

Logical Islands

Systems Engineers and Designers live in two worlds – one foot in the physical world and one foot in the logical world. In the logical world (virtual), the physical world is recreated symbolically. It's in the logical world that systems are designed or redesigned. The physical world is – what *IS*. The logical world is where we build the world, as we want it *To Be*. The implementation of a system is the reorganization of the physical world to match the logical world as designed. Sometimes, there is no actual, physical entity that corresponds to the logical model. Such is the case with a logical island. To understand a logical island, one must go back in time and re-trace the thinking process.

In an article titled, *40 Years of Free Minds and Free Markets*¹, author Brian Doherty interviews MIT trained engineer Robert Poole, Co-Founder of Reason Magazine, Reason Foundation, Director of transportation policy, Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow, Advisor to the Reagan, Bush, Clinton, Bush administrations². At one point in the interview, Poole said the following:

Poole: We did a “new countries” issue in the early '70s. It had an interview with Michael Oliver. Oliver was one of the important originators of the idea. A lot of people in the late '60s, early '70s libertarian world were disgusted with Nixon, and while [people like] Ed Clark [an L.A. lawyer and early Libertarian Party activist, who ran for president in 1980] said, “We’ve got to start a political party,” others said, “We’ve got to leave the country!”

Three or four people I knew of had separate independent projects. And we did start an attempt to find someplace to set up a new country. The New Hebrides was the third or fourth of Oliver's tries. He tried in the Bahamas and on a reef [near] Fiji.

I put in very little effort myself, but in the years before the Reason Foundation started I was hired as a consultant by Mike Oliver a couple of times, once to go and do some agitating in Abaco in the Bahamas and a few months after that to make an initial exploratory trip to the New Hebrides. I no longer think the U.S. is going to hell in a handbasket. I was never really fully convinced, but [a new country] seemed like a prudent backup possibility.

The term “new countries” is a door to the logical world of possibilities so I searched on Michael Oliver and found that he is a libertarian, real estate millionaire from Las Vegas who attempted to create a physical world from his logical concept of the way things *Should Be*. He built an artificial island by adding sand to a reef in the Pacific near Tonga. He named the “island” the [Republic of Minerva](#). “The only nation that responded to Minerva's calls for recognition was Tonga”. They sent a Navy gunboat and shut it down.

Minerva was supposed to be a libertarian paradise – no taxation, welfare, subsidies or any form of economic interventionism.³ Since Michael Oliver was in private business – arms length from government, he had to find a physical place to implement his utopian dream design. Libertarians

connected to government on the other hand, were on the inside track to create their utopian libertarian islands within the United States. All they needed was a plausible story line.

The Urban Plantation

Apparently the idea of a logical island of commercial privilege to help the po' folk in the cities was first proposed by Senator Robert Kennedy in 1967. He introduced legislation titled, "Urban Employment Opportunities Development Act of 1967". "The purpose of the bill was to provide federal tax credits, accelerated depreciation schedules and job-training programs as incentives for employers to locate industry in urban poverty centers."⁴ The bill didn't pass and the idea lay dormant until 1979.

Shortly after it's founding in 1979, Heritage Foundation hired Stuart Butler, a *transplant* from the UK. A reference to what was apparently one of Stuart's earliest papers for Heritage was found in a status report on Thatcher's Conservative Government that included not only the players in her government, but the economic policies that they were pursuing⁵. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was Sir Geoffrey Howe:

The Treasury Team

Chancellor of the Exchequer was Sir Geoffrey Howe

A lawyer by profession, Howe was Solicitor-General, and later Secretary for Trade and Consumer Affairs, in the Heath government. He was chief architect of the ill-fated Industrial Relations Act.

Sir Geoffrey is generally considered to be to the right of the center of the Conservative Party. He is firmly committed to cutting taxes and public expenditure, but can be expected to do so steadily, not dramatically. He is also known as a politician who is open to innovative ideas and approaches – he was, for example, the first major politician in Britain to give serious consideration to the notion of Enterprise Zones.²

The footnote references another paper written by Stuart Butler titled, *Enterprise Zone: A Solution to the Urban Crisis?* Both papers are signed, Dr. Stuart Butler, London, England. The obvious question at this point, is: Who's Heritage? I think the question is answered on Page 7 and subsequent pages. The following are excerpts⁶:

SOME NEW APPROACHES

Although the orthodox view continues to be the solution to urban problems must involve finding just the right mix of controls, subsidies and plans, there is a growing number of authorities who argue that what is really required is a complete reversal of the whole direction of policy. These authorities content that the bureaucratic approach to inner city problems drives away the very type of people who are most likely to revive the depressed

areas – the entrepreneurs. One of these experts is a Professor Peter Hall, a distinguished socialist academic, and a specialist in urban affairs. As professor Hall has argued:

What is necessary is to find new sources of innovation and enterprise, to replace that which is gone forever The city was always a seedbed for innovation, for new development impulses. Some entrepreneurs succeeded and grew large. As they did, they (often) took their business out of the city in search of larger scale, rationalized production processes....The job is to discover how to get the innovation going again.

Attracting High-Income Workers

Hall contends that the failure of current inner-city policy is due in large part to a tendency of bureaucrats to concentrate on preserving ailing, outmoded industries, and to their insistence on constructing low-income housing in a vain attempt to retain workers within the cities. Paradoxically, he argues, the best way to give new life to many cities would be to encourage small, science-based companies employing highly-skilled people, who, in turn, would create a demand for a wide range of jobs (in the service sector especially) for large numbers of semi-skilled and unskilled workers...

The Freeport Solution

...According to Hall, this would be in essence: an essay in non-plan. Small, selected areas would be simply thrown open to all kinds of initiative with minimum control. In other words we would aim to recreate the Hong Kong of the 1950s and 1960s inside Liverpool or inner Glasgow.

The Freeport concept would involve three key elements:

- a) The encouragement of entrepreneurship and capital formation. The specified areas would be made free of national exchange and customs control, and foreign capital would be welcomed. All goods could be imported and sold free of duty, and it would be legal to export them from the Freeport area also free of duty (perhaps after reprocessing and assembly). Areas of this kind do already exist in, for example, the Canary Islands and Shannon airport in the Republic of Ireland.
- b) These areas, he argues “would be based on fairly shameless free enterprise.” They would be free of taxes, social services, and industrial and other regulations. Trade unions would be allowed – but the closed shop would be banned. Wages would reach their own level by the normal processes of bargaining.
- c) Residence in the area would be based on free choice. Existing residents would be free to leave or to stay under the new system of deregulation, low taxation and low social benefits.

Enterprise Zones

In 1980, then Congressman Jack Kemp (R-NY) along with Congressman (D-NY) introduced a bill titled Urban Jobs and Enterprise Act. Heritage's Stuart Butler wrote an article about the legislation and the "problem to be solved" in July 1980 giving both the background on the concept and listing the provision of the bill.⁷ This legislation didn't pass, but it's useful to read the article because Butler compares this legislation to the British plan – and it includes this provision on foreign trade zones:

e) Foreign Trade Zone Provision

The bill contains a sense of the Congress provision to encourage the designation of Enterprise Jobs Zones as foreign trade zones. The Foreign Trade Zone Board of the Department of Commerce would be required to deal speedily with such applications, and to take into account the future development anticipated from the operation of the act in its evaluation. In other words, a foreign trade zone could be established before the facilities and business conditions normally required for foreign trade zone status were actually in existence.

According to a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) report titled, Enterprise Zones in America, A Selected Resource Guide, Volume II, federal enterprise zone legislation was included in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987.⁸ Jack Kemp, then Secretary of HUD, signed the foreword of the report. Since that time, legislation has been enacted that has added on to the base concept of the British concept of the *Freeport under the label of Enterprise Zone initially, but expanded and refined under the label of Intermodal Commerce Zone*.

It's *almost* funny that the British figured out a way to re-colonize America using the incremental method of the Fabian Socialists under the cover of libertarian philosophy. To see how it was done, you have to follow the progression of transportation legislation first – then to really fill out the picture, you have to look at legislation that was passed for other agencies of government.

Mobility 2000

Mobility 2000 was the name of the Dallas-Fort Worth federally mandated, regional transportation study that was completed in 1986. Two years later, a conference was held by the same name that brought together the who's who of transportation associations and experts to develop a "national program of automated highway technology, which eventually evolved into Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).

"Founded in 1988, Mobility 2000 was an informal assembly of industry, university, and government representatives created to promote the use of advanced technologies to improve highway safety and efficiency. The initiative was formalized in 1991, when the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) was enacted, and the national Intelligent Vehicle Highway System (IVHS) program was established... In 1994, the

national IVHS program was renamed the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) to clarify the multi-modal intent.⁹

The ISTEA legislation passed in 1991 was a major paradigm shift in our national transportation systems. Section 103 of Title 23 Section 1006 (a) (b) (1) of the legislation describes the purpose as:

“The purpose of the National Highway System is to **provide an interconnected system** of principal arterial routes which will serve major population centers, **international border crossings**, ports, airports, public transportation facilities, and **other intermodal transportation facilities** and other major travel destinations; meet national defense requirements; and serve **interstate and interregional travel**”¹⁰

About six or seven years ago, one of my research projects was on the North American Union with the transportation system being a key element of it. When I found the ISTEA of 1991, I read it – and posted highlighted sections of it on my website. It was a useful exercise for quick reference to certain sections of it. At the bottom, there are a couple of links were added that are about “*intermodal commerce zones*”:

[International Corridor System](#) [[North American Union research](#)]

The Idaho Intermodal Commerce Zone legislation was examined a little more closely on this webpage:

[Intermodal Commerce Zones](#)

Research on the corridor system included the Kansas City SmartPort because of the anomaly of a Mexican Customs Office in the United States. Notice on the right hand side, 1997 NAITCP International Organization of Mayors and private partners.

[International Cities](#)

In 2010, there was an article in the Idaho Statesman about a Chinese delegation of 23 persons to visit Meridian, Idaho at a location that was being called, “[The CORE](#)”. The CORE is an intermodal commerce zone. After spending over a year researching and writing about it under the name I gave it - [Trojan Triangle](#). The Trojan Triangles research was compiled into a report titled, ‘[How U.S. Territory Became a Land Bridge Between Two Bodies of Water](#)’ which was followed by a special series published on a different website that I called, ‘[Losing Our Sovereignty](#)’.

Another aspect of the internationalization of administrative law was discovered in Idaho law in about 2006. This was documented on a webpage titled, ‘[Harmonizing Laws](#)’ and it includes the section in Idaho law authorizing local governments to enact international building and energy

conservation codes – and to contract out the enforcement of those codes. Most recently during research on the Smart Meters and Smart Grid, it was discovered in the Idaho Public Utilities Commission files, that the IPUC ordered Idaho Power to lobby for the International Energy Conservation Code.

The analytical conclusion of all of this is that the intermodal commerce zones are *Freeports* - logical islands defined for the purpose of breaking up the United States for the purpose of re-colonizing America. Given Stuart Butler's involvement in it, we could call it a British attempt at a Do-Over.

[Chinese Cities Coming to America](#)

[Pending Chinatown in South Salt Lake anticipates fall 2011 grand opening](#)



And I think it's time to start calling out the Traitors who are enablers of the occupation and destruction of America:

[Senator Cornyn](#)

[Maryland's Health Enterprise Zones Need The Right Incentives and Rules](#)

Vicky Davis
May 18, 2012

¹ Reason Magazine, Brian Doherty, December 2008, *40 Years of Free Minds and Free Markets: An oral history of reason*, <http://reason.com/archives/2008/11/17/40-years-of-free-minds-and-fre/print>

² Reason Foundation, bio, Robert Poole, <http://reason.org/experts/show/robert-poole>

³ Wired Magazine, Chris Baker, January 19, 2009, *Live Free or Drown: Floating Utopias on the Cheap*, http://www.wired.com/techbiz/startups/magazine/17-02/mf_seasteading?currentPage=all

⁴ PediaView – open source encyclopedia, term: Enterprise Zone. http://pediaview.com/openpedia/Enterprise_zone

⁵ Heritage Foundation Backgrounder, Stuart Butler, June 11, 1979, *Britain After the Elections: Thatcher's Conservative Government*, http://s3.amazonaws.com/thf_media/1979/pdf/bg87.pdf

⁶ The Heritage Foundation, International Briefing, February 20, 1979, Stuart Butler, *Enterprise Zone: A Solution to the Urban Crisis?* http://s3.amazonaws.com/thf_media/1979/pdf/intb3.pdf

⁷ Heritage Foundation, Stuart Butler, July 10, 1980, *The Urban Jobs and Enterprise Zone Act*, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/1980/07/the-urban-jobs-and-enterprise-zone-act>

⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Office of Community Planning and Development, *Enterprise Zones in America: A Selected Resource Guide, Volume II*, published November 1989, Jack Kemp, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Intro-1, (Adobe 7) http://channelingreality.com/Zones/1989_Enterprise_Zones_in_America_Selected_Resource_Guide_Vol_II.pdf

⁹ I-70 Rural IVHS, Corridor Master Plan, Colorado Department of Transportation, prepared by De Leuw, Cather & Company, Appendix C.

http://www.channelingreality.com/NAU/IVHS/History_Docs/Corridor_master_Plan_CO_DOT_Appendix_C.pdf

Full report was originally found on the Federal Highway Administration website, but was apparently moved.

<http://www.itsdocs.fhwa.dot.gov/edldocs/3825/app-c.pdf> Another copy of the full report was found on scribd:

<http://www.docstoc.com/docs/40388985/Corridor-Planning-and-Feasibility-Analysis-Corridor-Master-Plan>

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Transportation, Research and Innovation Technology Administration (RITA), H.R. 2950, Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), National Highway System Replacement language for Section 103 of Title 23, Section 1006 (a) (b) (1) Purpose, <http://ntl.bts.gov/DOCS/istea.html>