	On MetroChart	(Core No.)
NAAO	National Association of Assessing Officers	x	17
NACO	National Association of County Officials		
NAHB	National Association of Home Builders		
NAHRO	National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials	x	16
NASBO	National Association of State Budget Officers	x	7
NASPO	National Association of State Purchasing Officials	x	8
NCCAO	National Conference of Court Administrative Officers	x	
NCCUSL	National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws	x	
NCR	National Civic Review		
NIMAPC	Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission		
NIMC	National Institute of Municipal Clerks	x	21
NLC	National Legislative Conference	x	5
NML	National Municipal League	x	
OAS	Organization of American States	x	
PA	Port Authority, New York		
PACH	Public Administration Clearing House 1313 Chicago (the central core)	x	
PAS	Public Administration Service	x	2
PPA	Public Personnel Association	x	12
PPC	Parole and Probation Compact Administrators Association	x	
UN	United Nations		
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization	x	
URA	Urban Renewal Administration		
U.S.C.M.	U.S. Conference of Mayors	x	

\* \* \* \* \*

## Bibliography

The author regrets that satisfactory arrangements could not be reached with the 1962 *American Mercury* management for inclusion of certain original articles published from 1959 through 1960 in *The American Mercury* magazine, New York. Authored by Jo Hindman, the following titles, analytical of 1313 Metro, are to be found as reference material indexed in public libraries. Each article provides a special study of a Metro problem:

	Issue of
"Bulldozer At Your Door," <i>American Mercury</i> .....	Sept., 1958
"Terrible 1313," <i>American Mercury</i> .....	Jan., 1959
"City Killers," <i>American Mercury</i> .....	Sept., 1959
"1313's Mail Order Laws," <i>American Mercury</i> .....	Jan., 1960
"St. Louis Defeats Metro Plan," <i>American Mercury</i> .....	Mar., 1960
"Who Are the Metrocrats?" <i>American Mercury</i> .....	June, 1960

The following publications are pro-Metro in viewpoint (order of introduction for reading and study): Most can be purchased from the various Metro organizations at the 1313 address (see MetroChart, inside front cover of this book). Some of the Metro publications are cataloged in public libraries.

*Thirteen-Thirteen*, a directory, 1961. Pp. 25. (Various editions.) Available (free) from Public Administration Service, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

*A Half Century of Municipal Reform*, by Frank Mann Stewart, published by University of California Press, 1950, \$5.00. Pp. 289.

This is a history of 1313 and its beginnings, written by an executive of the 1313 parent body, National Municipal League, New York.

*The States and the Metropolitan Problem*, Council of State Governments, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago, 1956. Pp. 153.

*National Civic Review* (formerly *National Municipal Review*). Name change effective with January, 1959, issue. Published by National Municipal League, 47 E. 68th Street, New York 21, N.Y. Monthly, with the exception of the month of August. \$5.00 per year subscription. Single issues available from publisher.

*Ibid.*, *The Yearly Indexes*, supplements to the *National Civic Review*.

*Model State Constitution*, 5th ed., 1948 (under revision in 1961-62);

*Model County Charter*, 1956; *Model City Charter*, 5th ed., 1941.

\$1.00 each from National Municipal League, 47 E. 68th St., New York 21, N.Y.

*Model State and Regional Planning Law* (1954)—from same address as above, \$1.00.

- Public Administration Organizations*, a directory (1954), Public Administration Clearing House (PACH), 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois, Herbert Emmerich, Director. Pp. 150.
- Suggested State Legislation* (published every year), 1959 Program, developed by Committee of State Officials on Suggested State Legislation of The Council of State Governments, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Pp. 193.
- Ibid.*, 1957 Program. Pp. 207.
- State Government*—Quarterly published by the Council of State Governments, Winter, 1959. Pp. 75.
- The Government of Metropolitan Miami*, Public Administration Service, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, \$5.00 per copy.
- The Charter of Metropolitan Dade County*, Florida, adopted May 21, 1957. Pp. 29. For copy request from Board of Commissioners, Metropolitan Dade County, Miami, Florida.
- The Government of Metropolitan Sacramento*, 1957, Public Administration Service, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, \$5.00 per copy.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Newsletters

Various of the organizations at 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, publish periodicals, such as:

*ASPO Newsletter of American Society of Planning Officials.* June, 1960 issue. Pp. 56. Request copies from ASPO.

*City Managers' News Letter*, a semi-monthly publication for members of the International City Managers' Association, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. One of the news letter's features is a job placement service listing city manager vacancies, salaries, etc., in cities and towns.

*State Government News*, published monthly by the Council of State Governments, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Circulation is free to Federal, state, municipal legislators. Ask your Congressman for a copy.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Special Reports

*Fluoridation of Municipal Water Supply*, by Charles S. Rhyne and Eugene F. Mullin, Jr., National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, 730 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., 1952. Price \$3.00.

Contains a State Act (Connecticut) to fluoridate public drinking water; also an Ordinance (City of Alexandria, Virginia) to introduce fluorine into the city water supplies; and a Resolution (Davenport, Iowa) to proceed to introduce fluorine into public water supplies.

Publisher of this pro-fluorine packet of expediting law—NIMLO, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, address above, is listed in 1313's *Public Administration Organizations Directory* (1954), p. 103.

"The Haynes Monograph Series"—Numbers I-XVI. *Metropolitan Los Angeles. A Study in Integration*. Various authors, 1952-55. Prices up to \$3.50 each. *The Haynes Foundation*, University of California at Los Angeles. A complete set of these Metro studies is located in the Governmental Research Library, U.C.L.A.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Magazines

*Public Management*, International City Managers' Association, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, a monthly, 25-page average.

*Journal of Housing*, published 11 times yearly by NAHRO—National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

*Public Personnel Review*, a quarterly published by Public Personnel Association.

For further reading and analyses:

Send for free publications lists furnished by the various 1313 organizations at the 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois address. (Refer to MetroChart—inside front cover—for the various organizational names).

Metro 1313 publications represent a varied approach to 1313's communication web: The periodicals range from annuals, quarterlies, monthlies, bi-monthlies, proceedings, to research papers (mental health, especially); also include newsletters, digests of various sorts. Every level of American government is being given close surveillance and reporting by the Metro agencies in their attack upon constitutional American government.

\* \* \* \* \*

## U.S. Government Publications of Special Interest

- Federal-State-Local Relations*—Dade County (Florida) Metropolitan Government, *Hearings* before a subcommittee of the committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, Nov. 21 and 22, 1957. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1958.
- Ibid.*, (Joint Federal-State Action Committee), Feb. 18, 1958. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1958.
- Ibid.*, (Non-Governmental Organizations and Individuals), Feb. 24 and 25, 1958. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1959.
- Slum Clearance and Related Housing Problems*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 2nd Session, January 7, 8 and 9, 1958. (Here, the reader will see Metro pressure groups in action on the federally subsidized urban renewal program.)
- Urban Renewal Notes*, a part of the Urban Renewal Service authorized by the Housing Act of 1954, published by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, (HHFA-URA) Urban Renewal Administration, Washington 25, D.C. (A request to HHFA-URA in Washington, D.C. will place you on the mailing list to receive this usually bi-monthly 6-page booklet.)
- Technical Guide*, twenty-five cents each from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Contains advice and recommended procedures for carrying out local urban renewal federally subsidized programs.
- "Questions and Answers on Relocation Payments," Technical Guide No. 2. *Loc. cit.*, *ibid.* HHFA-URA, Washington 25, D.C. 35 cents.
- Bulletin Series* of the Urban Renewal Administration, each bulletin 25 cents each from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Most of these bulletins are designed for the nonprofessional concerned with, or involved in the urban renewal process.
- Thirteenth Annual Report*, 1959, Housing and Home Finance Agency, 366 pp., Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. \$1.50.
- Oakland Mobilizes for Urban Renewal*, Bulletin No. 1, Urban Renewal Service, HHFA, Urban Renewal Administration, Washington 25, D.C. 35 cents.
- Congressional Record*, various issues. Obtainable from your Congressman.

April 4, 1962, issue, pp. 5490-92. Congressman Fountain reviews anonymous 1313 influence in Federal government in describing machinations of advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (CIR). CIR is the "portable 1313 clearinghouse in Federal government, established in 1959."

Feb. 21, 1962 issue—Debates on floor regarding Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, also pp. A1314-18.



\* \* \* \* \*

## Miscellaneous

*ABC's of Urban Renewal*, copyright by Sears, Roebuck and Co., published by the Urban Renewal Division of Sears, Roebuck and Co., Chicago, Illinois, Harry N. Osgood, director. Foreword by James C. Worthy, vice-president, Public Relations. Pp. 25. Copies available on request. Includes Federal highway program described as stimulant to urban renewal; carries endorsement by following 1313 adjuncts: ACTION, NAHRO, NAHB, ASPO, etc. Sears Executive offices located at Chicago 7, Illinois.

*Working Together For Urban Renewal*, a "guidebook on Why, When, and How Social Welfare Agencies and Urban Renewal Agencies Should Work Together," September, 1958, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, NAHRO publication N-407, price \$1.00. Pp. 29.

*IULA Quarterly*, published by the International Union of Local Authorities, 5 Paleisstraat, The Hague, Netherlands. March, 1958, issue lists IULA's *Communist affiliate, Yugoslavia*.

IULA stresses *taxation*, has conducted inquiries into thirteen countries of the world, describes socialistic countries which had the highest percentage of taxation as "by far the most favourable." (Note European spelling of "favourable.") IULA recommends that local authorities should have the power to levy a *local income tax*.

*Boletin*—The Municipal Digest of the Americas, publication of the Pan-American Commission of Inter-Municipal Cooperation, Havana, Cuba. July-August, 1956, issue reported on The Superior School of Public Administration in Central America (ESAPAC).

(1313's Committee on International Municipal Cooperation—CIMC furnishes information on IULA, The Hague, Netherlands, and (prior to Fidel Castro) upon IMO in Havana, Cuba, and copies of *Boletin*)

1313's *Communist linkage* is further traceable through the following publication, obtainable from U.S. Department of State, UNESCO Division.

UNESCO, 10C/41—Paris, 30 June 1958, Translated from the French —"Review of the List of Non-Governmental Organizations Admitted to Consultative Arrangements and Evaluation of Their Relations with UNESCO." Lists 1313-affiliate IULA, Appendix 81; IULA's Yugoslavia works with Communist East Germany in information pool, reference source—Appendix 39 of the UNESCO publication.

# Index

## A

*ABC's of Urban Renewal*, 136  
 Abrams, Charles, 139  
*Adams v. Housing Authority of City of Daytona Beach*, 60 *Southern 2nd*, 663, 42, 71, 78, 86  
 Agency/Authority, 23, 29, 42, 44, 48, 50-51, 54, 57, 62, 67, 69, 73-74, 77, 80, 87, 92-93, 99, 125, 129-30, 187  
 Alabama, 39, 63, 143  
 Alaska, 51, 73, 87, 143  
 Albuquerque, New Mexico, 130  
 All-America Cities Contest, 90  
 American Bar Association, 47  
 American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 111  
 American government (Republic), 13, 14, 34-36, 48, 111, 116, 124, 125  
 American Russian Institute for Cultural Relations with the Soviet Union, 27  
 American Institute of Planners, 122, 132  
 American Legion, 63, 103  
 American Municipal Association, 15-16, 25, 35, 68-69, 100, 107, 122, 128  
 American Public Welfare Association, 15, 122  
 American Public Works Association, 15, 122  
 American Society of Building Officials, 18, 137  
 American Society of Planning Officials, 15, 122, 131, 136, 138  
 American Society for Public Administration, 15  
 Appointees/appointive power, 23, 23-24, 30, 32-33, 37-38, 90, 97, 99, 106, 113, 127, 131  
 Arizona, 51, 71, 86, 143  
 Arkansas, 143  
 Armed Forces, Metro 1313, 32  
 Association to Improve Our Neighborhoods, ACTION (National), 15, 68, 122  
 Architects, 135  
 Assessment of Property, 104, 134  
 "At large elections," 102  
 Authorities/Agencies, cf. Agency/Authority

## B

"Balkanized Government," 36-37  
 Ballot franchise, 27, 37, 88-90, 106, 130, 138  
 Bane, Frank, 98 n  
 Bang-Jensen, Povl, 115  
 Bankruptcy, 61, 71, 77, 100, 106, 123  
 Bartle, H. Roe, Mayor of Kansas City, Missouri, 60  
 Bebout, John E., 123  
 Benedict, Ruth, 111  
 Benicia, California, 51, 71, 88  
 Bennington, Vermont, 105  
*Berman v. Parker*, U.S. Reports, Vol. 348, 45, 47, 58  
 Bernalillo County, New Mexico, 130  
 Bessemer, Alabama, 63  
 Bibb County, Georgia, 131  
 Blight, 53, 55, 62, 76, 88  
 Bloomington, Indiana, 80  
 Blucher, Walter, 26

Blue Earth County, Minnesota, 98  
 Bonds, 53-54, 66  
 Boston, Massachusetts, 133  
 Bradford, Amory H., 133  
 Bricker Amendment, 34-35, 46, 48  
*Bridges v. Alaska Housing Authority, et al.*, 87  
 Building Officials Conference of America, 14-15, 18, 137  
 Bulldozers, 79, 91  
 Bunker Hill (Los Angeles), 50, 67, 71, 73-78  
 Businessmen, 59-61, 65, 70, 79, 83, 88, 108, 127, 133-34, 136  
 Butler, Senator, 118, 129  
 Byrd, Sen. Harry F., 62

## C

Calexico, California, 51  
 California, 48, 51, 55, 66-67, 73-74, 80, 87, 93, 97-99, 103, 105, 131, 135, 143  
 California Home Owners and Taxpayers Association, 108  
 Campbell, O. W. ("Hump"), 26  
 Canada, 23, 26  
 Capehart, Sen. Homer, 62  
 Carnegie Corporation, 28, 95  
 Cartel, 19, 24  
 Census Form 60 PH-6 (short form), 121, 123  
 Census Form 60 PH-8 (Household Questionnaire), 117, 121, 123  
 Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 61, 70  
 Champaign County, Illinois, 135  
 Chapin, F. Stuart, Jr., 134  
 Charters of American Government (city and county), 13-14, 30, 35, 90  
 Check-and-balance government, 23, 35, 48, 100-101, 129  
 Chicago, Illinois, 13-15, 70, 80, 94, 98, 114, 137  
 Cincinnati, Ohio, 112 n, 132  
 City councils, 36, 52, 63-64, 89  
 City (municipal) housing laws (ordinances, codes, etc.), 51, 57, 63, 74, 81-82, 84  
 City manager, 13, 90, 102-5, 130, 138  
 Clayton Act (Federal), 19  
 Cleveland, Ohio, 131  
 Collectivization, 15, 24, 29, 32, 34-35, 37-38, 43, 68-70, 77, 93, 109, 124, 127  
 Collier, Rep. Harold R., 63  
 Colorado, 63, 68, 90, 143  
 Colquitt County, Georgia, 98  
 Colton, California, 87-88  
 Columbia University, New York, 69, 111  
 Columbus (City of), 132  
 Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 100, 105-7, 128, 138  
 Committee for Economic Development, 122  
 Committee for International Municipal Cooperation—U.S.A., 15-16, 67, 95, 138  
 Communist, 15, 27, 28, 35, 65, 95, 109, 111, 124-26, 134, 135  
 Community Redevelopment Act (California), 52, 64, 66, 74

- Competition, 18-19, 74, 128  
 Condemnation of private property, 85, 90, 97  
 Conference of Chief Justices, 14  
*Congressional Record*, 63, 120, 131  
 Connecticut, 133, 143  
 Control(s), 13, 16, 37, 54, 73, 84, 93-94, 107, 127-28, 131, 133  
 Cornell University, 112  
 Corrupt practices, 56, 60, 84, 135  
 Costa Rica, 120  
 Cottrell, Leonard S., 112  
 Council on Foreign Relations, 20  
 Council on Intergovernmental Relations (1943-46), 98  
 Council of Population and Housing Census Users (advisory to Bureau of Census), 122  
 Council of State Governments, 14, 17, 20, 31, 35, 43, 95-98, 100, 107, 122, 128-29, 130  
 County of Los Angeles, California, 32, 89  
 Covenants running with the land, 43, 74  
 "Cow pasture dreamers," 100  
 Cram, George, attorney, 137  
 Cuba, 13, 16, 18  
 Currie, Laughlin, 69
- D
- Daughters of the American Colonists, 103  
 Daughters of the American Revolution, D.A.R., 63, 103  
 Debt, 54, 62, 66-67, 88  
 Delaware, 143  
 Denver, Colorado, 59  
 Detroit, Michigan, 26, 51, 57, 71, 93, 127-28, 132  
*Detroit Free Press*, 57  
*Detroit Times*, 58, 129  
 Dimond, Judge John H., 87  
 Displaced property owners, 77, 137  
 "Disposable cities," 63, 75, 135  
 Douglas Decision, 45-47  
 Duquesne University, 137  
 Dykstra, Clarence Addison, 27-28
- E
- East St. Louis, Illinois, 104  
 Elective office, 30-32, 37, 90, 95, 97, 102, 107, 127, 131  
 Elkhart, Indiana, 89 n  
 Eminent domain, 45, 56  
 Emmerich, Herbert, 26  
 Europe, 16, 36, 90, 110-11, 135  
 Evanston, Illinois, 40  
 Executive department of government, 13, 22-25  
 Executive power, 18, 97, 102, 113, 127
- F
- Fairbanks, Alaska, 87  
 Farm lands, 93, 98, 100, 131  
 Federal government (United States), 13, 24, 71, 132  
 Federal Housing Administration (F.H.A.), 57, 60  
 Federation of Tax Administrators, 15  
 First International Seminar on Urban Renewal, 69, 135  
 Florida, 42, 55, 57, 86-87, 100, 121, 136, 143  
 Ford Foundation, 26, 28, 68-69, 95, 105  
 Frank, Lawrence K., 112  
 Foster, William Z. (Communist), 65, 72, 124 n, 125  
 Fresno, California, 51, 99  
 Fruin-Colnon Contracting Company, 90
- Fund for the Republic (Ford Foundation), 69
- G
- Gaither, H. Rowan, 28  
 Gallup, George (Gallup Poll), 115 n  
 Georgia, 98, 130-31, 143  
 Governors' Conference, 14, 16-18  
 Governor, Metro 1813, 32, 121  
 Grants (Federal), 42, 52, 83  
 "Greenbelts," 43  
 Group Dynamics, 109-16  
 Gulick, Luther, 20, 37, 69, 70, 76, 90, 98 n, 106, 135
- H
- Hague, The (The Netherlands), 16, 69, 75  
 Harvard University, 132  
 Hatfield Amendment, 55, 68  
 Hawaii, 51, 73, 143  
 Heglund, Hon. Sheridan, 131  
 Henry County, Indiana, 98  
 Hiss, Alger, 115  
 Holland, Michigan, 131  
 Home rule, 29, 31  
 "Horse-and-buggy" charters, 38, 93, 131  
 House of Governors, 17  
 Housing, 132-34, 136, 139  
 Housing Advisory Committee of U.S. Bureau of Census, 122  
 Housing and Home Finance Agency, 62, 69, 85-86, 89  
 Housing Laws (cf. National Housing Act, Community Redevelopment Act)  
*Housing in the U.S.S.R.* (Communist publication), 134  
*Human Events* (publication), 114, 116  
 Human Relations, Department of (proposed), 115
- I
- Idaho, 57, 143  
 Illinois, 34, 63, 75, 104, 128, 131, 135, 143  
 Indiana, 30, 80, 89 n, 92, 93, 98, 143  
 Indianapolis, Indiana, 92  
*Indianapolis Star*, 62, 89 n  
 Institute of Pacific Relations (an instrument of Communist policy), 69  
 Institute of Public Administration, 20, 123  
 Inter-American Municipal Organization, 16  
 Interest charges/payments, 42, 54  
 Interlocking directorate, 20, 27, 94, 138  
 International City Managers' Association, 15, 70, 108, 122  
 International Committee Social Sciences Documentation, 95  
 International Conference of Building Officials (formerly Pacific Coast Building Officials Conference), 18-19, 82, 137  
 International Federation for Documentation, 95  
 International Federation of Housing and Town Planning, 132, 138  
 International Organizations Rescission Act of 1962 (proposed as H.R. 9507), 35  
 International Union of Architects, 132, 134  
 International Union of Local Authorities, 16, 35, 95  
 Interstate Clearing House on Mental Health, 14, 16, 35  
 Interstate Compacts, 18, 23, 96, 104, 129, 130  
 Interstate/Intergovernmental Cooperation Commissions, 96-100, 107  
 Iowa, 31, 143

- J**  
 Jordan, William G., 17  
 Judiciary/Judicial, 19, 24, 123
- K**  
 Kalamazoo, Michigan, 51  
 Kansas, 80, 143  
 Kansas City, Missouri, 80  
 Keith, John P., 26  
 Kentucky, 84-85, 143  
 Knoxville, Tennessee, 131
- L**  
 Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, 105  
 Lakewood Plan, 33-34  
 Land use, 13, 37, 43-44, 54, 73-74, 77, 93, 124, 127, 131-35, 137  
 Langer, Sen. William, 121  
 League of California Cities, 67, 98  
 League of Women Voters, 26-27  
 Lease, 53, 75  
 Legislative determination, 55, 83  
 Legislative power, 17, 22, 24, 25  
 Levett, Richard H., Judge, Federal District Court, 120  
 Lindemann, Frank W., 53  
 Loans, 42, 54, 58, 60, 77  
 Logansport, Indiana, 89 n  
 Los Angeles, California, 51, 66, 73, 74, 134  
 Los Angeles County, California, 33, 89  
 Louisiana, 71, 143  
 Louisville, Kentucky, 84, 85
- M**  
 Macon, Georgia, 131  
 Madison, South Dakota, 105  
 "Mail-order laws," 31, 95-99, 128  
 Maine, 143  
 Managers (Metro 1313), 30-34, 40, 102-8, 128  
 Marion, Indiana, 89 n  
 Marx, Karl (Communist)/Marxism, 71, 77, 109, 124-26  
 Maryland, 143  
 Massachusetts, 51, 105, 133, 143  
 McCarran, Sen. Patrick, 16, 46-48, 121  
 McCulloch, Rep. William M., 118  
 Mead, Margaret, 112  
 Mental Health, 18, 31, 35, 94, 96, 108-12, 114-15, 123  
 Merging (the Metro "steps"), 22, 30, 38, 94, 99, 102, 104, 125, 127, 130  
 Metro district, 103-4, 113  
 Metro interstate merger, 104, 113  
 Metro legislation, 17, 19, 21-24, 30-31, 33-35, 38-39, 81, 93, 96, 97-99, 128-34  
 Metrocrats, 21, 23, 29, 36, 83-84, 106-7, 121, 123-25, 128, 131-32, 138-39  
 "Metropolitan complex," 95-96, 107-8  
 Metropolitan Government (Metro 1313), 18-28, 29, 33, 35, 41-42, 47-48, 84, 87, 93, 100-103, 113, 123-29, 131-32, 138-39  
 Mexico, 23  
 Miami-Dade, Florida, 20-22, 26, 35, 38-39, 41, 92-93, 101, 104, 131  
 Miami Herald, 21  
 Michigan, 26, 51, 57, 71, 76, 93, 127-29, 131, 137, 143  
 Michigan Society of Planning Officials, 127  
 Michigan Southeastern Metropolitan Research Corporation, 26  
 Michigan State Bar Journal, 137  
 Michigan State University, 127  
 Millikan, Senator, 121  
 Minnesota, 76, 98, 143  
 Misdemeanors/fines/prison, 81, 121  
 Mississippi, 115, 143  
 Missouri, 60, 90, 100, 103, 104, 143  
 "Model" charters and constitutions (1313), 23, 30, 32, 83, 85, 102-3, 130  
 Monopoly, 19, 138  
 Montana, 57, 143  
 Monthly Review (Socialist magazine), 127  
 Moreno, J. L., 25, 110-13, 116  
 Moscow, Russia, 134  
 Municipal Finance Officers Association, 15  
 Municipal Leagues of Cities, 100  
 Multi-purpose districts, 23, 97  
 Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 136
- N**  
 Nashville, Tennessee, 132  
 National Association of Assessing Officers, 15  
 National Association of Attorneys-General, 14, 18  
 National Association of County Officials (name changed to National Association of Counties in 1962), 122  
 National Association of Home Builders, 15, 68, 132  
 National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, 15, 41, 42 n, 68-69, 82, 122, 132  
 National Association of State Budget Officers, 14  
 National Association of State Purchasing Officials, 14  
 National Civic Review (formerly National Municipal Review), 104  
 National Council of Soviet-American Friendship, 27  
 National Housing Act, 52, 77, 86, 132-33  
 National Institute of Municipal Clerks, 15  
 National Legislative Conference, 14  
 National Municipal League, 14, 20, 27, 32, 69, 90-91, 94, 104, 128-29, 133, 136, 138  
 National Planning Association, 122, 136  
 National Planning Board, 77  
 National Resources Planning Board, 75, 77  
 National Retail Merchants Association, 60  
 Nation's Business (magazine), 25  
 Nebraska, 31, 57, 143  
 Nevada, 143  
 New Deal, 67, 83, 113, 123, 138  
 New Hampshire, 143  
 New Jersey, 96, 130, 133, 136, 143  
 New Mexico, 130, 143  
 New Orleans, Louisiana, 71  
 New York, 51, 59, 110, 128-30, 132-33, 139, 143  
 New York Port Authority, 129-30  
 New York Times, 119, 120, 133  
 North Carolina, 132, 143  
 North Dakota, 143  
 Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, 26  
 North Tonawanda, N.Y., 71
- O**  
 Oakland, California, 51, 80, 81, 82  
 Oakland Mobilizes for Urban Renewal (publication), 80-84  
 O'Connell, Judge Stephen, 86  
 O'Harrow, Dennis, 132  
 Ohio, 112 n, 132, 143  
 Oklahoma, 57, 97, 132, 143  
 Opperman, Paul, 26

Oregon, 68, 132, 143  
 Organization of American States, 15, 119  
 Overstreet, H. A., 109, 114

## P

Pacific Coast Building Officials Conference  
 (renamed International Conference of  
 Building Officials), 13  
 Palo Alto, California, 97  
 Pasadena, California, 51  
 "Patchwork" constitutions, 38  
 Pennsylvania, 132, 136, 143  
 Phoenix, Arizona, 51, 82, 86, 105  
 Planning, 18, 21, 32, 43-45, 65, 68, 86, 92-  
 94, 97-99, 109, 113, 124, 127-28, 131-38  
 Plymouth, Indiana, 89 n  
 Plymouth, Michigan, 71  
 Police Power, 43, 45, 56, 75, 84, 92-93, 127  
 Polls (State Department; Gallup Poll),  
 115, 115 n, 116  
 "Pork chop belt," 100  
 Port Authority, New York, 129-30  
 Predatory forces, 128, 138  
 "Present Danger to the Constitution of  
 the United States," speech title, 46  
 Proportional representation (Metro  
 political technique), 100  
 Provo, Utah, 105  
 Public Administration Clearing House, 18,  
 20, 28, 122  
 Public Administration Service, 14-15, 20, 75  
 Puerto Rico, 51, 73, 133  
 Public Personnel Association, 15  
 "Public purpose" (a pseudo-liberal  
 interpretation), 46, 47  
 Public Use, 45, 74

## Q

Questions and Answers on Relocation  
 Payments, 88

## R

Randolph, Massachusetts, 105  
 Reece Committee, U.S. House of Repre-  
 sentatives (Tax-Exempt Foundations Re-  
 port), 28, 67  
 Regional Plan Association (New York-  
 New Jersey-Connecticut), 26, 133  
 Regions, 18, 22, 30, 44, 84, 86, 125, 133, 135  
 Repeal Metro Legislation, 88  
 Rhode Island, 143  
 Rickenbacker, William F., 118-20  
 River systems, 23, 125  
 Riverside, California, 103  
 Rockefeller (Spelman) Fund, 15, 28, 95, 98  
 Roosevelt, Franklin, 113  
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 17  
 Rosenberg, Texas, 105  
 Russell Sage Foundation, 112

## S

Sacramento, California, 20, 51, 59, 97, 108,  
 131  
 "Sacramento Plan," 65-72  
 St. Louis, Missouri, 39, 90, 104  
 San Antonio, Texas, 103  
 San Diego, California, 51, 63, 71  
 San Francisco, California, 26, 70, 113, 132  
 San Jose, California, 43, 51  
 Sangamon County, Illinois, 135  
 Santa Clara County, California, 98  
 Santa Cruz, California, 51  
 Sawtelle, California, 50, 50 n, 71  
 Schick, Dr. Bela, 111

Schools, 99, 114, 117, 120  
 Scope of Soviet Activity in the United  
 States (a Congressional publication), 69  
 Search and seizure, 74, 79-91  
 Sears, Roebuck and Co., 136  
 Seattle, Washington, 131  
 "701 program," 133  
 Sharrow, Victor, 119  
 Sherman Anti-Trust Act (Federal), 19  
 Short ballot, 23, 31-32, 90, 99  
 Signal Hill, California, 88, 135  
 Social Engineers, 77, 100, 109-16  
 Socialism, 33, 127, 135  
 South Carolina, 143  
 South Dakota, 57, 105, 143  
 South Pasadena, California, 51, 71  
 SPX (Soviet Principle X), 48  
 Stalin, Joseph, 111  
 State Housing Acts (Urban Renewal), 52,  
 55  
 States' Rights, 22, 23  
 Steiner, Gilbert Y., 131  
 Super-government, 30, 113  
 Supreme Court, 45-46, 48, 82

## T

Taft, President, 17  
 "Tampa Case," Phillip Grubstein v. Urban  
 Renewal Agency of Tampa, Florida, Nov.  
 18, 1959, 86-87  
 Tax-allocation bonds, 54, 65-72  
 Taxes/taxpayers, 21, 37, 40-41, 51, 55, 58-  
 59, 65, 74, 85, 88, 90, 94, 97, 104, 106,  
 123, 127, 132, 134  
 Tennessee 31, 131, 136, 143  
 Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), 23,  
 109, 125  
 Texas, 31, 96, 103, 105, 144  
 Texas Councilor (newspaper), 31  
 Toward a Soviet America (Communist  
 publication), 66, 72, 125  
 Toward World Understanding  
 (publication), 113  
 Trotsky, Leon, 111  
 Tulsa, Oklahoma, 97  
 Tutchenko, S., 135  
 Types of Urban Renewal, 53, 79, 83-84

## U

Uniform Laws, 17, 98  
 United Nations, 16, 26, 35, 46-49, 66, 119,  
 125, 132, 138  
 United Nations Educational Scientific and  
 Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 34-35,  
 48, 113, 132, 138  
 United States Constitution, 18, 24, 47-48, 82,  
 87-88, 91, 96, 100, 114, 120-21, 128-29  
 U.S. Census (Population and Housing),  
 117-28  
 U.S. Conference of Mayors, 25, 68  
 U.S. Department of Justice, 118-19  
 U.S. House of Representatives, 17, 25, 116-  
 17, 124, 129-30, 135  
 U.S. Housing Act (cf. National Housing  
 Act), 15, 52  
 U.S. Navy Research, 111  
 U.S. Senate, 25, 62, 116-17, 129-30  
 University of California, 26-27, 132  
 University of Chicago, 14, 94, 98, 114  
 University of Illinois, 131  
 University of Mississippi, 115  
 University of North Carolina, 132  
 University of Oklahoma, 132  
 University of Oregon, 132  
 University of Pennsylvania, 132  
 University of Wisconsin, 27, 132

Urban Affairs Department (proposed), 16,  
24-25, 34-42, 107  
Urban Land Institute, 122  
*Urban Land Use Planning*, 184  
Urban Renewal Administration, 42, 73-78,  
82, 86, 99, 136  
Urban Renewal Council, 136  
Urban Renewal/demolition, 24, 28, 41-43,  
46-48, 50-91, 94, 108, 113, 121, 124, 127-  
28, 135-37  
U.S.S.R., 17, 77, 96, 111, 124-25, 135-36  
Utah, 57, 105, 144  
Utt, Hon. James B., 35

## V

Vermont, 105, 144  
Virginia, 71, 74, 144  
Virgin Islands, 133

## W

Walker, David M., 136-37  
*Wall Street Journal*, 25, 61  
Washington, D.C., 15, 53, 59, 61-62, 65, 70,  
98, 109, 136  
Washington, George, 49, 107  
Washington (State of), 131, 144  
Webb & Knapp, 59, 66, 69, 122  
West Virginia, 144  
Wisconsin, 106, 132, 144  
World government, 20, 72, 110-11, 114, 125  
World Health Organization, 132  
Wortis, S. Bernard, 112  
Wyoming, 57, 144

## Z

Zeckendorf, William, 66  
Zborowski, Mark, 111-12  
Zoning, 13, 31, 43, 56, 75, 81, 93, 133-34, 135

## *The Author:*

Jo Hindman is a native Californian, nationally known as a writer, lecturer, research analyst, and former West Coast editor of *The American Mercury* (New York). A graduate in business administration, University of Southern California, a member of the graduate body of U.S.C.'s Graduate School of Business Administration, a member of the American Management Association and other professional and honorary organizations, a holder of responsible positions in business and industry, Jo Hindman maintains a keen interest in civic and national affairs and steadfastly upholds the principles of American competitive private enterprise.

Written with a bold and accurate pen, Jo Hindman articles have appeared in a score of national magazines, including *The Freeman*, *Christian Economics*, *Human Events*, *Ladies' Home Journal*, *National Republic*, and *Vital Speeches*; additionally, she has contributed to the *Quarterly* of the Historical Society of Southern California and has edited a series of volumes concerned with war and postwar production problems, released by the Southern California Management Council.

This composite experience has produced an intense concern over the stealthy controls that are being slipped over the free persons and fortunes of citizens and businessmen of the United States.

Of pioneer stock established generations ago by forebears who sought freedom in the young America, Jo Hindman believes that the keystone of abundance is the right of every person to own and control private property and the fruits of his labor. To destroy this right in the United States by any method is to reduce America to economic and spiritual rubble.

Jo Hindman believes that truth is immutable and eternal, and that it is man's earthly assignment to approach truth as closely as possible; that the governmental document most closely aligned with the Creator's plan of freedom through individual responsibility to Him is the Constitution of the United States; that this concept, which denies encroachments upon freedom, is critically endangered by the creeping controls of collectivistic Metropolitan Government, and that Americans love their country and its constitutional government and will give place to no power—domestic or foreign—that would destroy it.



The CAXTON PRINTERS, Ltd.  
CALDWELL, IDAHO