

# United Nations plan in Tulsa

- **Column: Randy W. Bright**

**January 15th, 2009**

<http://www.tulsabeacon.com/?p=1298#more-1298>

As Tulsa and many other cities across the nation begin to develop and adopt new comprehensive plans and form-based codes, we should be very concerned about retaining the kind of property rights that have allowed this nation to become the best place to live on earth.

The United Nations has been very instrumental in pushing their agenda items, as outlined in Agenda 21 and other documents, upon the United States.

About a year ago I attended a conference held by the City of Tulsa, and it was there that I first heard some of the code words that are normally associated with New Urbanism spoken locally. After the meeting I spoke to State Rep. Lucky Lammons and I gave him an explanation of what New Urbanism was. Standing in our circle was one of the speakers of the conference. When I told Lucky that all of this came from the U.N.'s Agenda 21, she immediately replied, "that's right."

The United Nations began to formulate its land development policies as early as 1976. At the 1976 United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, more commonly known as Habitat I, the concept that personal property was something that must be eliminated was introduced in its preamble, which read as follows:

"Land...cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Private land ownership is also a principle instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth and therefore contributes to social injustice; if unchecked, it may become a major obstacle in the planning and implementation of development schemes. The provision of decent dwellings and healthy conditions for people can only be achieved if land is used in the interests of society as a whole. Public control of land use is therefore indispensable..."

This statement is a direct attack on our Constitution and our way of life in America. It is polar opposite to the very things that we believe, and it is incredulous that so many of our government officials are leading us, by way of comprehensive planning and form-based codes, to a point where our descendants may never be allowed to own property or own their own home.

The implication that land "cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals" means that land must be controlled by government, not by property owners. Eventually, "ordinary" individuals will not buy their own homes if they cannot enjoy its full-intended use, or

they may ultimately be prohibited by law as has been the case for many centuries in other countries, and still is in some.

Land must remain an ordinary asset in this country, but the high degree of control that will be exercised by the new comprehensive plans and codes within cities will create a powerful disincentive to home and property ownership. Furthermore, control of land via other projects, such as the Wildlands Project, will eventually make land ownership outside cities difficult or impossible.

The statement implies that private land ownership is evil because it allows citizens to build wealth for their family and their heirs, leading to “social injustice.” What does that mean? That if one works hard, takes risks, builds wealth and creates jobs, it must mean that he has stolen something from those who have not done the same?

And if land ownership is a major obstacle to planning and implementation of development schemes, then land ownership, or at least the control of land that is owned by individuals, is not far away.

And who could be against decent dwellings and healthy conditions? But these must be provided by the government according to the standards that they develop that meet their concepts of what is good for everyone, not what individual deem appropriate for themselves.

Many years ago I designed some HUD Section 8 apartment projects. The regulations we had to follow were tight, not allowing one square inch more or less than regulations allowed. Every apartment had to be the same: small, cramped, austere space, because after all, the tenants were being supported by the government. Is that what we eventually have to look forward to?

There are many well-meaning people who think that New Urbanism is a good thing because it looks so good on the surface. In reality it is a Trojan horse that will allow our Constitutional rights to be taken away from us, if we are not vigilant to prevent it.

©2009 Randy W. Bright

Randy W. Bright, AIA, NCARB, is an architect who specializes in church and church-related projects. You may contact him at 918-664-7957, [rwbrightchurcharch@sbcglobal.net](mailto:rwbrightchurcharch@sbcglobal.net) or [www.churcharchitect.net](http://www.churcharchitect.net).