Response to Certain County GOP Leadership Objections

by Joseph Parnell McCarter

It goes without saying that county Democrat Party leaders reject the <u>"Save The Campbell" Plan</u> and a county <u>Charter Consistent with The USA's Original Christian Founding Principles</u>. And it is not surprising that most RINO Republicans reject it. But what surprised me is how a number in Ottawa County conservative GOP leadership have rejected it as well, when in reality it is the practical, moral and legal course. This article is intended to summarize my response to the objections by some in the Ottawa County conservative GOP leadership.

Objection #1: It would be immoral for Ottawa County to municipalize the J.H. Campbell plant and transfer its title to a county electric cooperative, which would in turn pay Consumer's Energy fair market value for it.

As explained in the article <u>here</u>, it is not only morally permissible for the Ottawa County government to municipalize it under current circumstances, it is a moral duty to do so. Biblical liberty should not be confused with absolute irresponsible liberty. For example, parents are not at liberty to withhold food from their small child when they have the wherewithal to feed the small child. Similarly, a public utility monopoly providing water, electric, gas, etc. to the public is not at liberty to turn off service, or cease providing reliable affordable service, at will. There is a compact with the public to provide continued reliable, affordable utility service. If such utility wants to cease providing that service, then it has the responsibility to sell its asset to someone who will keep up such service. Current circumstances are such that <u>our region's grid is already at an elevated risk level of demand exceeding supply</u>, and the electric grid operator has clearly warned we are <u>on a dangerous path forward with grid reliability</u>. Under circumstances such as this, it is highly irresponsible and endangering to the public to close and demolish the Campbell plant in 2025, especially when there is no sound replacement in place.

There is an important distinction between a public utility monopoly and regular private enterprise businesses. It should be noted for the latter that <u>the proposed charter</u> stipulates that government should not engage in activities which the private sector can do as well or better. The "Save The Campbell" plan is not a move towards socialism in any sense, but is instead a move away from State of Michigan regulation (which in fact is following a globalist agenda under Gov. Whitmer) to more local control.

Objection #2: The county executive in a home rule charter county would have too much power.

This is simply erroneous. A <u>county executive under our proposed county charter would be more accountable</u> than the current administrator. The fact that the county executive has to be elected by the citizens itself means the position is more accountable to the people, and less able to hide behind the Board and the bureaucracy. But furthermore, the county executive would be subject to recall by the citizens and impeachment by the Board of Commissioners, along with having to seek re-election every four years. Furthermore, the Board would be able to override the county executive's veto and would originate all spending bills. And the executive branch would be subject to oversight by the Board. All of these measures limit the power of the county executive in appropriate and adequate ways.

Objection #3: Consumer's Energy is planning to build a gas plant in Ottawa County to replace the Campbell plant.

It is NOT true what a Republican leader in Ottawa County leadership claims that Consumers Energy (CE) is building a new gas-powered plant to make up for the lost energy after the Campbell plant is demolished. We verified the veracity of this claim with two sources at CE. Consumers Energy's plan, in their own words, remains to "achieve 60 percent emissions reductions by 2025 — faster than President Biden's goal — and keep us on course to achieve net zero emissions by 2040. We've already begun tapping more solar power and plan to add nearly 8,000 megawatts by 2040."

Objection #4: The mainstream media has treated the "Save The Campbell" effort more nicely, so it must be that the effort would help the liberal cause.

As evidenced in the Holland Sentinel articles <u>here</u>, the mainstream media has not necessarily treated the effort nicely, although it is true that Mlive more fairly covered it. That said, I think the main treatment by mainstream media at this point is to ignore it and hope that it goes away.

Objection #5: Election of the county executive would take away power from the conservative Board of Commissioners.

It is hard to predict who will rule the Board after the coming elections, just as it is hard to predict who the citizens would elect as a county executive. It is quite possible that the next Board will be more liberal, and a future conservative executive would place a check on their liberal tendencies. This is a highly speculative and questionable objection. In any case, the plan is sound, and speculations of this kind should not derail it.

Objection #6: We should focus our efforts on supporting Governor Whitmer and Rep. Huizenga's plan to pay Holtec money to re-commission the Palisades nuclear plant in order to make up for the coming loss of the Campbell plant.

As described <u>here</u> and <u>here</u>, this is a terribly dangerous and fiscally irresponsible plan.

Objection #7: You and your political goals are too "extreme".

This is what I was told in an initial meeting with one of the leaders in the Ottawa County GOP. I think it really gets to the heart of the main objection to what is being proposed, even though it is not often publicly stated. There is a rejection of the long term goal outlined in my book <u>Return to the Articles of Confederation</u>: <u>A Rebuttal to Trustee Steele and All of Those who Oppose Biblical Christian Rule</u>, and so there is a rejection of what is seen as a first step in that direction with this plan and charter. Contrary to this objection, it is the practical, moral and legal course. It is the alternatives which are impractical, immoral, and illegal.