

Jefferson Mining District and South West Oregon Mining Association
Joint statement on the proposed mineral withdrawal

Contrary to Special Interest promotion, a mineral withdrawal is not a popularity contest but a process which the BLM had rules to follow prior to public comment which it intentionally failed to do.

Essential to the process is the requirements to take mineral inventory and make market value determination in minerals and disposed property being displaced and the economic or other impacts, lost to the people of the County, by the non-productive replacement proposed, which lawful project requiring a mineral withdrawal is not in the record either. These impact assessments are required to inform the public of the value that will be stolen from present and future generations. The public comment is not informed by these assessments or for a lawfully relevant project; In this case, stealing mineral wealth and direct and indirect local economy for a merely aesthetic use of no actual relevant value in law. The Eye-of-the-beholder is not a good valuation measure. Most of us look for beauty in our lives, if we can see it through the smoke caused by non-harvesting and wasting of timber, but we must not allow the ideological, even religious, worship of intangible things to commit waste as any such mineral withdrawal will do. Contemporary Conservation is Waste. The withdrawal is Waste.

In this regard, the testimony of all those contrary to a proposed mining development in the area is hypocritical and evidence that there is more value in minerals ready to contribute to the local economy and jobs than in the mere aesthetics planned to replace it.

By this alone, there is no validity in law to withdraw the minerals, notwithstanding the additional harm to the local economy and violations of the relative Federal and state Obligations and Duties in law. The congressmen and senators calling for withdrawal are committing fiduciary breach to the people they are to serve and the law to which they are bound. Also are the national defense and security implications.

Under the withdrawal proposed some minerals will still be mined, the common minerals, sand a gravel, etc., the monies from which go to the agencies. But other types of minerals gold, silver, copper, etc., the uncommon minerals, the risk and reward going to any men and women miners intending so will be prohibited. The federal legislators have proposed to steal the uncommon valuable mineral estate and lock it up permanently in favor of common sand and gravel mining. This is similar to the tactic of locking up timber harvest which benefits the people and the County in favor of thinning projects which benefits only the agency and its “stakeholder” co-conspirators.

The withdrawal is being proposed because the property claims of miners are inconvenient for the agencies. Private property rights are under attack here and because valuable mineral mines are an inconvenience to the oppressive detrimental control by the federal agencies over the land and over the lives of all the people and the countryside. Private mining claims are not aesthetically pleasing to federal agency management “Wilding” or “Sustainable Development” objectives.

There is much more to say on how wrong this withdrawal is which County authority, having the obligation and duty, would be wise to protect against. And not leave this imperative matter to circus environment emotional outburst as witnessed at the recent stacked and packed staged comment meeting at the Anne Basker building, but by force of law requiring production and meeting economic necessity. The BLM should not be allowed to file a false report to Congress in support of the withdrawal legislation. We need your help.

And isn't it the truth, that despite 150 years of economic mining activity in the area the water is still pristine as testified to by those adverse to mining the minerals they use on the daily basis?