

Open Letter To President Donald J. Trump, Part 2

Dear Mr. President:

At the close of my personal letter to you, dated 11-25-18, I stated that I would be dealing with sustainable development along with other issues in my future article, "Open Letter to President Donald J. Trump, Part 2."

The Dangerous USMCA

I stated that the revised NAFTA trade deal, the USMCA is a globalist trap; for it brings in the UN's Law of the Sea Treaty (LOST) through the back door. Now that you've signed this new trade deal, we have to hope that Congress will reject it.

There may be some parts of the agreement which are favorable as far as trade is concerned, but that is just a small part of the multiple-page document. It establishes supranational governing bodies that have ultimate authority over many aspects besides trade. It becomes a regional government and is open ended in order to include other countries, forming an even larger regional government just as was done in Europe.

Mr. President, if you only concentrated on the trade aspects and trusted your team with the rest of it, you may not be aware of the pitfalls.

According to a recent article in Canada Free Press, USMCA contains a new chapter (24) on environment which was not in the NAFTA agreement. The three parties recognize sustainable development (SD), the lynchpin of United Nations Agenda 21, now morphed into UN 2030, as an essential ingredient **without which trade cannot exist.**

According to what is stated here, the three parties recognize and no doubt agree that any party that does not promote and advance sustainable development will not have the privilege to trade.

Mr. President I believe that our Trade Representative, Mr. Lighthizer, and those involved with him, must have either been asleep or failed to pay attention to what was going on. Could it be that he and others were completely in favor of advancing sustainable development? I believe this is what has occurred. As we saw in the last stages of the renegotiation of NAFTA, it was apparent Lighthizer was not on America's side.

For example, when you sent a directive to eliminate Chapter 19 in its entirety, your directive "disappeared" because so many others wanted to retain that portion. And then, there's the fact that Lighthizer is a member of the globalist Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the intent of which from its inception in 1921 was and is to gradually and incrementally change the United States so that it can be merged with other nations into a world government. That being the case, it is reasonable to expect him to be about the business and goals of the organization of which he is a member.

As for a member of the trade entity losing its privilege to trade for not promoting sustainable development, just think of the trouble this will cause. Let's suppose that one of the parties is not too enamored with having to force the sustainable development onto their people; but recognizes that if there isn't at least a show of complying, it will result in no trade.

It is apparent that the parties to the agreement are caught in a pincers-like trap between the people and the authorities of the Trade Commission. If they fail to advance sustainable development, they will be denied the privilege to trade.

The purpose for joining with the other parties was to bring

about more trade, more opportunities for more jobs – in short, for a better life for business and the people; but all this is headed in the opposite direction. What’s going on here?

The United Nations is using trade as the bait to suck all nations into one global entity of complete economic, cultural and political control, i.e., the New World Order, or Global Governance. And to implement this on-going plan, the UN is using local change strategies such as Agenda 21 to introduce and incrementally facilitate change through state and local governments which will bring a mind-set more favorable to global governance.

Agenda 21 Connection

It is difficult to define the connection of Sustainable Development and Agenda 21. [Agenda 21 is a part of Sustainable Development](#), and is the vehicle which advances sustainable development.

Let’s take a look at some of the people behind all this activity, as well as what they propose and endorse.

William F. Jasper, editor of the New American Magazine attended the 1992 Earth Summit, known officially as the United Nations Conference on environmental Development (UNCED), the eco-confab in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. It was unprecedented in size and scope, bringing together some 35,000 government officials, diplomats, NGO activists, and journalists. According to Jasper, Rio became the launch pad for a number of huge initiatives that have been gradually gaining force and wreaking havoc on the planet in intervening decades; one of the main documents to come out of UNCED process was Agenda 21.

The ICLEI (International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives) web page states that its Local Agenda 21 Model Communities Programme is “designed to aid local governments in implementing Chapter 28 of Agenda 21,” the global action plan for sustainable development.

ICLEI's website informs us:

The Council was established when more than 200 local governments from 43 countries convened at our inaugural conference, The World Congress of Local Governments for a Sustainable Future, at the United Nations in New York.

ICLEI's website notes that in 2003 it changed its name "ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability," no doubt to place more emphasis on the "local" and to diminish concerns about its "international" influence and its political and financial ties to the United Nations. ICLEI and other UN-affiliated NGOs and government officials have come under increasing suspicion in recent years from American citizens, and have taken to camouflaging their UN-driven environmental agendas, even to the point of denying obvious and easily documented connections. On its web page entitled "ICLEI Connecting Leaders," ICLEI explains some of its networking strategies. They include:

Connect cities and local governments to the United Nations and other international bodies. ICLEI represents local governments at the United Nations (UN) Commission on Sustainable Development, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Conventions on Biodiversity and Combating Desertification and cooperates with the UN Environment Programme and UN-HABITAT.

"That seems pretty clear: ICLEI's mission is to "connect" local governments to the UN and its affiliates. It goes on: "

Mobilize local governments to help their countries implement multilateral environmental agreements such as the Rio conventions through Cities for Climate, Protection, and Local Action for Biodiversity and other initiatives.

Again, fairly straightforward: Get the locals to lobby and pressure the national government to hop on board the global programs that will transfer more money, authority, and power

to the UN. ICLEI continues:

Forge multi-stakeholder partnerships such as Resilient Cities, a global framework on urban resilience and climate adaptation where local governments, international agencies, development banks, ministries, institutions, and others collaborate.

Translation: bribe, entice, seduce, flatter local officials, NGOs, and corporations to join the green lobby.

According to William F. Jasper, in the New American Magazines article, "[Your Hometown & the United Nations' AGENDA 21](#)," although the Climate Change Convention has dominated the media headlines and political landscape for many years, Agenda 21 is even more far-reaching and dangerous. Jasper points out that the alarmists declare that desperate measures are necessary to "save" Mother Earth, and only a comprehensive, global plan will do. He admits that UN Agenda 21 is definitely comprehensive and global. It proposes a global regime that will monitor, oversee, and strictly regulate our planet's oceans, streams, rivers, aquifers, sea beds, coastlands, wetlands, forests, jungles, grasslands, farmland, deserts, tundra, and mountains – in short, everything. There is nothing on, in, over, or under the Earth that doesn't fall within the purview of some part of Agenda 21.

According to the report. The most accessible of Agenda 21 to come out following the Rio summit was published under the title Agenda 21: "[The Earth Summit Strategy to Save Our Planet](#)," edited by environmental-activist attorney Daniel Sitarz, and enthusiastically endorsed by now deceased Earth Summit chief Maurice Strong. The book is instructive for demonstrating the completely alien mindset that holds sway in so many influential political, academic, and media circles. Sitarz's edition provides a powerful, albeit unintended, indictment of the UN agreement by offering this candid appraisal of the plan's totalitarian ambition. Incredibly, Sitarz admits with apparent approval that:

Agenda 21 proposes an array of actions which is intended to be implemented by every person on Earth... It calls for specific changes in the activities of all people... Effective execution of Agenda 21 will require a profound reorientation of all human society, unlike anything the world has ever experienced – a major shift in the priorities of both governments and individuals and an unprecedented redeployment of human and financial resources. This shift will demand that concern for environmental consequences of every human action be integrated into individual and collective decision-making at every level.

One might ask, what does all this have to do with the renegotiated NAFTA – the USMCA? If the USMCA is ratified it will bring in by the back-door the UN Law of the Sea Treaty that will not only aid in implementing much of what is planned in Sustained Development through Agenda 21, but so much more. However, even if there wasn't anything else to avoid, what is imbedded in this one Chapter 24 is more than enough to outright reject this USMCA trade deal.

And that, Mr. President is what you should do. You shouldn't even let it come to a vote. I'm sure you intended that it be renegotiated to a positive result – positive to Americans sense of values. Of course, as we now see this hasn't been done. But if it is allowed to come before Congress and the Senate it will probably be ratified. There are many legislators who are supposedly on our-side, but too many who are not.

As I said in my [“Open Letter to you, part 1,”](#) the ball is in your court. Mr. President, millions of Americans are hoping you will step up to the plate and do the right thing – pull completely out of it.

If you choose not to, let's look at the consequences, it will mean that you will have broken your promise. And that is most likely to result in about 30 percent of your supporters staying home in 2020. And I hate to even think about the

consequences.

I'm not finished yet, Mr. President, but I'll have to take that up in Part 3.

© 2018 JW Bryan – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail J.W. Bryan: semper87plus@yahoo.com