



Flashback: Rick Perry Tied To Agenda 21, Globalist Policies

Terry Hall is a legendary Texan who successfully fought against George Bush's globalist plan to create a North American Union, which was first to be realized by the "trans-Texas corridor". Rick Perry was Governor of Texas at the time, and he fought true conservatives and anti-Agenda 21 patriots tooth and nail to finish the corridor. Now Perry is Secretary of Energy, which is key to America's infrastructure. □ TN Editor

Rick Perry may be good at invoking states rights and property rights, while disavowing 'foreign creditors,' but his actions as Texas' longest serving governor tell a different story. Public private partnerships (or P3s) are part and parcel of the United Nations' Agenda 21. Two of the purposes of Agenda 21 are to abolish private property and restrict mobility and P3s act as the vehicle to do it. Perry made P3s a centerpiece of his transportation policy since he stepped in as governor.

It started with the Trans Texas Corridor, known at the federal level as high priority corridors, corridors of the future, or the NAFTA

superhighways. Just in Texas, it was to be a 4,000 mile multi-modal network of toll roads, rail lines, power transmission lines, pipelines, telecommunications lines and more. It was going to be financed, operated, and controlled by a foreign company granted massive swaths of land 1,200 feet (4 football fields) wide taken forcibly through eminent domain.

Called the biggest land grab in Texas history, it was going to gobble up 580,000 acres of private Texas land (the first corridor alone was to displace 1 million Texans) and hand it over to well-connected global players using P3s, who would gain exclusive rights to determine the route and what hotels, restaurants, and gas stations were along the corridor in a government-sanctioned monopoly for a half century. It was the worst case of eminent domain for private gain ever conceived.

Property rights shredded

The Trans Texas Corridor, and P3s in general, represent an imminent threat to private property rights. While lawmakers repealed the Trans Texas Corridor from state statute only months ago due to the public backlash, the re-named corridor ('Innovative Connectivity Plan') and its threat to property rights lives on through P3s. Two such projects underway by a Spanish developer, Cintra, will charge Texans 75 cents per mile in tolls (nearly \$13 a day while Perry claims he hasn't raised taxes or indebted Texans to foreign creditors) to access lanes on two public interstates — I-635 and I-820. A third project being developed by the same company for two segments on SH 130 is, perhaps, the only leg of the Trans Texas Corridor TTC-35 project that will ever be built.

While Perry distracted Texans and tea partiers with 'emergency' resolutions on state sovereignty during the 82nd legislature, P3s spread from transportation projects to virtually every other type of public infrastructure in a bill, SB 1048, passed by the Texas legislature which he signed into law June 17. Now all public infrastructure, including public buildings, schools, nursing homes, ports, mass transit, etc. can be auctioned-off to private interests in long-term sweetheart deals with taxpayer subsidies and profit guarantees using P3s.

P3s give a private corporation the power to tax the public, whether

through charging tolls or other so-called ‘user fees,’ to access their own public infrastructure, and, perhaps more insidious, allowing well-connected private entities to profit from concessions on land taken through eminent domain.

Why shouldn’t the original landowner be able to profit from developing his/her land instead of having the government take it in the name of a “public use” and give it to another developer, one with government connections? Perry’s administration of P3s is like his administration of his Emerging Technology Fund that’s been highly criticized for steering taxpayer money to Perry’s campaign donors — a case in point, Dan Shelley.

Shelley worked for Cintra, who had its sites set on developing the Trans Texas Corridor. Shelley lands a job as Perry’s aide, steers the \$7 billion corridor P3 to his former employer Cintra, then goes back to work for Cintra. That’s how Perry does business — pay to play.

Texas “Open for Business”

While Perry is staking his campaign on Texas being the top net jobs creator, Perry’s version of Texas being “Open for Business” isn’t about low taxes and less regulation as much as it is about doing business with foreign companies, including selling off Texas’ sovereign land and public assets to foreign creditors, an issue which Perry’s first television ad uses to take aim at President Obama.

Aside from the P3s, Texas has 20 active deals going with the Chinese and has 32 foreign trade zones (FTZs), a vehicle to ease the flow of foreign goods into the United States that are chalk full of tax breaks for importers. Perry’s office promoted these FTZs in a document entitled Foreign Trade Zones: Texas Wide Open for Business and even dedicates a web site for Texas FTZs, www.TexasWideOpenForBusiness.com.

A recent Washington Post article documents Perry’s work to get Chinese government-owned telecommunications company Huawei, to base its U.S. operations in Texas, a company that the U.S. government has deemed a threat to national security noting that “three times since 2008, a U.S. government security panel has blocked Huawei from acquiring or

partnering with U.S. companies because of concerns that secrets could be leaked to China’s government or military.”

Perry’s coziness with the Chinese and foreign investors exposes a huge weakness in his right flank — illegal immigration and open borders. The Trans Texas Corridor has been linked to the global plan to economically integrate North America, with the eventual goal of a common security perimeter modeled after the European Union. Perry ushered in in-state tuition for illegals and has long been an obstacle to immigration reform or any Arizona-style immigration law.

Perry’s record paints a much different picture than what candidate Perry would have us believe — that he’s a states rights, Constitutionally limited government conservative that’s responsible for the “Texas miracle.” In reality, he’s more like an Agenda 21 globalist willing to sell America to the highest bidder.

[Read full story here...](#)



California Must Push For Higher Density In Cities To Meet Climate Change Goals

California is steeped in Technocracy run by Technocrats who are completely out of touch with reality as they seek to reform its entire societal structure. The 1938 definition of Technocracy is still accurate:

Technocracy is the science of social engineering, the scientific operation of the entire social mechanism to produce and distribute goods and services to the entire population.” □ TN Editor

To meet the bold new climate change goals put in place last year, California will work to put millions of electric cars on the road, revolutionize its dairy industry and generate half of all power from solar panels and other renewable sources.

But those efforts will come up short, warn state regulators, without dramatic changes to how Californians live and travel.

The state has pledged to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. To do so, Southern Californians will have to drive nearly 12% less by that date than they did five years ago, cutting their miles on the road every day from 22.8 to 20.2, according a Los Angeles Times estimate based on data from state and regional climate and planning officials.

These driving reductions mean that Californians will have to walk, bike and use mass transit much more frequently than they do now. By 2030, residents will have to travel by foot four times more frequently than they did in 2012, alongside a nine-fold increase in bicycling over the same time, and a substantial boost in bus and rail ridership, [climate officials say](#).

Getting people out of their cars in favor of walking, cycling or riding mass transit will require the development of new, closely packed housing near jobs and commercial centers at a rate not seen in the United States

since at least before World War II, [according to a recent study by permit and contractor data analysis website BuildZoom](#).

“You can’t be pro-environment and anti-housing,” said Marlon Boarnet, chair of the Department of Urban Planning and Spatial Analysis at USC’s Price School of Public Policy, who has advised state climate regulators on land-use issues. “You can’t be anti-sprawl and anti-housing. This is something that has not been very well understood.”

The primary question in meeting the reduced driving goals, Boarnet and other planning experts said, is whether cities and counties will sign off on the massive amount of housing needed in already developed neighborhoods. Local governments, not the state, largely govern the approval of new housing.

[Read full story here...](#)



Public/Private Partnerships:

Government-Sanctioned Monopolies

This is an important analysis and warning of why the Trump Administration must avoid Public-Private-Partnerships, a spawn of Sustainable Development, as the means for rebuilding America's infrastructure. □ TN Editor

President Trump is calling for a major new investment for rebuilding the nation's infrastructure of highways, bridges and more. There is no question that it needs to be done. However, it's vitally important that local, state and federal government agencies avoid calls to fund this massive effort through so-called Public/Private Partnerships (PPPs). Local officials must understand that there is a vast difference between calls for a competitive bidding process to select private companies for the projects versus an actual partnership with government.

During the first years of the Clinton Administration in the early 1990s, there was much fanfare about a new policy to "reinvent government." It was sold as a way to make government more efficient and less costly. It would, said its proponents, "bring business technologies to public service." In addition, the promise was that the new way would bring in private money to programs and projects, rather than tax dollars.

Pro-business, anti-big-government conservatives and libertarians were intrigued. The backbone of the plan was a call for "public/private partnerships." Now that sounded like their kind of program. Government, they said, would finally tap the tremendous power of the entrepreneurial process and the force of the free market into making government more effective and efficient. It sounded so revolutionary and so American.

There are certain areas where private business contracts do jobs such as running school cafeterias through a competitive bidding system. That type of arrangement certainly does serve the tax payers, encourages innovation and provides better service. That, however, is not how Public/Private Partnerships work.

Today that Clinton-led “reinvention” has revealed itself to be the policy known as Sustainable Development, which in reality is much more government operating through a top-down managed society. Sustainable Development policy calls for population control; development control; technology control and resource control. It is a direct assault on private property ownership and single family homes. It is the root of massive reorganization of American cities known as Smart Growth. It’s all tied to a specific agenda with a pre-determined outcome. To enforce the Sustainable policies proponents have worked hard to recruit private international corporations to work directly with them to promote the policies through the creation of Public/Private Partnerships.

It is little understood by the general public how Public/Private Partnerships are actually used, not as a way to diminish the size of government, but in fact, to increase government’s power. In truth, many PPPs are nothing more than government-sanctioned monopolies. These privileged few businesses are granted special favors like tax breaks, free use of eminent domain, non-compete clauses in government contracts, and specific guarantees of return on their investments. That means the companies, in partnership with the government, can fix their prices, charging beyond what the market demands. They can use their relationship with government to put competition out of business. This is not free enterprise, nor is it government controlled by the people.

A private developer, which has entered into a Public/Private Partnership with government, for example, can now obtain the power of eminent domain to build on land not open to its competitors. The fact is governments in partnership with private developers simply considers all property to be their common domain, to be used as they desire under the excuse of some undefined common good. For example a lower middle class neighborhood with a hundred small homes on quarter acre lots can be torn down and replaced with an upscale high-rise development. This gives builders, developers and the real estate industry new products to market. The new building will also generate more tax dollars for the community, thereby benefiting the “common good.” All will seem to benefit with the exception of the original property owners who were pushed out and displaced - all for the common good. That’s how PPP’s

are sold as a positive for the community. But other citizens are losers too as voters lose control of their government.

Private companies are now systematically buying up water treatment plants in communities across the nation, in effect, gaining control of the water supply and controlling water consumption, another major goal of Sustainable policy blueprint. At an April, 2007 meeting in Calgary, Canada, as part of the Security and Prosperity Partnership, then being promoted by former President George W. Bush to create a North American Union, government officials, business leaders and academics met to discuss redistributing Canada's water to Mexico and the U.S. Southwest.

Canada has water, lots of it, and the Public/Private Partnerships of the SPP were swarming on it like locusts as they sought to drain it from Canada's rivers and lakes and ship it to potential profit centers south of the Canadian border. Los Angeles was a prime prospective buyer.

The most popular PPPs involve the nation's highway system. Private companies are buying control of them through PPPs with state departments of transportation. Herein lays the direct threat if PPP's should become the driving force behind President Trump's plan to rebuild infrastructure.

Of course, it's not just American companies entering into PPPs with our government. Foreign companies are being met with open arms by local, state and federal officials who see a way to use private corporations and their massive bank accounts to fund projects.

As the Associated Press reported on July 15, 2006, "On a single day in June (2006) an Australian-Spanish partnership paid \$3.6 billion to lease the Indiana Toll Road. An Australian company bought a 99 year lease on Virginia's Pocahontas Parkway, and Texas officials decided to let a Spanish-American partnership build and run a toll road for 50 years."

PPPs were the driving force behind the proposed Trans Texas Corridor that was to run from Mexico, clear through the center of the United States to Canada. A Spanish Company called Cintra was given the contract to build the TTC. There was no competitive bidding process.

Cintra was the only candidate for the project.

In fact, that Spanish-American partnership in Texas and its lease with the Texas Department of Transportation to build and run the Trans Texas Corridor contained a “no-compete” clause which prohibited anyone, including the Texas government from building new highways or expanding existing ones which might run in competition with the TTC.

The highway was to provide few exit ramps. Communities that currently ran in the path of the existing state highway depended on traffic from it to provide business for restaurants, hotels and gas stations. The lack of exit ramps was done specifically to allow Cintra to build its own such services right in the middle of the TTC, eliminating the need to exit. Why was this important? Because the Cintra contract with Texas provided the company guaranteed profits.

Second, the TTC was to cut directly across 500,000 acres of prime Texas farm land. With no exit ramps farms and ranches would be cut in two. A barn might be on the opposite side of the massive highway from the rest of the farm, causing the farmer to drive as many as 50 miles to get to it. Property rights were not a consideration in the PPP contract for the highway. Communities, also, were to be cut in two, preventing police, fire, ambulances and school busses from reaching certain areas. Local rule was not a consideration in the PPP contract. That is not free enterprise.

Private companies operating in the free market lack one thing government has - the power of coercion. That’s a good thing. The free market operates with you making the decisions based on personal choice. Under Public/Private Partnerships the choices are decided for you in meetings behind closed doors.

Meanwhile, private companies that are not part of a PPP are unable to compete with those which are. They are shut out of competition from the establishment of economic development zones, which provide the chosen elite with reduced real estate taxes and financial aid. Companies, which find themselves outside of the elite status of the PPP may suddenly run into regulatory difficulties to get their own projects completed. It’s not

just a coincidence? All of these things are happening through agreements between certain industries and government.

PPPs are one of the reasons many people find they can no longer fight city hall. The private companies gain the power of government to do as they please - and the governments earn the independence of the companies, no longer needing to answer to voters. It's the perfect partnership. Their power is awesome and near absolute.

What Public/Private Partnerships are not, however, is capitalism or free enterprise, though it may have some of the trappings of such. The marketplace is still there. Its laws have not been repealed. But ultimately, corporatism does not trust the marketplace to do what the elites want.

In truth, Public/Private Partnerships are little more than a Mussolini type fascism of government and private industry organized in a near impenetrable force of power and collusion. Local and state governments interested in free market solutions and lower costs to tax payers must resist the temptation for an easy fix through the trap of the PPPs. For they only lead to higher costs and more government control.

Tom DeWeese is one of the nation's leading advocates of individual liberty, free enterprise, private property rights, personal privacy, back-to-basics education and American sovereignty and independence.

[Read original story here...](#)



Local Agenda 2030 Is Inspired by Decades-Old Local Agenda 21

Local Agenda 21 'limited success' was devastating to local U.S. communities, but ill direct Local Agenda 2030 to be the supercharged implementation of Agenda 2030. □ TN Editor

We're hearing more and more about cities and their roles in sustainability. But amidst that rising discussion, how can we build opportunities to ensure some real success for sustainable development in an urban world?

In October, the [Habitat III conference on urbanization](#) resulted in the adoption of a 20-year strategy on sustainable cities. That document, the [New Urban Agenda](#), promotes cities as positive forces for sustainable development. This recognition alone constitutes an important paradigm

shift.

Nevertheless, the New Urban Agenda falls short on two challenges.

First, it fails to adequately harmonize with the global agreements struck in 2015, particularly the [Sustainable Development Goals](#) (SDGs), the [Paris Agreement on climate](#), and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on [financing for development](#). Together, these agreements will guide global sustainability efforts towards 2030 - what's collectively known as Agenda 2030. This gap in the New Urban Agenda is problematic given that Habitat III was being seen as an [opportunity to “localize” the SDGs in cities](#).

Second, the New Urban Agenda fails to give clear guidelines on implementation of its own aims.

These gaps leave a hole at the centre of a key strategy on global action toward sustainable urban development regarding how to choose priorities and build public policies. In response, we propose a new initiative: Local Agenda 2030, inspired by the decades-old Local Agenda 21.

Early attempt at localization

Local Agenda 21 was an effort to implement at the local level the global environmental strategy that came out of the 1992 “Earth Summit” in Rio. Following the summit, experts and networks across the globe engaged in new campaigns to inform, offer methodological guidance, create peer-to-peer exchanges and more. This collective learning process was particularly key in bringing local authorities into the process, and in building political momentum.

Over the following decade, Local Agenda 21 spurred over 6,000 initiatives to locally adapt and adopt the global programme. The project raised the question of environment at the local level but also promoted a comprehensive approach to dealing with the interdependent issues of sustainable development.

And it was participatory: Steered by local authorities, Local Agenda 21 aimed to involve civil society, local business and government officials,

and to build consensus and coalitions on regional priorities. Finally, Local Agenda 21 sought to emphasize a series of key steps aimed at effective implementation — diagnosis, planning, programming, budgeting and monitoring.

The initiative proved critical in raising awareness on issues of sustainable development, within both public authorities and local communities. Locally, all stakeholders were able to seize the opportunity of this global agenda to push for new concerns — in this case, around the environment. It also instilled the idea to “think globally, act locally”, while jumpstarting the view that local authorities should be in charge of implementing the global agenda.

Unfortunately, Local Agenda 21 was often weak in implementation. Though consultative phases were typically robust, once an action plan was decided upon, implementation did not necessarily follow. Inevitably that has resulted in both frustration and a limited ability to scale up.

In this regard, we can point to three problems that beset Local Agenda 21. First, the initiative had a sole focus on the environment, an overriding priority that did not favour inter-sectoral action. Second, a lack of national support constrained the project’s means of implementation, particularly in terms of financial resources. And third, the involvement of third-party actors such as local civil society and businesses often was limited to consultation rather than actual participation in the decision-making process.

Policy labs

Based on these experiences, a new initiative — Local Agenda 2030 — could now help to facilitate the “localization” of the SDGs and Paris Agreement, and implementation of the New Urban Agenda. The key here will need to be moving beyond the aspirational aspects of these frameworks and to focus instead on specific implementation mechanisms and road maps for action. In this way, Local Agenda 2030 would have the potential to articulate both a political vision of sustainable development and a means for action.

Agenda 2030 enjoys a few assets that its predecessor framework didn't have. The new 15-year vision goes beyond environmental concerns, after all, to integrate social, economic and institutional issues inherent to sustainable development. Therefore, the environmental bias that characterized Local Agenda 21 wouldn't be an issue.

Local Agenda 2030 would be able to use the 2015 agreements, particularly the SDGs, as political backbone to define local priorities. In so doing, it could reconcile the challenge of contributing to the SDGs through localization with the ambition of putting cities at the core of sustainable development

How could policy priorities be designed through Local Agenda 2030? This question relates to the means of implementation. The last of the SDGs' 17 goals takes on this issue directly and offers ideas on key drivers for change. Translated at the local level, that would mean promoting local financing, technologies and innovation for urban development and municipal capacity-building. It also would mean addressing systemic issues of local policy coherence through strategic planning, multi-stakeholder partnerships and local monitoring.

Capitalizing on the lessons learned under Local Agenda 21, we can identify three main advantages of a new such initiative.

First, Agenda 2030 offers an attractive international perspective around sustainable development that ensures buy-in from political leaders, civil servants, businesses and civil society. This framework needs no further negotiation: It already has been adopted by all members of the United Nations, its implementation began last year, and it will now guide global and many national efforts over the next decade and a half.

In this way, Local Agenda 2030 could set the stage for all local stakeholders to gather and work on action plans for which objectives already exist. Such an initiative would be fairly resistant to political turnover and ready to facilitate local awareness-raising and commitment — both of which particular limitations of Local Agenda 21.

Second, cities constitute ideal laboratories to test the feasibility of integrated action. To move national policies out of "silos" takes time and

effort. At the local level, however, planning and governance offer more opportunities to engage in integrated territorial action. Local authorities are de facto policy conductors, who can facilitate collaboration. Therefore, cities could serve as micro-incubators, experimenting on new tools and partnerships, which in turn could be replicated and scaled up. International and national policies could make a difference by promoting this type of “lab” approach.

Third is the issue of follow-up and review — how we will be able to track progress on these goals. This is particularly important given that the [indicators by which this progress is supposed to be gauged](#) exist mainly at the national level. In order to serve as a tool for monitoring local policies, much of the SDGs will require localized data. Yet currently many cities lack such data, especially where urbanization is informal.

Still, we know of several important ways by which to facilitate the management of local knowledge. Technology can assist in this process — for instance, through geographical information systems or addressing software. So too can social innovation — for example, through participatory enumeration and mapping.

But this information still needs to be officially acknowledged. That will require a shift in the philosophy on follow-up and review — away from a focus on top-down expert evaluation to a bottom-up aggregation of locally produced data. And in this, Local Agenda 2030 can play a key role.

How do we do it?

To fulfil these promises, Local Agenda 2030 would have to mobilize dedicated institutional, financial and human resources. And while local authorities will be key in this initiative, the international community will also need to take a few initial steps in support.

One key strategy will be to build a community of interests, lobbying and knowledge on sustainable urban development. This means producing methodological toolkits, peer learning and coordination mechanisms, adapted indicators and criteria by international platforms and/or institutions. Education will be needed for both local authorities and the

general public. In this, some strong examples already exist, such as the [“Toolbox for Localizing the SDGs”](#), unveiled at Habitat III by UN-Habitat and the Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments.

Political leaders, too, must endorse local agendas and become champions for local implementation of the SDGs. Overarching visions will need to be institutionalized in municipal administrations, along with procedures to ensure that they are appropriated and mainstreamed — processes that will clearly require buy-in from public officials. In this, the role of media and academia in building powerful narratives and structuring political discourses can be critical.

It also will be important that national states give a mandate — and resources — to subnational authorities. This can be independent from politicized decentralization processes but still contribute to local authorities’ capacity-building and to multilevel governance. Calls for projects, initiated either by national governments or international networks, could spur new local initiatives.

Awards for experimentation could important mobilize financial and technical support for local authorities, and help strengthen their ability to implement sustainable development policies. The identification of best practices in the field also would bring visibility to Local Agenda 2030 — a helpful trigger that could come, for instance, from philanthropic foundations.

The city role

At Habitat III, mayors placed themselves at the forefront of sustainable urban development — and warned that they will need enabling environments to fulfil this role. Cities increasingly appear to be legitimate and committed stakeholders in solving global problems.

Nevertheless, Habitat III did not solve the issue of the role and place of mayors in the international sphere. It is increasingly clear that national-level authorities will have to partner with local authorities. Local Agenda 2030 could serve as both leverage and support for this evolution.

Explicitly referring to international agreements also is strategic for local authorities. Many national governments are reluctant to decentralize in

principle, but they may be convinced once cities prove that they can contribute to national strategies — around climate or sustainable development more generally.

Whether in terms of national governments endorsing cities' experimentations, local authorities proving their ability, or the international community providing guidelines, promoting Local Agenda 2030 would be a win-win-win situation. The international community would gain in knowledge from ground-level practices, states would gain local contributions to their national strategies, and local authorities would gain in political recognition.

Participation and proximity with local stakeholders also would be likely to attract popular traction, a particularly notable component of the success of Local Agenda 21. Today, the urban, climate and sustainable development communities could focus on promoting the emergence of a Local Agenda 2030 and dedicated multi-level collaboration, thus paving the way toward success in 2030 with the support of all.

[Read full story here...](#)



Hillary Promoted Agenda 21, Sustainable Development At Rio+20 Conference

The UN's Rio+20 Conference in Brazil 2012 was the followup to the first Earth Summit in Rio in 1992, which produced Agenda 21. Clinton's speech is important because it shows total complicity with the UN's Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development. Some text of her full speech are marked in bold. □ TN Editor

SECRETARY CLINTON: Good morning. To President Rousseff, the Brazilian Government, the Brazilian people for hosting us, to Secretary General Ban, Secretary General Sha: Thank you for convening this conference. And thanks to all of you representing governments, civil society, the private sector, young people, men, women, and children everywhere.

Brazil has done the world a great service by hosting us all here. This can

be a fractious time. But thanks to Brazil's deft and effective leadership, **we have coalesced around an outcome document that marks a real advance for sustainable development.** We know this is one of the most pressing matters of our time, because how we grow together over the long term isn't a question for only some countries. It is a question for all countries. And here in Rio, thanks to Brazil, we are at the center of our shared efforts to find answers.

I want to thank the President of Samoa for his remarks and the reminder that we meet at a critical moment. For some countries and some people around the world, this is not just a matter for long-term planning, but for immediate, pressing action. And we know that voices are being raised demanding expanded opportunities and a greater role in the decisions that affect the lives of us all. We have the potential to answer that call. Hundreds of millions of people have been lifted out of extreme poverty in just the past generation, laying the groundwork for even more progress. We are working together to end chronic hunger, an area where Brazil has shown particularly strong leadership. I believe we can end preventable child deaths and chart a path towards an AIDS-free generation.

In short, this is a time for us to be pragmatic, but also optimistic. A more prosperous future is within our reach, **a future where all people benefit from sustainable development no matter who they are or where they live.** But let's be honest. We know what is possible. We know what we could do. But we also know that future is not guaranteed, because the resources that we all depend upon - fresh water, thriving oceans, arable land, a stable climate - are under increasing pressure. And that is why, in the 21st century, the only viable development is sustainable development. The only way to deliver lasting progress for everyone is by preserving our resources and protecting our common environment.

So we have come together, here in Rio, to **identify practical ways we can all promote sustainable development.** And while our views may differ sometimes, I believe we agree on some fundamental principles. We cannot be boxed in by the orthodoxies of the past. **We should and must**

make decisions based on research and scientific evidence about what works. And above all, we need fresh, agile, action-oriented partnerships that can produce results year after year after year.

So while the outcome document adopted here contains many important principles and proposals, the most compelling products of this conference are the examples of new thinking that can lead to models for future action. It should be said of Rio that people left here thinking, as the late Steve Jobs put it, not just big, but different.

We should be thinking different about harnessing the power of the market. Remember in the 1960s, official development assistance accounted for 70 percent of the capital flows to developing nations, but today it amounts to only 13 percent, while at the same time, development budgets have actually increased. Why is that? Well, you know very well. Because while continuing to provide assistance, the private sector investments, using targeted resources and smart policies, have catalyzed more balanced, inclusive, sustainable growth.

The United States has taken this idea to heart. And earlier today, I helped launch a partnership between the United States and African nations that will use \$20 million in U.S. Government funding to unlock hundreds of millions of dollars in private financing for clean energy projects in Africa and beyond. It's part of our contribution to the United Nations Sustainable Energy for All initiative, which has secured significant private sector investments for sustainable energy. And we hope to see even more coming out of Rio.

You also see the power of the market in the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, which aims to help 100 million families adopt clean cookstoves and fuels by 2020. By supporting consumer research and creating incentives for manufacturers, we're helping to create a market for stoves that people will pay for and use, while at the same time preventing health problems in women and children, and cleaning the air of black soot.

Now in addition to tapping into the private sector, we should be thinking different about new types of partnerships to solve problems that might

otherwise seem insurmountable. Here in Rio, the United States launched joint efforts on everything from deforestation and water to solid waste. **We're also leading Feed the Future, a global effort to improve food security** that is helping food producers adapt to climate change even as they reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions.

And earlier this year, I was privileged to host six countries in the United Nations Environment Program as we launched the Climate and Clean Air Coalition. The goal is to reduce short-lived climate pollutants that cause more than 30 percent of current global warming, as well as millions of premature deaths and extensive crop losses. We know we have to keep working together on CO₂, but we think that our Climate and Clean Air Coalition, to which many more countries are joining, and we welcome you, can take targeted action and produce results with respect to methane and black soot and HFCs.

We also have to be thinking different about development in our cities. That is, after all, where most of the world's population lives today, where most of the growth is and will take place, and where innovative ideas are being put into action. **Under the Joint Initiative on Urban Sustainability that President Rousseff and President Obama kicked off last year, we are bringing political officials from every level - from state, county, local, municipalities - together along with industry leaders and developers to find creative ways to generate sustainable economic growth.** If, as I heard earlier today, that 70 percent of the structures that will be needed in 30 years to house, to provide economic opportunities for the world's population have yet to be built, then we have a tremendous opportunity we cannot waste.

And finally, **the only prosperous, sustainable economy is an inclusive economy.** That means we should think different about how we recognize the needs of workers in the informal economy, how we unleash the talent and energy of young people, and how we act on the compelling evidence most recently published by the World Bank that women are essential drivers of sustainable development. I applaud the bold call to action issued here in Rio by UN Women, and likewise the Rio+20 outcome document devotes a strong section to expanding

opportunities for women.

And while I am very pleased that this year's outcome document endorses sexual and reproductive health and universal access to family planning, to reach our goals in sustainable development we also have to ensure women's reproductive rights. Women must be empowered to make decisions about whether and when to have children. And the United States will continue - (applause) - the United States will continue to work to ensure that those rights are respected in international agreements.

Now none of this is an abstract discussion. There is just too much at stake, too much still to be done. And many of you visited the U.S. Center here in Rio and saw practical solutions related to some of the work I've discussed and other goals we hold in common. We believe solutions require action by all of us. Governments, yes; let's do our part. Let's do more than our part. Let's pave the way for more clean energy investments, take on the entrenched political and economic interests that stand in the way of clean energy, technology, and sources being used in nations around the world. Let's use the private sector, particularly the consumer goods companies, as they have agreed to do, to make sure they have sustainable supply chains, the right kind of packaging and marketing that puts the least amount of burden on the earth we share.

Let's bring in the nonprofits, the civil society organizations, faith groups, individuals, all of us, committed to realizing the sustainable development goals that we have embraced. We know that we will be judged not by what we say nor even by what we intend to do, but by whether we deliver results for people alive today, and whether we keep faith with future generations. I'm very honored to be here with all of you, and I pledge my country's, the Obama Administration's, and my own personal efforts to continue our work together. We simply cannot afford to fail.

Thank you all very much. (Applause.)

[Read full speech here...](#)



Globalism Through U.N.'s Agenda 21, Agenda 2030, And Vision 2050

This is a succinct presentation of the madness contained in the various plans to transform the planet: Agenda 21, Agenda 2030 and now Vision 2050. This is Technocracy at its peak, and the only opportunity we will have to stop it is before it imposes a complete scientific dictatorship. □
TN Editor

Four years ago, a man was convicted of collecting rainwater and snow runoff on his property and served a 30-day jail sentence in Medford, Oregon, while the developing world is trashing their environment at alarming rates, suffocating waterways, rivers, and lakes with trash and refuse.

A meeting in Vienna aimed to amend the 1987 Montreal Protocol to phase out hydrofluorocarbons from air conditioners, refrigerators, and inhalers. John Kerry said that “air conditioners and refrigerators are as big of a threat to life as the threat of terrorism posed by groups like the

Islamic State.” He believes that “It’s hard for some people to grasp it, but what we, you, are doing here right now is of equal importance because it has the ability to literally save life on the planet itself.”

he climate change industry claimed that HFC, a coolant, is thousands of times more potent than CO₂, the gas of plant life. Kerry added that “the increase in HFCs has led to the trend of global climate change.”

There used to be a saying when I was growing up in Romania that elites were going to tax the population so much that they would eventually tax rain water. Apparently H.G. 1591/2002 requires that rain water which drains in the sewer system must be calculated by multiplying the annual quantity of rain water with the total surface of buildings finished and unfinished as declared by each customer and then taxed accordingly.

As the bills seem to be arbitrary, confused customers were asking by which method various areas were taxed, by lottery, and who is actually measuring the rain fall, and how much pluvial water evaporates before it reaches the drains.

According to Nathan Mehrens, the “[EPA has entered into a series of ‘memoranda of understanding’](#) (MOU) with the United Nations and various foreign governments” with the idea of protecting the environment “while promoting economic growth and social development, promoting the role of the private sector in development, and encouraging social inclusion, women’s advancement, and environmental justice.”

All these seemingly isolated moves have common denominators the insane manufactured anthropogenic global warming claim and global climate change claim by the United Nation. The tin pot dictators at the U.N. are only interested in redistribution of wealth, population control, the buildup of megacities, and global governance under the U.N. aegis.

How would they build these mega regions, mega cities? The plans are already underway in the form of destroying the American suburbs, the family, the way we purchase and own homes and apartments, and by depopulating rural areas.

U.N. Agenda 21 has morphed into Agenda 2030 and now into Vision 2050, a plan to force 9 billion people to live by the globalists prescription of “living well and within the planet’s resources.”

Vision 2050 report is “a consensus piece that was compiled by 29 leading global companies from 14 industries and is the result of 18-month long combined efforts between CEOs and experts, and dialogues with more than 200 companies and external stakeholders in some 20 countries.” In simple translation, global companies and CEOs are going to dictate to all of us how we are supposed to live by 2050, no free choices there.

These experts and CEOs have decided for you what constitutes “global sustainability” without consulting you, and have determined their vision for the planet. The “must haves” include, as stated on their website:

- Incorporating the costs of externalities, starting with carbon, ecosystem services and water, into the structure of the marketplace;
- Doubling agricultural output without increasing the amount of land or water used;
- Halting deforestation and increasing yields from planted forests;
- Halving carbon emissions worldwide (based on 2005 levels) by 2050 through a shift to low-carbon energy systems;
- Improved demand-side energy efficiency, and providing universal access to low-carbon mobility.

What is exactly “low-carbon mobility?” A quick search yields no exact definition but many projects with the word “transform” and “sustainable development” attempt to describe what low-carbon mobility would entail.

Progressives love to travel and visit other cities but would like to do it by banning cars and promoting walking, cycling and public transportation as a healthier and safer alternative, protecting pedestrians and cyclists from cars. No mention is made of who would protect pedestrians from nuisance cyclists.

According to progressives, who seem to prefer their Beamers to go to

work, cities that were designed before the introduction of cars are more compact and attractive to walk and cycle in. In other words, cramming as many people in a city is desirable over spreading them in suburbia. “Older cities are more human than the suburbs and cities built after World War II.” We need the “human scale experience,” walking and biking for your health and to reduce the “carbon footprint.”

So, this is how your city will be transformed into a “[low-carbon mobility city](#).” You may be stuck in your neighborhood your entire life like a rat in a maze and your world may encompass a very small radius of travel, but, you will be saving the planet from a non-existent climate change Armageddon, a lame threat greatly benefitting the globalist elites who jet in style around the world in their personal gas guzzlers, impervious to air pollution.

“With 9 billion people on the planet competing for a limited supply of natural resources, the definition of ‘living well’ will also have to shift. Instead of a utopian dream, living well in 2050 means that all people have access to and the ability to afford education, healthcare, mobility, the basics of food, water, energy and shelter, and consumer goods. It also means living within the limits of the planet itself.”

If it’s not the wetlands, job-destroying EPA regulations, water use controls, electricity use control, rain water, raw milk, farmers prevented from growing their own food, ordinary Americans growing their own gardens, people living off the grid, humans forced to live in tiny homes whose furniture must be assembled and disassembled every day to make room to move around, choices of transportation, Bureau of Land Management assault on farmers, rules and regulations that choke entire industries and particularly the coal industry, protecting a tiny species of delta smelt at the expense of growing food for millions, the globalist agenda will create new regulations to destroy the source of food and livelihood of millions and thus control the population. <http://osnetdaily.com/2014/08/america-2050-the-agenda-21-depopulation-of-rural-areas-has-begun/>

According to Frederick Kempe, President and CEO of Atlantic Council, the “unprecedented change” will drive “60 percent of the world’s

population to mega-cities by 2030, and competition for food, water, and energy resources could increase the possibilities of violent conflict.” Experts say, “The United States must urgently address its domestic economic and political dysfunctions.”

The Atlantic Council, a think-tank, wrote a 57-page report, “[Envisioning 2030: U.S. Leadership in a Post-Western World](#),” to “help prepare the Obama Administration and its global partners for unprecedented change.”

The report predicts a future of “vast economic and political volatility, environmental catastrophe, and conflicting, inward-looking nationalisms that would be unlike any period that the United States has seen before.” “President Obama will be setting the tone and direction for U.S. policy in a post-Western world.” (Atlantic Council, Executive Summary, p. 5)

As the powers that be are actively and speedily working to affect this outcome, the global order champions “predict” that wealth will shift from the west to the east.

Presidential candidate and highly successful businessman Donald Trump said it best; we should be concentrating on Americanism, not globalism.

Listen to Dr. Paugh on Butler on Business, every Wednesday to Thursday at 10:49 AM EST Dr. Ileana Johnson Paugh, [Romanian Conservative](#) is a freelance writer, author, radio commentator, and speaker. Her books, “Echoes of Communism”, “Liberty on Life Support” and “U.N. Agenda 21: Environmental Piracy,” “Communism 2.0: 25 Years Later” are available at Amazon in paperback and Kindle. Her commentaries reflect American Exceptionalism, the economy, immigration, and education. Visit her website, ileanajohnson.com

[Read original story here...](#)



HUD Grants Threaten To Destroy The Fabric Of American Cities

One year ago, the New York Post released [*“Obama collecting personal data for a secret race database.”*](#) In fact, his “secret race database” was merely a subset of the massive data collection scheme hatched by George W. Bush when he established the Office Of The Director Of National Intelligence in 2005. The DNI restructured all US intelligence agencies to create a unified data collection behemoth. The NY Post concluded, *“Obama is presiding over the largest consolidation of personal data in US history.”*

The first political use of this massive data base is Obama’s HUD grant program. The NY Post noted this in 2015:

*“Federally funded cities deemed overly segregated **will be pressured to change their zoning laws to allow construction of more subsidized housing in affluent areas in the suburbs, and relocate inner-city minorities to those predominantly white areas. HUD’s maps, which use dots to show the racial distribution or density in residential areas, will be used to select affordable-***

housing sites.” [emphasis added]

Tom’s article analyzes the details of Obama’s nefarious plan to use HUD to destroy the very fabric of American cities. □ TN Editor

America’s homeowners should be shaking in their shoes. The federal government has decided that people who have worked, saved and planned so they can buy homes in nice, safe neighborhoods of their own choosing, are racists. They charge that it is a “social injustice.” The government now claims that it’s unfair unless everyone can have the same, whether they earn it or not. And it doesn’t matter whether they can afford such a home. We’re told that it’s racist to deny someone an equal home, just because they don’t have the money for it. White privilege, don’t you know.

You may be watching the “Black Lives Matter” protests taking place on city streets around the country. You may be alarmed that such violence can happen in your downtown. And you may wonder what is behind such activity. Well, get ready for the same kind of threats and violence to possibly come directly into your own neighborhood simply because you have a nice house.

Does that sound far fetched? Well you need the details on how the federal Housing and Urban Development agency (HUD) is working to enforce its new rule called Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH).

Social Justice is the name of the game under AFFH. That means the rule of law is dismissed in favor of “fairness.” Social Justice is enforced on us using pure emotion, basically operating on the level of a twelve year old girl in a pet shop who doesn’t like seeing the puppies with their sad eyes looking out from a cage. “Let the poor little doggies out,” she cries. Social Justice is purely based on redistribution of wealth. Your wealth. That’s money you worked for, saved, invested, and protected for YOUR needs; YOUR dreams; YOUR future.

“SELFISH,” cries the social justice mongers. Why should you have so much when others have so little? Never mind that you had to save your money while forced to pay 50% of it in taxes that theoretically went to

those less fortunate. The fact is, there is no “justice” in such a policy. Envy, desire, jealousy and theft are much closer to the truth.

Do you think that sounds harsh. Well, Mr. and Mrs. Property Owner, tell me how harsh this sounds! As reported by John Anthony of Sustainable Freedom Lab:

- First HUD is forcing every community which is applying for its grants to complete an “Assessment of Fair Housing” to identify all “contributing factors” to discrimination. These include a complete break down of race, income levels, religion and national origin of every single person living there. They use this information to determine if the neighborhood meets a preset “balance,” determined by HUD.
- Second, HUD demands a detailed plan showing how the community intends to eliminate the “contributing factors” to this “imbalance.”
- To produce the community’s plan for compliance, HUD rules demand that a wide array of “interested parties” participate in its creation, just to assure community input and to keep things fair, of course. These include civil rights groups, affordable housing developers and civic activist organizations. They call this “civil society.” All have a specific, left-of center agenda and a definite interest in the outcome.
- Once the plan is prepared, then the community is required to sign an agreement to take no actions that are “materially inconsistent with its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing.”
- Once the community provides answers as to how they will implement the grant under these guidelines to HUD’s satisfaction, then they will receive the grant.

These are the rules your locally elected representatives are forced to agree to in order to get that “free” grant money. And nearly every city council and county commission in the nation has already taken such

grants.

Now ask yourselves, just why HUD would be so insistent in demanding that the community tie itself to the so-called civil rights groups in order to get the grant. The answer to that question is diabolical.

You see, if the community hesitates to comply in any way; perhaps local voters decide to turn down a program, or there aren't enough local funds to fully comply, then HUD has a secret weapon waiting for them. Lack of compliance, in HUD's eyes, results in law suits over civil rights violations.

The civil rights groups then become a useful tool. They start protests and demand "fairness." They get on television. They pressure city hall. And to the rescue comes HUD with its own law suits.

Baltimore, Maryland became one of the first cities to feel such pressure and threats as the NAACP sued Baltimore over alleged housing segregation. The NAACP argument was that Section 8 subsidized housing programs "bunch people together, and that only fuels more crime and other problems."

The solution, says the NAACP is to "integrate the poor among wealthier families." Outrageous as it sounds, such social justice mongers actually accuse those living in affluent neighborhoods of "self segregation for white privilege."

The pressure from these groups, along with the massive force of HUD backing them, has resulted in Baltimore being forced to agree to spending \$30 million of tax-payer dollars over the next ten years to build 1,000 low income homes in affluent neighborhoods. The result will be a destruction of property values and the loss of equity for the homeowners. In short, destruction of earned wealth, leading to destruction of the middle class. That's what socialism does. It creates more poor.

On top of that, Baltimore has moved to destroy the property rights of landlords by denying them the ability to not rent to people who can't afford their properties. Of course the government doesn't say it that

way, preferring to pretend that denying people who can't pay for your property as "discrimination." And who will pay the landlord when he is stuck with the bill? The only result will be fewer landlords and fewer choices for housing.

In Portland, Oregon, the infamous "poster child" of federal Smart Growth development policies, the city council has now unanimously approved a new tax to raise \$12 million per year to pay for "affordable housing." "The lack of affordable housing is the greatest crisis facing our city right now," says Commissioner Dan Saltsman. Perhaps he should take a long look at the twenty year Smart Growth history of Portland in which massive amounts of land were locked away to limit the "sprawl" of the city. This led to land shortages, which led to bans on single family homes, which led to the need for massive high rise apartment buildings, all of which led to higher costs and shortages of homes. Now, they have a "crisis" of low income housings. Their solution now is another tax on construction, driving up housing costs even more.

Do they ever learn? Government control over every aspect of our lives, as demanded by socialism never works. High costs, shortages and sacrifice are the only result. It has never been different wherever it has been enforced.

Now HUD is rushing to enforce AFFH with a vengeance. HUD has raced to make Westchester County, New York the example for more suits. Right out of the new HUD playbook, a private civil rights group called the Anti-Discrimination Center sued the county under the Federal False Claims Act, claiming Westchester County lied when they filled out the HUD compliance form for their grant. Since there is no official definition of "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing" the definition is whatever HUD declares it to be. There is no way for the local government to win such a suit. The result of the suit against Westchester County was \$62.5 million - a sum greater than all of the community development and related funding received by the county from HUD.

More suits are being filed against communities across the nation as HUD steps up its enforcement and local officials are scared, wondering what they can do to fight back, if anything. Some have tried to stand up to

HUD, refusing to comply. But once the law suits are filed, and the “community organizers” start their pressure, most have quickly backed down.

Let’s make one thing clear. The civil rights legislation of the 1960s made it illegal to bar people from neighborhoods based on their color or ethnic background. It guaranteed them the opportunity. But it said nothing about forcing people into neighborhoods to live beyond their means. No one, no matter their color or ethnic background, has a right to force their way in to a neighborhood they can’t afford. Instead, they must do the same thing those who already live there did; work, save, invest and prepare. Then no one can stop them. It has nothing to do with race or some perceived special “privilege.”

For twenty years we opponents of Agenda 21 and Smart Growth have warned of the dangers of taking these HUD grants. We were ignored and called conspiracy nuts. The result now is that HUD has taken the gloves off. There is no longer a pretense that any kind of local control over spending the grant money exists. HUD now controls your community. Property rights are dead, property values are dying, and the local officials you elected to guide your community have been rendered irrelevant by HUD mobsters who have come back to collect.

So what do local community representatives do? First and foremost STOP TAKING THE GRANTS!!!! Second, stand up to these thugs who intend to rule our communities. Stand up to the law suits and stand up to the pressure of the special interest groups. In short, represent your community as you were elected to do. And finally, you might try listening to those of us who have studied these policies for decades instead of the slithering snakes of the American Planning Association and their ilk who fill their own pockets with those grants.

Our American liberties are counting on local and state officials to start standing on your own two feet and represent US, instead of cowering in a corner because you sold us down the river.

The American Policy Center is now working with officials who want to understand and fight back to save their communities. Recently we held a

conference call for such officials. [Here is a link to it](#) so you can hear first hand of the dangers you are facing and some solutions for you to fight back. Perhaps this time you'll listen.

[Read original story here...](#)