

## New Legislation Points to Global Governance

Written by Kathleen McCarthy  
Friday, 21 May 2010 08:29

---

Sooner rather than later, each of us will have to make a decision about his/her national identity as an American. The question will be whether, as an American sovereign, you are willing to relinquish your status in favor of a merging with other sovereign nations, beginning with Mexico and Canada most likely, to form an entirely new form of international/global governance; hence the term "new world order."

This choice of national identity is no longer science fiction. The media has finally brought this grave issue into mainstream focus, and the evidence points conclusively to just such an eventuality. Every day, America is drawn further into the global financial meltdown through Washington's policies of intervention, financial aid, and our own out-of-control borrowing that forces taxpayers' participation on whatever level our international creditors dictate.

Such evidence includes Congress committing U.S. taxpayers to 17 percent of the International Monetary Fund's \$1-trillion bailout of Greece. In fact, IMF bailouts of any other countries will exact 17 percent of their financing from U.S. taxpayers, all of which Congress will have to first borrow itself, further enslaving future generations to debt that only benefits other countries. In the final analysis, TARP and the stimulus bailouts mostly served to salvage Goldman Sachs and other Wall Street elite, in the same way that the IMF's bailout of Greece is really a salvaging of wealthy Greeks and European banks -- at least for the time being.

Further evidence is the current American Power Act of 2010, which is the updated version of last year's cap-and-trade legislation that passed in the House but has been renamed by the Senate to throw the public off. This legislation intends to impose the heaviest taxation since the income tax upon every activity that produces carbon, including inhaling/exhaling air. Part of this tax will pass through to Edmund de Rothschild's World Conservation Bank for the purpose of redistributing wealth to Third World countries in exchange for their land, and for perpetuating the worldwide \$10-trillion carbon-credit trading.

In other words, Americans will be taxed to directly benefit international interests other than our own because a portion of that tax will go directly to a pre-established international fund. Those funds do not transfer back to Americans in the form of services or subsidies, but will ultimately enrich the shareholders of the World Conservation Bank, along with newly created "green bank" subsidiaries, which are really subsidiaries of privately owned central banks worldwide.

## New Legislation Points to Global Governance

Written by Kathleen McCarthy  
Friday, 21 May 2010 08:29

---

This legislation is the scam of the millennium. The financial burden its taxation imposes on Americans threatens to eliminate our middle class. Please read House bills H.R. 2454 and H.R. 2998, and Senate bill S.1733. Read all the amendments to these bills, as well. The full text and summaries can be found at [Thomas.gov](http://Thomas.gov) , [GovTrack.us](http://GovTrack.us) , [OpenCongress.org](http://OpenCongress.org) , and [Vote-Smart.org](http://Vote-Smart.org)

These four Web sites are nonpartisan, and designed to inform without bias. All bills can be researched through these sites, including the bills' status, amendments, and votes.

It is important to note here that the software being used to track carbon-trading was purchased in 2002 and submitted for a patent by then-Fannie Mae Chair and CEO Franklin Raines, using funds from Fannie Mae, while simultaneously cooking the agency's books and allocating to himself \$9.2 million in bonuses. He was indicted and fired, but reemerged as a founding member of the Emerald Cities Collaborative, which is in turn a board member of the Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX), where this very software is currently deployed. (The patent was approved on December 7, 2006.)

The CCX was originally funded in 2003 with \$1.2 million in seed money from the Joyce Foundation, when then-Illinois state Senator Barrack Obama and then-Chicago-based public-housing overlord Valerie Jarrett were both board members.

Meanwhile, Al Gore's carbon-offset company, Generation Investment Management, has purchased 10-percent ownership in the CCX, and Goldman Sachs coincidentally has purchased another 10 percent. The CCX recently merged with the London-based Climate Exchange PLC, completing the picture of global control of a \$10-trillion industry largely dependent on Clean Energy/cap-and-trade/American Power legislation that has as its linchpin American taxation for this financial treachery to succeed.

Because our entire system of law is more deeply rooted in commerce and British Maritime Law, with much government authority granted through the 1946 Administrative Procedures Act, some form of global governance begins to make sense. I urge everyone to read "They Own It All (Including You)" by Ron McDonald and Robert Rowen. Be prepared to be shocked and shaken, but understanding the means/methods by which American principles and liberties are being systematically stripped from us with our unwitting participation is the first step in stopping such plans from succeeding.

Perhaps you have no problem with the notion of a one-world government, akin to *Star Trek's*

## New Legislation Points to Global Governance

Written by Kathleen McCarthy  
Friday, 21 May 2010 08:29

---

United Federation of Planets. But if that is what you envision, then at least do your homework, especially because such governance would not remotely resemble the utopian existence depicted in

*Star Trek*

. Nothing in mankind's history supports that a top-down, centralized form of governance has ever been anything but tyrannical. It boils down to human nature. Every instance of Marxism, socialism, fascism, monarchy, totalitarianism, and despotism has been a caste-based society, with precious few haves and multitudes of have-nots with no possibility of ever being a have. It is a socioeconomic structure dependent on coercive control of the populace for its survival. Proof of this abounds; just read your history.

The core tenet is that such social structures pretend to embrace the collective good over that of the one, except when the "one" is in power. Such social structures make American political corruption look like a girl- or boy-scout camp. When has there ever been an example of such governance as benevolent, with laws applied equally and fairly among its citizens? When has there ever been an economic model that succeeded through coercion and universal subsidy? We have countless examples of such models failing every single time throughout history, yet here we are again, at the crossroads of transforming America from a free-market republic based on the rule of law to that of a socialized governance, whose laws have no absolutes, subject to the whim of lawmakers in power (sound familiar?) and an economy heavily subsidized by the needs as defined by international power brokers and bankers -- an unholy alliance of gov-corps (big business, big government, big unions, and potentially big churches if Obama's faith-based initiative succeeds).

The claim that Obama inherited this economic mess is to deny truth at its very center. Obama is as culpable for the financial morass every bit as much as any other Republican or Democrat in the 110th Congress. Recall that both McCain and Obama purposely left the campaign trail to lobby their peers in favor of Bush's TARP bailout. Obama used his considerable influence to garner Democrats' "yes" votes for the legislation. Obama voted in favor of TARP, then implemented his own stimulus bailouts less than six months after taking office. It is absurd to believe that Obama is a victim of the previous administration or Congress, when he was one of its members and a hearty advocate of the bailouts. You can support Obama all you want, but do so with truth, not some sugar-coated version of his politics.

Bush's policies were among the worst this country has ever had to endure. Make no mistake. But Obama is no better; he is arguably much worse. He has spent four times the amount Bush spent during his eight years in office. Maybe it is time to consider that the Republican/Democrat duopoly is really only a well-crafted illusion to keep American voters' eyes off the ball, keeping voters so focused on the fight in arena that we are missing the covert battles taking place that threaten our liberties and way of life. Just review much of the past two decades of legislation,

## New Legislation Points to Global Governance

Written by Kathleen McCarthy  
Friday, 21 May 2010 08:29

---

including the USA PATRIOT Act, and the abuse of executive power, invoked by Bush more times than any other president, until Obama if he maintains his trajectory. Clinton held 262 question/answer sessions with the press in his first 16 months, Bush 156, but Obama only 64. Transparency is at an all-time low, and the proposed "net neutrality" legislation will only further expand government control of speech via the Internet. Growth in government programming and employment has far surpassed sustainability, and the Social Security and Medicare/Medicaid trust funds (part of the General Fund since Clinton, which he hailed as an overall budget surplus) are bankrupt as Obama's health-care reform became law against the will of Americans, both in merit and substance.

No one disputes the need for health-insurance reform, but the new health-care bill falls far too short of this goal. And by requiring 40 million new enrollees, it is arguably one of the greatest boons to primary-health-insurance providers since Medicare.

---

In truth, whether Democrats or Republicans control either Congress and/or the administration, there has been a steady decline in American politics, economies, laws, and ethics, as well as the general well-being of citizens, for at least the past two decades. The fact is that this degradation is one long continuous string of ever more corrupt policies/legislation that serves special interests over those of the American people, regardless of which party controls the Congress or administration.

The current financial crisis. Lack of sensible immigration control. Unholy alliances between corporations and the public sector, such as Wall Street cronies occupying key government positions, including those with vital regulatory authority (e.g., ex-Halliburton employees occupying the two highest positions at the Minerals Management Service, which is the regulatory agency for oil drilling and collection of royalties from drilling). Obscene lobbying and campaign financing that unduly influence legislation. And justices/legislators/administrators without the will to enforce laws already enacted, or create new laws with teeth that would ultimately discourage crime in Washington and Wall Street. All point to the need for Americans to take back the control of our bloated, inefficient, yet ever-expanding government before our national identity is lost forever.

What kind of circular logic justifies giving more control to a government that proves time and again it is incapable of managing even the most fundamental responsibilities as enumerated in the U.S. Constitution? The lack of respect for Americans in government today is best illustrated by last week's meetings held by members of Congress with both U.S. Attorney General Eric

## New Legislation Points to Global Governance

Written by Kathleen McCarthy  
Friday, 21 May 2010 08:29

---

Holder and U.S. Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano to discuss Arizona's new immigration law. In both cases, these two individuals, who hold two of the highest law-enforcement offices in the country, admitted they had not bothered to read the 17-page document that is Arizona's newly signed legislation on immigration. This law reflects the federal law on immigration and falls under the purview of both offices, and both have expressed harsh disapproval of it, Holder going as far to say that he would seek some legal remedy against Arizona over it. Yet they had not even bothered to read it prior to being confronted by a panel on the matter. Can you imagine getting away with this level of incompetence or insubordination in your job? What manner of leadership would stand for such blatant lack of judgment?

Which brings me to the latest horror by Holder, who has proposed a statutory amendment to Miranda under the guise of a "public safety exemption." It would allow authorities to arrest citizens suspected of being domestic terrorists without having to exercise Miranda rights. Holder goes too far this time. Currently, military laws cover every possible scenario for prosecuting terrorists, both internationally and domestically. The only reason Holder (representing the Obama Administration) is interested in matching this authority in civil court is to exercise the same military force against American nationals that they suspect of "belligerent" conduct. It is an outrage, completely anti-American to its core and, if successful, a chillingly dangerous threat to our liberty. Call your Congressman and warn him that this public-safety exemption is unacceptable. Voters have a window of opportunity between now and November, because we actually have some clout. Use it.

Meanwhile, Napolitano is flexing her authority in an effort to seize five acres of a family-owned dairy farm at the Vermont-Canada border, where the little used Morse Line Port border crossing (two cars every hour -- approximately 40 cars per day) is scheduled for a \$45-million overhaul. The renovation would require an additional five acres of the Rainvilles' farmland, for which Napolitano has offered the family \$39,000 under the threat of eminent domain, which allows the government to take private land for public use. However, eminent domain requires that the use be legitimate, public, and for fair market value. All three miss their mark entirely. The border crossing is so rarely used as to be mostly irrelevant, making a far better case for its closing altogether. There are plenty of other crossings that can handle the relocated traffic. Additionally, Napolitano's offer of \$39,000 is a long way from fair market value. Nothing about this latest government intrusion makes sense, nor does it remotely reflect the spirit of the law. Furthermore, it utterly threatens a family's livelihood for a mere five acres that has no business as part of the renovation to begin with. This is just another version of governmental theft. As Americans we need to stand against these actions because but for the Grace of God it could be you or me.

What really needs to occur in this country is a revitalization of civic participation, a restrengthening of the 10th amendment (states' rights), and for everyday Americans to run for

## New Legislation Points to Global Governance

Written by Kathleen McCarthy  
Friday, 21 May 2010 08:29

---

office to get things back on track. There are presently 540 members in the 111th Congress -- 99 Senators and 431 Representatives. We currently have 130 Congressmen serving in D.C. who have been there more than 18 years, 68 who have been in office 24 years or more, and 44 career politicians who have occupied seats for more than 30 years, four of which are 40-year-plus veterans. This must change if we are to have any hope for an overhaul of D.C. The sad truth is that our legislators rarely write the bills they sponsor. Legislation is mostly written by lobbyists and activists, then massaged by legislative staff to ensure that the bills conform to House/Senate rules. Eventually these bills make it to the legislators themselves for introduction and processing (committees, debate, amendments, voting, and a thousand other procedural sideshows if the bills aren't fast-tracked for signing into law).

Citizens can begin with a less-grueling commitment by running for local and state seats. In Iowa's June 8 Primary, there are 47 seats with people running unopposed. This is a travesty! We must fill these positions with family, friends, and neighbors willing to serve long enough to get things on track. And those good enough to run must be supported by those of us who can help with our particular competencies, such as research, financial analysis, legal analysis, fundraising, marketing, public relations -- all from a grassroots effort so as to avoid the machine that defines the two-party leadership that cares more about gaining power than holding their candidates accountable to the Constitutional principles each swears an oath to uphold.