

Freedom Matters

A Weekly Newsletter

Dane County, Wisconsin

Vol. 2, No. 16

Friday, April 19, 2002

We are a free people in a republic, under a constitution which limits the powers of government to those necessary to secure the unalienable rights of each person to their life, liberty and property. Yet, when a legislature is in session, no one's life, liberty or property is safe. It's the curse of a democracy. That's why we have a republic instead. *Freedom Matters* dedicates itself to the fight to restore our republic. Most of the press and courts fail to do so. They've forgotten that freedom matters.

What Happened to "Compromise" in Springdale?

by Mike Byrne and Bob Bowman

Strange, how a newspaper can report the facts and still not tell the truth. Consider the case of the Springdale annual meeting of electors, April 9, 2002.

When concerned landowners of the Town of Springdale in Dane County Wisconsin wanted their town board to hear a clear message from them, they got together and planned what they wanted to do and how to do it. They came in and made their point at the annual town meeting. Under Wisconsin law that meeting is a regular chance for electors of a town to communicate on issues that MATTER TO THE CITIZENS. We at Freedom Matters applaud their actions in light of the recently created land use plan in Springdale, touted by the board there as based on CITIZEN INPUT and "COMPROMISE."

A local reporter at the meeting published a biased report of it. It called the meeting a "carefully orchestrated show of force," thus casting the landowners as bullies. Where was that reporter for the last twelve months in Springdale, when a carefully orchestrated parade of planners, attorneys, and bureaucrats, abetted by media and its editorial slanting of news, crafted a town land use plan to satisfy the liberal agenda of Madison? That agenda aims, step by step, on taking control of rural land. Its method is to take away civil rights, one by one, and to make development too expensive for most people.

Another bias in the report says that the citizens "came prepared with three-page scripts and an attorney." It is a bias because it fails to report that the town board ALSO came to meetings "prepared with written scripts and with attorneys." That's how the board devised the two documents they enacted. The report fails to note that electors at the town meetings testified that those documents were written off-stage, and never voted on at the committee meetings. It fails to report that town officials failed to keep minutes of the posted committee meetings, thus verifying the testimony that NO VOTES were ever taken on the touted "citizen input."

That process has a similarity of outcome to the land use plans presented for adoption to the five towns along highway 12, plans that were promised to be unique and locally driven. Instead, they are all cut from the same cloth. Gosh. Surprise! Surprise! The county "awarded" the planning money for all five of those plans to script writers Vandewalle and Associates, who employ some of the county executive's own ex-staffers.

Another bias in the report was to omit that the town board failed to notice the annual meeting (i.e., they did not publish or post it). Didn't the board want to have CITIZEN INPUT at the meeting? Past town boards always published it. Hence, Phil Esser moved, at this year's annual meeting, that the town board publish notice of next year's annual meeting. It passed.

Another bias in the report was to quote almost entirely from those who favored the board and opposed the landowners. Those quotes praised the land use plan and the ordinance as a "compromise" and lamented that the landowners were wrecking that "compromise."

Proving that it was NOT a compromise, the landowners at the meeting objected to it, and voted against it, and the fact that they won the vote is not crucial to that proof. By those facts, balanced reporting requires making clear that the plan and ordinance were NOT a compromise.

How do you "compromise" confiscating the money of innocent citizens? The Springdale plan confiscates up to 75% of a person's property. That's the import of John Oltman's testimony at the Springdale meeting. That was staggering testimony, yet the press report treated it like a throw-away. Piously calling it a "compromise" is an outrage. It is a double outrage to fail to expose it.

The worth of land equates to money in the bank. If our neighbors confiscated 75% of our bank account, we would have no trouble seeing it as theft.

What is happening in Springdale is a cancer in our nation. That cancer, if unchecked, will destroy us.

How does *Freedom Matters* know what happened in Springdale? We had our own reporter on the job.

Readers' Bulletin Board. e-mail us your comments. Include your name, for publication by *Freedom Matters*

*** Published by Freedom Matters, Inc., Cross Plains, WI. 53528, Michael Byrne, Editor ***
To subscribe or unsubscribe, e-mail to rebshar@chorus.net, or call call Bob at (608) 831-6653.
Our e-mail subscriber list is confidential. We will not sell it or reveal it.

Back Issues of *Freedom Matters* are available on request, as e-mail.

