

From: Rural/Urban Resources

- Aggies need to stop working against property owners! Below is part of the October Newsletter from the Water and Natural Resources (but are the same) organizations, bragging about training water planners how to "educate" people on how to take control of the landowner's private property. I could understand this thinking coming from Longhorn University, but A&M? -

[Texas A&M institute to hold social media training Nov. 6 in San Angelo](#)

How can natural resources professionals use social media to provide education? Find out at "Social Media 101 - Raising Stakeholder Awareness in an Information Age" **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid. Nov. 6** at the Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Center, 7887 U.S. Highway 87 North, in San Angelo.

Hosted by the [Texas A&M Institute of Renewable Natural Resources](#) (IRNR), the training will be 9 a.m.-3 p.m., with registration at 8:30 a.m. It will cover the basics of social media and its effective use in online communications.

"If you are in the role of outreach and information dissemination, you have a challenging mediascape to conquer," said **Amy Hays**, IRNR program specialist and workshop trainer. "That challenge is finding a way to be heard against a tide of competing voices."

- Basically, Texas A & M "specialists" will teach you how to "disseminate" information on how to take private property - as the landowner owns his or her underground water. But HOW can taking private property, by control or seizure, be in the public interest or be a public benefit? IF it is "a public interest", can gas, oil, coal, gravel, sand, and other minerals and ores be far behind? IF it is in the "public interest" to take what is under the ground, why isn't it in the same "public benefit" to take what is above ground?

A "public interest" is public (government) ownership.

These "specialists at A & M are also lying by omission about Proposition 6 on November 5, saying it is a one-time transfer of \$2 billion from the "Rainey Day" fund to the Texas Water Development Board. It does more than transfer \$2 billion: It also would change the state Constitution to allow the TWDB to issue up to \$53 billion of general obligation bonds. But supporters don't want this fact known, and they are lying by omission; a fact that makes the proposition deserve a "no" vote. A "yes" vote is a vote for dishonesty.

Am having a difficult time believing A&M is moving so far to the left. Aggies need to yank the reins and stop this nonsense. -

WHEN did the "fighting farmers" become socialists?

