



ARGU

AMERICAN RIGHTS GUARDIAN UPDATE

VOLUME 5 NUMBER 1 WINTER 2000

The only printed voice of opposition to Federal Government Indian Policy in Wisconsin

Published by Protect Americans' Rights and Resources to maintain an informed membership

A paragraph in section 8 of the United States Constitution reads; the Congress shall have the power to---Exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and exercise like authority over all places purchased by consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, Dock-yards, and needful buildings.

PARR Ed Note: Folks; that's all the United States Constitution will allow the Federal Government to own. Now read on...

Federal Land Grab

(By Bob Manzke)

This article will explain President Clinton's series of federal land grabs. Then, following articles will elaborate on these actions. Like in so many things that Clinton does, section 8 of the constitution has been considered nonexistent. You see, section 8 is considered a hindrance in this age of victims. Section 8 has become obsolete just like President Taylor's 1850-removal order of the Chippewa. Therefore, if the rules and laws that have governed this country so well for hundreds of years interfere with your agenda, you merely trash them. Why is Clinton doing this? Remember this is the president that blew up several piles of camel dung and a drug store with several million \$ (a pop) cruise missiles, to camouflage his lying. All this land grabbing by Clinton is to leave a legacy divorced from the lying and sleaze of his 8 years of presidency. Read on!

Conservation proposals are falling like rain from the White House as President Clinton tries to create an environmental legacy without the help of Congress. With just 12 months left in Clinton's presidency, agencies are working quickly to try to complete more than a dozen major rules this year. Authorities inside and outside government cannot remember when there has been so much activity.

The rule making is "absolutely unprecedented," said Sen. Slade Gorton, R-Wash., chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on the interior. He is hopeful the next president can undo many of Clinton's initiatives.

Page 1

Dale Riddle, who tracks regulatory proposals for Seneca Sawmill Co. in Eugene, Ore., compares the blizzard of proposals to the New Deal years. "We've never seen anything like this," Riddle said. "There's so many, it's hard to keep up with all of them."

In October, Clinton sought regulations to place up to 50 million acres of already roadless national forests off-limits to development.

Two months earlier, Clinton announced an ambitious proposal to clamp down on loggers, farmers and other landowners **that indirectly** may foul waterways with runoff from their property. Recently, Clinton designated three new monuments in Arizona and California, protecting hundreds of square miles of federal land from development. Other proposals would put forest health above all other priorities in managing national forests, encourage state and local rules to help threatened salmon in the Pacific Northwest, and broadly dictate land use on 64 million acres of public lands in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana, and on 10 million acres of national forests in California's Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Bureaucrats are stretched thin as they hold hearings and collect public comments. The 29 meetings the Forest Service's Rocky Mountain region has held on Clinton initiatives in recent months - combined with other local efforts - have overburdened employees and confused the public, said Lyle Laverty, regional forester for the area. "Dialogue conducted under these conditions is not likely to produce the quality of feedback that you are looking for," he wrote in a memo last month to his boss, Forest Service Chief Mike Dombeck.

(Continued See Land Grab Page 2)

Critics say Laverty's memo shows Clinton is trying to do too much too quickly. Rules written in haste only will increase public cynicism and prompt lawsuits, they warn.

The GOP-controlled Congress has taken to criticizing administration officials, threatening legislation and urging agencies to improve regulatory processes. **PARR Ed. Note:** Clinton intends to spend several wheelbarrows full of money to promote the return of the Pacific Salmon. No need, all they need to do is remove the Indian gill nets from the mouths of the spawning rivers.

§§§§§§

The Nature Conservancy

(TNC).

(By Bob Manzke)

I want to share with you excerpts from a report by The Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise (CDFE). As if Clinton can't do enough damage by himself, **what a (to hell with the property owners) cabal** he and the TNC make. ---

The compiled information was obtained from public records and this report is copyrighted 1994 by the CDFE. This report is titled "Getting Rich". The environmental movement's income, salary, contributor, and investment patterns, with an analysis of land trust transfers of private land to government ownership.

TNC is the largest of the top 12 environmental organizations in the country that was investigated in this report. Founded in 1951 with an annual budget of \$278,497,634 (1993), a staff of 1,150, membership consists of 708,000 individuals and 405 corporations. Tax Status: (501)(c)(3).

TNC expenses were \$219,284,534, with assets of \$915,664,531 and a fund balance of \$855,115,125. John Sawhill is the President and Chief Executive with a salary of \$185,000 and a benefit package of \$17,118. Officer and Director compensation is \$1,786,432. Other salary and wages of \$45,824,545. Pension plan contributions of \$1,193,453. Other employee benefits of \$3,832,110.

Donor Corporation or corporate funded foundation includes Allied Signal, ARCO, Boeing, BP Oil, Dow Chemical, DuPont, Enron, Exxon, Newmont Gold Company, Times-Mirror Corporation and others. TNC has grown beyond this 1993 report in many ways.

I could give you the rest of TNC's profile but I'll spare that and instead get into the Bait and Switch:

The Bait: The charming Nature Conservancy uses an ad with its appealing tag line "Conservation Through Private Action".

Switch: TNC then sells private purchases to the federal government---*Without the prior knowledge of the private land seller, often at a secret government request, using privileged appraisal information supplied by agents of the federal government, above "*

Page 2

approved appraised value". Paying "lowball" prices below "approved appraisal value" by offering tax breaks to the seller because of TNC's non-profit tax status. They also keep the mineral and oil gas rights.

Pretty slick, and who pays for taking land off the local tax rolls? Who pays for obtaining influence within the federal agencies for congressional appropriations to pay for TNC purchases? We do. --- \$76,318,014 income from government sales in fiscal 1993. This rates right up there with the greatest Indian scams.

TNC has used diverse methods of acquiring land. May 26, 1993, Albert Pyott, TNC Director, Illinois, sent a letter to Professor Dieter Kuhn, landowner in Pulaski County. Unfortunately for Dr. Kuhn, his Illinois property was in an area where TNC was assembling land for a wildlife refuge. He did not want to sell, so in his letter Pyott wrote, "The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, (FWS) like all other federal agencies, has the power of eminent domain which allows the use of condemnation to acquire lands and interests in lands for the public good...If your land is not acquired through voluntary negotiation, we will recommend its acquisition through condemnation."

TNC did not have the official backing of FWS and according to James C. Sawhill, The Nature Conservancy President & Chief Executive Officer, "There are no circumstances in which it is acceptable for The Nature Conservancy to tell landowners that it will encourage involuntary condemnation proceedings." Dieter stood his ground, complained to his congressman about TNC tactics until they backed off, and apologized for Pyott's letter.

The American Policy Center recounts, "hundreds of complaints have been recorded concerning the practices of the Conservancy's land grabbing operation. A family in Indiana had to sue to get back their father's land that was signed over to The Nature Conservancy when he was very old and mentally incompetent. Agents of the Conservancy had "helped" him in changing documents that left his entire estate to them. The family won back their property after being forced to spend a fortune in legal fees."

1996 TNC tax documents disclosed an income of \$1,112,458, 000 and assets \$1,358,866,000. If TNC is going to exercise its influence over public policy and tax dollars, it is reasonable to demand a public accounting of how they operate. However, because they enjoy a federal tax-exempt status, the organization is immune from the Freedom of Information Act. Unknown millions of public dollars are awarded to TNC with little or no oversight of how the monies are spent. Additionally, there is no economic assessment of the impact when large tracts of land are removed from production and the tax base. TNC is not required to pay taxes except in Texas. The Former Attorney General of that state, Dan Morales, stripped them of their tax-exempt status in Texas on February 28, 1997 Opinion Number DM-432. For more information

(Continued See TNC Page 3)

or a complete copy of this report please contact: Center for the Defense of the Free Enterprise, Liberty Park, 12500 N.E. Tenth Place Bellevue, Washington 98005 1-425-455-5038 or fax 425-451-3959 74123.3036@compuserve.com

PARR Ed. Note: The above in its true sense does not include Clinton's Federal land accumulation initiative. However, it shows what a faction the Private-Land-Owner has to combat to retain his property against the White House inspired onslaught.

§§§§§

ISSUE ITEM

Can you imagine working at the following Company? It has a little over 500 employees with the following statistics:

- 29 have been accused of spousal abuse
- 7 have been arrested for fraud
- 19 have been accused of writing bad checks
- 117 have bankrupted at least two businesses
- 3 have been arrested for assault
- 71 cannot get a credit card due to bad credit
- 14 have been arrested on drug-related charges
- 8 have been arrested for shoplifting
- 21 are current defendants in lawsuits
- In 1998 alone, 84 were stopped for drunk driving

Can you guess which organization this is? Give up?

It's the **535 members of your United States Congress**. The same group that perpetually cranks out hundreds upon hundreds of new laws designed to keep the rest of us in line.

§§§§§

Robin Hood

(By Bob Manzke)

Wow! Only 84,000 acres of oil rich land, small amount for the taxpayers of the United States to pay to get Al Gore elected to the presidency. Appears that President Clinton fancies himself Robin Hood, with the United States being Sherwood Forest, and he is taking from the rich (the taxpayers) and giving to deserving the Indians.

In the second largest return of public land to American Indians in the continental United States in more than 100 years, (the Navaho was the biggest) the federal government is giving back 84,000 acres in northern Utah that it took from the Utes in 1916 to secure the rights to oil shale reserves.

"We consider this part of the Clinton-Gore environmental legacy," Energy Secretary Bill Richardson said in an interview, reflecting the anticipated benefits of the arrangement for President Clinton, as well as for Vice President Al Gore in his quest for the presidency. "We're trying to do the right thing, returning land to its rightful owners."

The land transfer is part of a deal Administration officials have been negotiating with tribal leaders for almost seven years, and a major component of the Page 3

deal will help solve a long-standing pollution problem in another part of the state.

Mr. Richardson, who plans to announce the deal soon at the tribe's headquarters in Fort Duchess, Utah, said the Utes would be required to contribute a small percentage of any profits they derived from oil and natural gas production to the cleanup of a long-abandoned uranium site 80 miles south of their reservation.

As a third component of the deal, the Utes have agreed to allow a strip along 75 miles of the east bank of the Green River, which borders their reservation, to be designated as wild and scenic, a status that affords the protection it currently lacks.

O. Roland McCook Sr., chairman of the tribe's governing body, said he was delighted that land originally ceded to the Utes in 1882 was being returned.

"The tribe will once again be the true owner of its traditional lands," Mr. McCook said, adding that the Utes "can actively protect and steward an area the membership's ancestors rightfully believed would be a part of their descendants' heritage and homeland."

Environmental groups in Utah were more measured in endorsing the deal. While applauding any effort to clean up the uranium site, officials from several organizations said they wanted to know more details before congratulating the government for an act of apparent generosity. "If something can protect the land, clean up radioactive tailings and address concerns the Utes have for their own land-management needs, we're for it," said Lawson LeGate, senior Southwest representative for the Sierra Club. "But we must withhold final judgment until we see all the details."

The land to be transferred adjoins 4.5 million acres of the Uintah and Our Reservation in northern Utah, where about 3,800 tribe members live. It was set aside for the Utes, only to be taken back by **executive order** when the Navy was securing oil reserves for possible use as fuel in World War I or for a national emergency. The only larger parcels of land ever turned back to Native Americans by the government involved the Navajo and tribes in Alaska, after it became a state in 1959.

To begin the cleanup, Congress has to authorize a change in oversight to the Energy Department from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, a transfer that is expected to proceed smoothly. Also, federal lawmakers need to approve money to finance the project. Mr. Richardson said the administration's budget request for fiscal year 2001 would include \$10 million to begin the cleanup. Mr. Richardson said the contract with the Utes calls for the tribe to pay 8.5 percent of mineral royalties to the cleanup site, where a mill operated from 1956 through 1984.

As the third major part of the deal, the Utes have agreed to cede control of a quarter-mile buffer along the Green River, a change that adds another natural resource to the list of lands the administration had

recently designated for preservation and protection. This change would restrict activities along the river-bank and, more important to many environmentalists, outlaw construction of any dam.

To accomplish that, the Energy Department intends to pass management of the strip to the Department of Interior.

PARR Ed Notes: Ceded territory was given back to the Tribe! You realize this may well be a trendsetter. The fact that the land titles in the ceded territory in Northern Wisconsin are clouded could well become a major factor in the future. What if, another Clinton comes along and decides to return the Wisconsin Ceded territory to the Chippewa?

Clinton overturned a prior president's executive order returning the oil rich land to the Indians. This has merit; this means that future administrations can overturn the rash of Clinton executive orders.

This is the third biggest land turnover to the Indians since the 1959 giveaway in Alaska. The reason for the Alaska giveaway was to accommodate the Alaskan pipeline through a pristine congress designated wilderness area. Believing that an ulterior motive is not prevalent here would be a little naïve.

The same government that has pulled out all stops to halt urban sprawl has determined that 4.5 million acres are not enough for 3800 people. This amounts to 1184.21 acres per. person, yet they need another 84,000 acres. I guess because they are a victim group that pays no taxes they deserve this, and this entitlement is denied to us who pay the bills. We are considered to be insensitive and greedy when we grumble that the ¾ acre lots grudgingly allotted to us.

\$\$\$\$\$\$

Local Aftermath of Federal Government Forest Mismanagement

(By U.S. Congressman Mark Green)

This is Congressman Green's most recent column and it will also appear in the Counties Association Magazine.

Congressman Mark Green must balance Forest access critical to prosperity of Wisconsin communities' conservation of forest areas with preservation of our communities.

In March of last year, as you may have heard, the U.S. Forest Service issued a moratorium on the construction and repair of roads in our National Forests.

Why the moratorium? Because the Forest Service, under orders from the White House, was formulating a new set of rules regarding roads in National Forest areas. In October, President Clinton unveiled the new rules in a proposal he called the "Wild Forest Protection Plan." The plan unveiled by the president effectively prohibits the construction or reconstruction
Page 4

of any roads in our National Forests, period. It could "lock away" an additional 50 million acres of public lands.

The forests could not only be "locked away" from logging companies, but from taxpayers like you and me - who might want to use these lands for hunting, fishing, snowmobiling, or just spending time with our families. Without roads, these forests remain largely inaccessible to anyone - and under the Clinton plan, they'd likely stay that way. However - even more troubling may be brewing; this may just be the beginning.

If the administration's actions thus far on this issue are any indication, access to our National Forests could soon be even more significantly reduced. For example, right now the Forest Service is beginning to Execute a directive in Vice President Al Gore's "Clean Water Action Plan" that requires the decommissioning or demolition of 5,000 miles of existing forest roads each year. What we're seeing today may just be a first taste of what is to come. This certainly raises troubling questions for the forests themselves, for counties, for businesses and for people who live as neighbors to our nation's treasured woodlands.

Surprisingly, the Clinton plan actually threatens the very forests it strives to protect. As trees naturally die and fall in untouched forests, they begin to accumulate. Consequently, many forest floors are covered with dry, decomposing wood that too often serves as kindling for massive forest fires. By clearing out this dead wood, humans serve a critical function that contributes significantly to the protection of the forest.

But if people can't build roads, they can't get this dead wood out, and that's a serious threat to our forests.

For businesses that depend on forests, such as timber producers, these recent actions are chilling. Thousands of folks in Wisconsin and across America feed their families by doing the hard work that provides our Nation with the wood it needs each year. Although many in the environmental movement claim that logging has brought on ecological catastrophe, the truth is that sound conservation management has created healthier forests over the course of the 20th century. In the 1930s, fires destroyed between 40 and 50 million acres of forest each year. By 1960, after three decades of active management, humans had reduced that destruction to only 2 to 5 million acres annually - and we continue to make strides toward protecting our forest resources.

These actions by the administration could also have a serious effect on those people who live as neighbors to National Forests. Shop owners rely heavily on tourist traffic brought into their areas by forests. Timber workers rely on the forest to make their living. In addition, some people have simply chosen to live near a forest because of the tremendous outdoor opportunities these forests offer.

All of these things - the very way of life for folks
(Continued See Forest Page 5)

who use and live near forests - could potentially be put in jeopardy by the Clinton administration's actions. These converging factors threaten to have a profound impact on counties - reduced tourist traffic, less business growth, even lay-offs and population decline from people moving away. In the long-term, that means slower progress, fewer revenues, less school funding and more problems for counties.

However, you can do something about this issue. Although the initial comment period on the president's plan has expired, there will likely be others. Keep a close eye out for additional comment periods when you can offer your opinions to the decision-makers that still have the ability to influence this process.

This is also an issue to keep in mind as the presidential election approaches. Whether the administration's plan to ban new roads in National Forests is implemented by the end of this year or not, the new president will still have the ability to affect this policy.

All of us support responsible natural conservation, but most of us - particularly those in county government - recognize the need to balance that natural conservation with the preservation of our communities. The two are not mutually exclusive - both are achievable if we can strike the right balance. It's often a difficult balancing act to pull off, but doing it successfully means a brighter future for both our families and our environment.

PARR Ed Note: Along with the above-mentioned conflict, we at PARR have an additional problem with eliminating National Forest roads. The National Forest belongs to all the people of the United States. All the people, not just those young and agile enough to back pack into the forest to enjoy them. Eliminating the roads cuts off access for the old, the handicapped and a myriad of other people with all sorts of afflictions. These forests were paid for by all taxpayers not just a small percentage of the inhabitants of the United States, i.e. Indians, and environmentalist. Will there be special roads for Indians only?

\$\$\$\$\$\$

Indian Sovereignty Myth.

(By: John A Fleming)

Most, if not all, of the Indian tribes in our country claim to possess sovereignty as a tribe. This is both untrue and not possible under our U.S. Constitution and the Constitutions of the several States. Today, and indeed since the Indian Citizenship Act of June 2, 1924, which gave the then non-citizen Indians (mostly tribal members) citizenship by birth, all American Indians are citizens of the United States of America and of the state that they individually lived in. They each, as well as all other citizens of the United States, possess the attribute of sovereignty that is given to each citizen of our country by the Constitution of the United States.

Sovereignty in our nation belongs to the citizens. It
Page 5

does not rest in the state capitals, or in the federal government at our national capital, Washington D.C. Our sovereignty is not vested in a king, a dictator, a president, or in elected positions of the various states or federal government, and indeed---not in tribes. In short, when our thirteen colonies/states came together and decided to unite, they declared and established a number of principles and rules to include the following, --

- Sovereignty will rest with the citizens
- Majority rules
- Through the Articles of Confederation and then the Constitution, they needed and established a national government to do limited national activities with enumerated powers only. Through these Articles and then the Constitution, they assured the rights of the sovereign and independent several states, the freedom, liberty and certain other of the individual citizens' rights, and placed fixed limitations upon the federal government.
- They established a method to change the Constitution. Indians and their tribes were not only considered but they were mentioned in the primary documents that established our nation. The tribes were not given a place in our federal system of government.

The Tenth Amendment of our Constitution specifically provides guidance on this matter and tribes are not included in the distribution of power (to govern). Read it, perhaps you should reacquaint yourself with these documents. The Declaration of Independence gives a good idea of how our forefathers thought of the Indians at that time in our history.

Treaty after treaty stipulates that the tribes will obey the Constitution and the acts of Congress. Supreme Court cases abound with the clear facts that the tribes were no longer sovereign but bound to the Constitutional requirements and the will of Congress. Battle after battle defeated the Indian tribes resulting in the tribes being conquered, subjugated and actually subordinated to the will of this nation. Here is another myth---the Indian Industry (movement) has for decades been trying very hard to make American citizens in general feel guilty for what "they" did to "them". It doesn't take a brain surgeon to figure out that the pillage, rape, theft, cheating, stealing of property, fighting, killing and hurting of people, that affected Indians and their tribes also affected the common citizen and other immigrants that moved to the west or lived in the west--- the rancher, the farmer, the Mexican property owners and or residents of the southwest, just to mention a few categories. People of all colors, races, and religions, **NOT JUST INDIANS**, were affected by the lawlessness, wild and uncontrolled criminal activity during this time in our history. The cause was equally as clear. Both levels of Constitutional governments (states/territorial-to include local-and federal) were small, very limited and unprepared

(Continued See Myth Page 6)

for such a massive and rapidly moving force as the migration of peoples to the West. The damage being created by the continuing of this myth, the guilt complex placed upon "whites" by misinformation stemming from the Indian industry is growing and may well damage many of the good things that industry has accomplished. Tribal sovereignty is a myth. American citizens of all racial backgrounds and differing political and religious beliefs individually possesses the attribute of sovereignty.

PARR Ed. Note: John Fleming worked for the U.S. Indian Health Service, in Montana, for 23 years.

§§§§§§

Deer Feeders

(By Bob Manzke)

Several PARR members have asked us to inquire as to the legality of automatic deer feeders. The funny part of this inquiry is that the letter I wrote to George E. Meyer, Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, was written under PARR letterhead and I signed off as Exec. Secretary of PARR. I must say the reply was fast and the letter is courteous. However, PARR's title was conspicuous by its absence from this reply. One can't be too cautious; the use of PARR might result in Leprosy. Anyway, here's the reply: Deer Feeders, Dear Mr. Manzke:

Secretary Meyer has forwarded your January 20th letter to the Bureau of Law Enforcement for a response. My name is Gary Homuth, policy officer and thank you for contacting us.

The device that dispenses bait (usually corn or other grains for wildlife) you described is referred to by us as a mechanical feeder. Since the Department of Natural Resources does not have the authority to regulate feeding, these devices are legal to place on your property or other property one has permission to feed and observe wildlife. However, a mechanical feeder cannot be used to hunt over.

Our general hunting regulations prohibit hunting "over bait contained within or containing metal, paper plastic, glass, and wood other than hollow stumps or other nondegradable materials." These mechanical feeders are usually constructed of metal or plastic. Since the bait is contained within this device, they are illegal to use for hunting over.

As you may have heard, The Wisconsin Conservation Congress has been seeking public input over the last year on how the White-tailed Deer herd is managed in our state. There are 7 areas of concern they have been focusing on and baiting and feeding is one of the categories being studied. The Conservation Congress is planning to seek public review of all the study groups preliminary recommendations June 15th— June 30th statewide. One meeting is planned for each county. You may wish to advise your membership to watch for press releases advertising these meetings beginning towards the end of May. The Page 6

rules for baiting and feeding for the year 2001 may change.

Again, thank-you for contacting us. If you have any further concerns please contact me.

Sincerely: Gary R. Homuth Bureau of Law Enforcement 608-266-3244

§§§§§§

AN ELKO PROCLAMATION

(Hugh S. Collett, M.D.)

By virtue of their arrogance, which is deserved because of their superior intellect, the people of Elko County declare the District of Columbia to be a National Monument. These people have looked at a map and some old books and thereby declare the District of Columbia to be a road less area. Henceforth all roads in this road less area will be barricaded and only foot traffic will be permitted. No wheeled vehicles will be allowed.

This monument area will be under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service and its director, Ms. Gloria Flora. She will also be in charge of the instruction and indoctrination of all present and future employees of the forest service. She is also authorized to utilize the services of the Bureau of Land Management.

It will be her duty that these employees learn to crush any opposition to bureaucratic regulations. They must be taught that the people are not sufficiently educated to know what is good for their welfare. It will also be explained to them that anyone belittling them is guilty of fed bashing.

Those harassing or intimidating the officials will be guilty of racism. All employees will patrol the National Monument area armed with side arms and assault rifles. All individuals in the area who are allowed to bear arms after background checks by the FBI, CIA, District of Columbia, Elko County and the National Rifle Association must have non-removable trigger locks installed.

All living creatures in the river flowing through the Monument area are declared endangered and must not be disturbed. These include all fish, snails, clams, crabs, worms etc. Since there are no cockroaches or termites in Elko County, the people of Elko County realize that they are an endangered species. They will be so listed. It will be a prison offense and fine for anyone killing them or interfering with their habitat.

All finished products, which have raw materials, obtained from the ground by mining or drilling is prohibited. Therefore, no building materials or heating materials are permitted. Likewise, any article of clothing, or any food, which is prepared by a genetic or chemically engineered technique is also prohibited. The piles of granite and marble which have been quarried from open pit mines to build monuments and buildings since the city was founded and which have degraded the once beautiful hills of the District must

(Continued See Elko Page 7)

be removed and replaced in the pits from which they were quarried.

In the future, no quarried material will be permitted for building purposes. All parks with their grasses and trees will no longer be tended, mowed, fertilized or treated with insecticides or pesticides. Irrigation is banned and only rainwater is permitted in order that they may maintain their natural state.

Any trees not native to the region will be removed, such as the Japanese cherry trees. It is expected and desired that this advanced management of the grasses and trees will result in overgrowth of dead material, which will be good fuel for future fires. Fires are very beneficial to the land as has been demonstrated by the burning of 1 million acres of rangeland in northeastern Nevada in 1999. This is the result of excellent management by the forest service and Bureau of Land Management.

The large marsh area that was present before the establishment of the District of Columbia must be restored. There will be complete protection for all birds and other species using this marsh. All insect species, including the mosquito, (*aedes aegypti*), which were formerly living in the swamp, will be reestablished to their former habitat. These mosquitoes have been placed on the endangered species list and must be protected. Therefore, any insecticides must not treat marshland.

The yellow fever disease, which is caused by a virus transmitted by this mosquito, is an important historical illness. In 1793 and 1794 it killed one fourth of the population of Philadelphia. This illness must be allowed to naturally occur and must only be treated in the old historical ways. No chemically developed or genetically engineered drugs may be used in the treatment of yellow fever caused by this mosquito.

Mining is very harmful to the environment. In the future, no one in the Monument area is allowed to use tools, communication devices, transportation vehicles, power or illumination, which depends on materials from mines. This includes — but is not restricted to — copper, gold, silver, iron, coal and uranium.

Drilling for oil and gas is also environmentally harmful and no product from this source is allowed. Any synthetic material, such as tires and plastic, which use oil or gas products in their production, is prohibited.

Genetically engineered materials for clothing or food consumption are prohibited. All such engineering is prohibited whether it is done by modern genetic methods or by old-fashioned natural selection. Hybrid corn is particularly prohibited.

Cattle and sheep are very damaging to the environment. It is important that they not be used for food and clothing in the Monument area. There will be strict prohibition of supplying meat of these species or making clothing and other uses of their bodies: For example, leather and wool.

Only vegetables and fruit that contain worms and blemishes will be permitted for consumption. This is to ensure that no insecticides; pesticides or fertilizer have been involved in their production. Those without blemishes and worms were undoubtedly produced by using these prohibited substances and are not allowed in the Monument area.

No transportation on the river is allowed that can cause environmental damage. All boats using oil or gas for propulsion, or which create noise, are prohibited. Steel ships are also prohibited because they are a product of mining. Canoes are permitted as long as they are constructed of birch bark.

It has been demonstrated that federal ownership of 87 percent of Nevada has been very beneficial to the federal agencies, and to politicians needing to establish their legacy. Since we realize that this is a glorious and worthwhile purpose, it is therefore the intention of these intelligent people of Elko County to continue establishing National Monuments in the eastern states. We wish them to have the same advantages as Nevada and other western states. Planned for this designation next year are 50 million acres in New England. Those regulations in force for Washington, D.C., will apply to all newly designated areas. Each year a similar area will be so designated until all land east of the Mississippi River will have 87 percent under the beneficial and protective guidance of the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. Once this has been accomplished, similar designation of land west of the Mississippi will commence. Any objection to this improvement in the management of this land will be regarded as fed-bashing. Ms. Gloria Flora will designate those objecting as rebels and racists that do not appreciate the benefits that the benevolent government is providing for them. They must be forced to understand that this is progress and that they must obey and not object in any manner. The use of shovels as a form of protest is especially prohibited.

§§§§§§

CIRCA & ACCOUNT- ABILITY

My Name is Jim Tenney and I am the Executive Director of CIRCA. CIRCA is a legal foundation that fights to control the overreaching of the federal government and to reestablish constitutional law as the law of the land. We also do education through seminars about “Accountability” and how to use “Accountability” through recent Supreme Court Decisions to protect our individual rights.

Accountability was the tool the court has been using to reestablish our constitutional rights. Through several decisions the court has now given us most of the tools we need to stop the unconstitutional actions by our federal government. We need to go to the courts and press for our rights using these argu-

ments. As Justice Kennedy stated in the Line Item Veto Decision: this is about Accountability and we are going to make Congress Accountable to the people again.

The federal government has been using an unconstitutional chain of law for over 140 years. The Dred Scott Decision established a Territorial authority that extended into statehood and that along with Emergency War Powers has allowed the Federal Government the ability to expand its authority way beyond the scope envisioned by our forefathers.

The Center For Individual Rights and Constitutional Accountability (CIRCA) is a new 501-C4 legal foundation that has been taking on these unconstitutional actions utilizing the "Accountability Argument" authored by CIRCA's lead lawyer Lana Marcussen.

One of the suits that CIRCA has taken on is a suit known as the Woodruff Butte Case. Woodruff Butte is a volcanic hill located in Northern Arizona that can be mined for high quality borrow material (sand and Gravel). The owners of the Butte have been prevented from using their private property for over 7 years. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) have been working together to prevent the use of this material source on **private property**. The authority they claim to have to take the use of this man's **private property** is through the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section -106. Section -106 requires that on any federally funded highway jobs the federal and state agencies have to consult with the Native American Indian tribes concerning historic or religious sites that might be impacted by the federally funded projects.

ADOT (A state agency) has claimed they can expand section-106 (A federal law), by signing an agreement with an Indian tribe, to control the use of **private property** (Woodruff Butte) as a material Source. We have discovered agreements between ADOT and an Indian Tribe going through the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). We are also sure there are other such agreements between federal agencies and state agencies completely bypassing our elected officials! This has been going on for many years and is going to take time to overcome, *but we now can go to court and directly attack these situations!*

Judge Carroll, a Federal District Court Judge in Phoenix, Arizona made a ruling on Woodruff Butte telling FHWA and ADOT; under the NHPA they have no Property Clause Authority to control this private property! They were ordered to complete the consultation process with the Indians according to the law and cut off the federal funds for the project until the consultations were completed. Basically, the court is saying they have to abide by the law as written by Congress and this law does not give them the ability to control this man's property. In the fight on our cross
Page 8

claim to get damages for our clients the state is still claiming they can go to an Indian tribe, sign an agreement and assume power constitutionally reserved to Congress! We are sure there are more of these kinds of actions taking place because of the Powers the federal government has reserved in the Indian law.

In CIRCA's cross claim, damages and compensation were claimed *under discrimination laws instead of under takings law*. This proved to be a big surprise to the federal and state agencies. In the administrative record we were able to get over 400 pages of documentation outlining the strategies and actions of FHWA, ADOT, SHPO and the Indian Tribes during this protracted fight (CIRCA involvement in this case started in January of 1998). In the administrative record it was very clear they were expecting a takings suit and they were not concerned about a takings action! We are still in a fight to get compensation and put this Genie back into the bottle. But we are actually doing it!

Recently CIRCA filed suit against President Clinton and Interior Secretary Babbitt, to prevent them from declaring the Shivwits Plateau and other lands in Arizona, National Monuments under the Antiquities Act of 1906. If this is accomplished this area will be inaccessible, here again set-aside for the elite.

You Members in Midwestern states are probably thinking "this is in Arizona what does this have to do with us?" Well read the first paragraph of the suit listed below:

Plaintiffs seek to determine the proper constitutional process to permanently protect and conserve the character of the **federal public domain land, state trust land and private land** of the Shivwits Plateau in Northern Arizona.

PARR Ed. Note: The use of the Accountability tool, pioneered by CIRCA, may well be the salvation of all states. It may be the genesis of the regaining and retaining of their sovereign rights by individuals.

In March your membership is due, and like everyone else CIRCA needs financial support to continue. If you feel inclined to help, and have a couple of bucks left after supporting PARR, send us your donation and we will forward it to CIRCA.

\$\$\$\$\$\$

Chairman's Corner

PARR Chairman Greg Graunke is very vigilant. There is not much going on in this state that Greg isn't aware of and addressing. Following is Greg's follow-up of a situation reported in the last newsletter. This incident involved two Indians shooting a deer off a paved road in the Town of Mason, two months before the season opened.

Dear Mr. Graunke,

Your letter dated 1/23/99 was received via fax at Copper Falls State Park in Mellen WI. Your letter

(Continued See chairman's page 9)

(Chairman's continued From Page 8)

stated that PARR had not received any new information on a case and that involved several Chippewa members. On October 19, 1999 I sent you a letter advising that two Chippewa members were involved and gave you some indication of what the possible charges would be.

The defendants in the case are Mr. Ronald Peterson and Mr. William Mitchell. The charges are:

- Hunt with the aid of an artificial light.
- Hunt during the closed season.
- Trespass.

This case is now in the hands of the Bayfield County Court System. Once the charges are adjudicated the information will become public record and you can contact the Clerk of Court in Bayfield County on the disposition of the case. Contact: Bayfield County Clerk of Court Courthouse Washburn, WI 54891

Sincerely Yours, Michael J. Vogelsang Warden Supervisor Ashland Team.

Following is Greg's next move to gain more information. To:

Bayfield County Clerk of Courts,

Mr. Michael Vogelsang, warden supervisor, informed me that your office is where PARR needs to request information on a case involving Ronald Peterson and William Mitchell. The charges are, hunt with the aid of an artificial light, hunt during the closed season, and trespass. At this point PARR requests a copy of *the* arrest report and any other information on this case and the outcome or status of the case at this time. Thank you for your cooperation on this matter. Response requested--Equally yours, Greg Graunke Chair/PARR.

Now this next letter addresses an interesting subject:

Dear Senator, Kohl--Feingold

It has been brought to Parr's attention that certain Indians on reservations are receiving federal grants for housing, up to \$60,000.00, and if they continue to live in the homes for 15 years the grant does not have to be paid back. This would seem rather preposterous but stranger things have happened, such as .8% of 1% of the population getting a so-called 50% of the fish in a lake or having unregulated spearing of musky. Although it would seem at first that the housing grants and so called treaty rights have nothing in common. However, one of the conditions of the super rights enjoyed by Indians is subsistence hunting and fishing. (\$20,000 a year's worth). This would lead one to believe that perhaps the various bands have enough subsistence in the form of government handouts that the rest of the tax payers do not get, but have to pay for. If your office could shed any light on this subject it would be appreciated and if that is not possible could you direct me to the people who know of the details. Thank you!

PARR is now in cyber space. Visit your home page.

www.parr1.com