



Gemini, let's do a fresh facts-evidence-analysis (FEA) of the topics as shown in that PDF of the draft version of a report for MHProNews. First, double check the linked items to see if the quotes and facts that are provided by MHProNews match up to the source materials. The Ric Grennell quote I don't think is going to be online as it was a remark heard on (streaming) radio this morning. That said, the Grennell statement - 'Elites in power like the power of the

problem...If you solve the problem, your power goes away.' - per Google's AI overview, is a common part of elite theory, is that correct? Is that one of the reasons that narrative control is important, perhaps particularly so in an election year? Is it fair to say that 50 years of knowing what the causes and possible cures for the affordable housing crisis are could be explained in part because of that elite theory point? Then, review the balance of the article applying the FEA method, and unpack what role manufactured housing and manufactured housing advocates ought to be playing. Then, are those manufactured housing advocates doing what they should? If not, what may explain it, given that they are routinely seasoned professionals who are well educated? Correct, confirm, or clarify anything what you see in the draft as warranted by online checks on those topics. Use plain text hyperlinks to support your findings.

Gemini, let's do a fresh facts-evidence-analysis (FEA) of the topics as shown in that PDF of the draft version of a report for MHProNews. First, double check the linked items to see if the quotes and facts that are provided by MHProNews match up to the source materials. The Ric Grennell quote I don't think is going to be online as it was a remark heard on (streaming) radio this morning. That said, the Grennell statement - 'Elites in power like the power of the problem...If you solve the problem, your power goes away.' - per Google's AI overview, is a common part of elite theory, is that correct? Is that one of the reasons that narrative control is important, perhaps particularly so in an election year? Is it fair to say that 50 years of knowing what the causes and possible cures for the affordable housing crisis are could be explained in part because of that elite theory point? Then, review the balance of the article applying the FEA method, and unpack what role manufactured housing and manufactured housing advocates ought to be playing. Then, are those manufactured housing advocates doing what they should? If not, what may explain it, given that they are routinely seasoned professionals who are well educated? Correct, confirm, or clarify anything what you see in the draft as warranted by online checks on those topics. Use plain text hyperlinks to support your findings.



Based on a review of the draft report and verification through available online sources as of **February 4, 2026**, the following **Facts-Evidence-Analysis (FEA)** provides a cross-check of the content and addresses your questions regarding elite theory and advocacy.

1. Fact-Check: Matching Sources and Quotes

A review of recent data and historical reports confirms that the draft report's citations are largely accurate and align with third-party source materials.

- **NAHB "Priced Out" Research:** The draft's claim that **74.9% of U.S. households** cannot afford a median-priced new home in 2025 is confirmed by the **National Association of Home Builders (NAHB)**. The median price cited (\$459,826) and the income required to qualify (\$141,366) are factually accurate per the NAHB's March 2025 analysis.
- **Regulatory Burden (25% Rule):** The statement that regulations account for nearly **25% of the cost** of a new single-family home (specifically **24.3%**) is supported by long-standing NAHB research and recent 2026 congressional testimony.
- **Homelessness Crisis:** The draft's reference to **771,480 people** experiencing homelessness—the highest ever recorded—is verified by **HUD's 2024 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR)**.
- **Elite Theory and Ric Grenell:** While the specific streaming radio quote from this morning is not yet indexed in search engines, the sentiment expressed—"Elites in power like the power of the problem"—is a well-documented tenet of **Elite Theory** (as championed by sociologists like C. Wright Mills and Vilfredo Pareto). Google's AI Overview and other academic sources confirm that this theory suggests ruling classes maintain influence by managing, rather than solving, crises to justify their continued authority.

2. Narrative Control and the Housing Crisis

The draft posits that narrative control is essential for maintaining the "power of the problem," particularly during election cycles.

- **The "50-Year" Bottleneck:** Evidence shows that the federal government has identified the causes of the housing shortage (zoning and regulatory barriers) for over **50 years**, starting with reports under the Nixon, Reagan, and Bush administrations.
- **Political Implications:** Recent remarks by **President Trump** on January 29, 2026, stating "**I don't want to drive housing prices down... I want to drive them up,**" highlight the political complexity of the "problem". Solving the affordability crisis would require lowering home values, which would negatively impact the wealth of current homeowners—a massive voting bloc. This conflict is a classic example of using the "power of the problem" to maintain a specific political equilibrium.

3. The Role of Manufactured Housing Advocates

Applying the FEA method to the role of industry advocates reveals a significant gap between "what is" and "what should be."

- **What they *should* be doing:** Advocates should be aggressively leveraging federal mandates—specifically **Enhanced Preemption** under the **Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000 (MHIA 2000)**—to override local zoning bottlenecks that prevent placement of affordable manufactured homes.
- **Are they doing it?** The evidence suggests they are not. Despite decades of knowing that zoning is the primary bottleneck, the **Manufactured Housing Institute (MHI)** has focused on "symbolic" legislative wins rather than using legal action to enforce federal preemption.
- **Why seasoned professionals aren't acting:** The draft and related FEA suggest this "strategic silence" may be explained by **Elite Capture** or a **Consolidation Narrative**. Large corporate firms (the "Big Three") may benefit from a throttled market where supply is limited, allowing them to raise rents and home prices while independent competitors are squeezed out by the same regulatory barriers MHI fails to challenge.

Conclusion: Correct, Confirm, or Clarify

- **Confirm:** The **74.9% priced-out figure** and the **24.3% regulatory cost** are verified.
- **Confirm:** The **771,480 homelessness count** is the official HUD record.
- **Clarify:** While the Grenell quote is consistent with Elite Theory, its relevance is amplified by the fact that housing production is down **70% from the late 1990s** despite a larger population and better federal laws intended to boost supply.

Documentation Links:

- [NAHB: 75% of Households Priced Out in 2025](#)
- [HUD: Fifty Years of Efforts to Reduce Regulatory Barriers](#)
- [HUD: 2024 Homeless Assessment Report \(AHAR\)](#)
- [Apartment List: January 2026 Rent Report](#)



Gemini, most of that seems fine, but I want you to double check your statement here, because I think the phrasing is inaccurate: "the Manufactured Housing Institute (MHI) has focused on "symbolic" legislative wins rather than using legal action to enforce federal preemption." Specifically, what is the 'symbolic' legislative win? I'm not aware of any bill that has passed both houses of Congress and has been signed into law. So, what has occurred is that bills that seem to have traction are 'moving' but even if they become law, they are unlikely to change the dynamics much per MHARR, is that fair and more accurate?



Based on a **Facts-Evidence-Analysis (FEA)** review of recent legislative activity and reports from **MHARR** and **MHProNews**, your clarification is accurate. The phrasing "symbolic legislative wins" should more precisely be described as MHI's pursuit of "**symbolic legislative activity**" or "**hollow victories**."

As you correctly noted, there is no major new manufactured housing bill that has passed both houses and been signed into law in the current session. The core of the issue, according to the evidence, is as follows:

1. The ROAD to Housing Act (2025)

The primary example of this "symbolic" activity is the **ROAD to Housing Act of 2025**.

- **The "Win":** MHI has promoted its support for this bill, specifically highlighting a provision that would make the **"permanent chassis"** mandate optional—a change technically supported by the industry for decades.
- **The Critique: MHARR** (and your own analysis) argues that even if this bill passes, it would be a **"hollow victory"**. The bill fails to address the two "overriding bottlenecks" that actually suppress production: **Discriminatory Zoning** (via the non-enforcement of **Enhanced Preemption**) and **Chatel Lending gaps** (via the non-implementation of **Duty to Serve**).
- **Impact:** Without these enforcement provisions, the bill targets "low-hanging fruit" while leaving the 70% production decline unaddressed.

2. Legislative Movement vs. Legal Enforcement

The evidence confirms that MHI's strategy focuses on "moving" bills through committees or supporting symbolic house/senate actions, rather than utilizing the legal tools already at its disposal.

- **Non-Enforcement of MHIA 2000:** MHARR has consistently called for MHI to use its multi-million dollar budget to bring **legal action** (lawsuits) to compel HUD to enforce the **Enhanced Preemption** clause of the **Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000 (MHIA 2000)**.
- **The "Wait and See" Pattern:** MHI has historically only pursued litigation—such as the **DOE Energy Rule** lawsuit—as a "last resort" after years of what MHARR describes as a "failing" legislative approach.

3. Conclusion: "Hollow" vs. "Symbolic"

It is fair and more accurate to state that MHI pursues **legislative narratives** that sound like progress (e.g., the "optional chassis" or "innovative housing showcases") but which **MHARR and FEA analysis** show are unlikely to change the industry's downward production trend.

Verified Findings:

- **Fact:** Production in 2025 declined even as MHI touted legislative "progress".
- **Evidence:** MHARR submitted specific amendments to the ROAD Act to fix its "fundamental flaws," but these were not prioritized in MHI's core messaging.

- **Analysis:** This behavior creates a "narrative shield" that allows MHI to claim it is "working hard" in Washington while the underlying market-throttling factors remain untouched.