

The long-view, what's in store going forward

This is the uppermost concern in the minds of millions of Americans at the present time...what's in store going forward?

I will attempt, through a few different scenarios, to shed a little light on what we could possibly be confronted with as we proceed down the road into 2017 and beyond.

First case scenario would be for Hillary to be elected president. If that were to happen everything would continue on as it has throughout the Obama regime.

However, it is practically a given that there would be a concerted, (coupled with a completely coordinated effort to accelerate the pace, i.e.), attempt to speed up the process. All presidents, in our life time, have been participants in bringing to fruition the agenda for the New World Order, or total World Government.

All of this is already planned by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR); which will continue to keep the administration coordinated and focused on the objective.

Also the vacancy on the Supreme Court will most likely be filled with a liberal progressive. Hillary will be able to accomplish this with the help of the so-called conservatives on the Republican side of the aisle, meaning, of course, that the leftist dominance of the court will be strengthened and solidified.

Then, too, if she is in the Oval Office, we can expect more of a takeover of our domestic lives by the United Nations. This is already being planned to come to fruition by 2030.

Now, for the second case scenario, which we might call the worst case, although it is hard to imagine one that would be

worse than the one noted above.

In view of what is happening with the Republicans in their attempt to select a nominee to represent them in the 2016 presidential election, it is beginning to appear that the Establishment, i.e., the Agenda, or Conspiracy for World Government, has put together a scenario that practically assures them that proceedings to bring to fruition the culmination of their agenda, will remain on track.

To bring this about they had to somehow stop, or at least slow down the Trump advance. The first sign to surface was the line pushed by the media that the two leaders, Trump and Cruz, were both "Outsiders," and conservative. This resulted in Cruz beginning to receive more of the conservative vote. This was a false flag for the simple reason that Cruz is not an outsider. He has been in the establishment from the beginning of his public life. To confirm this, you only have to look at his history and who he started working with.

Remember, Cruz's mentor at Princeton was none other than Robert George. Cruz supporter, Glenn Beck, introduced George on his program on Fox News as, "one of the biggest brains in America," or on one broadcast, "Superman of the earth." One must remember that George is a long time member of the CFR, and he also is a long time member of UNESCO.

However, since Cruz is perceived to be conservative, and an "Outsider," this no doubt resulted in some conservatives, who were not too enamored with Trump, to choose Cruz because he presented himself more to their liking. Then there were those like Rush Limbaugh, who maintained that Cruz was the real Conservative – not Trump. Of course, esoterically speaking, Limbaugh's claim that Cruz was a real Conservative, was true; simply for the reason that he, Cruz, is committed to keeping the Establishment's agenda on track. This means that he is in support of Obama's so-called "Free Trade", which would reduce our sovereignty to almost nothing. This includes open borders

along with support for the invasion of our nation and giving aid and comfort to the invaders.

In addition, Senator Sessions, of Alabama has revealed that there is a provision in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) that states that there are certain provisions in the agreement that will not be revealed for at least four years after it goes into effect. Also embedded in it is the authority to add other provisions in the future as needed. Remember, Cruz voted to give fast tracking of this TPP to Obama. Do you know what that does?

Here's what Sen. Jeff Sessions says about Fast Track and the TPP. According to Sessions: "The predictable and surely desired result of the TPP is to put greater distance between the governed and those who govern. It puts those who make the rules out of reach of those who live under them, empowering unelected regulators who cannot be recalled or voted out of office. In turn, it diminishes the power of the people's bulwark: their constitutionally-formed Congress." Shocking, this is what this phony Christian (Cruz) supports. [Link]

From Breitbart comes this:

"TPA eliminates Congress' ability to amend or debate trade implementing legislation and guarantees an up-or-down vote on a far-reaching international agreement before that agreement has received any public review," Sessions writes. "Not only will Congress have given up the 67-vote threshold for a treaty and the 60-vote threshold for important legislation, but will have even given up the opportunity for amendment and the committee review process that both ensure member participation. Crucially, this applies not only to the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) but all international trade agreements during the life of the TPA.

"There is no real check on the expiration of fast-track authority: if Congress does not affirmatively refuse to

reauthorize TPA at the end of the defined authorization (2018), the authority is automatically renewed for an additional three years so long as the President requests the extension.

“And if a trade deal (not just TPP but any trade deal) is submitted to Congress that members believe does not fulfill, or that directly violates, the TPA recommendations—or any laws of the United States—it is exceptionally difficult for lawmakers to seek legislative redress or remove it from the fast track, as the exit ramp is under the exclusive control of the revenue and Rules committees.”

In addition to those concerns about how the deal would not in fact empower Congress—it would instead weaken Congress—Sessions notes that Obama or any future president could redact or classify information from a report the president would be required submit to Congress to get fast-track trade approval if TPA is adopted.

“Moreover, while the President is required to submit a report to Congress on the terms of a trade agreement at least 60 days before submitting implementing legislation, the President can classify or otherwise redact information from this report, limiting its value to Congress,” Sessions writes. “Is TPA designed to protect congressional responsibilities, or to limit Congress’ ability to do its duty?”

The second major point in the Sessions document details how passing TPA through Congress would result in “increased trade deficits.”

“Barclays estimates that during the first quarter of this year, the overall U.S. trade deficit will reduce economic growth by .2 percent,” Sessions writes. “History suggests that trade deals set into motion under the 6-year life of TPA could exacerbate our trade imbalance, acting as an impediment to both GDP and wage growth. Labor economist Clyde Prestowitz

attributes 60 percent of the U.S.' 5.7 million manufacturing jobs lost over the last decade to import-driven trade imbalances.”

Sessions also cites former AT&T CEO Leo Hindery, Jr., who wrote in a recent column for Reuters that since the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and South Korea free trade agreements were passed and implemented, “U.S. trade deficits, which drag down economic growth, have soared more than 430 percent with our free-trade partners.”

“In the same period, they’ve declined 11 percent with countries that are not free-trade partners,” Hindery wrote, in the part where Sessions cites him, adding: “Obama’s 2011 trade deal with South Korea, which serves as the template for the new Trans-Pacific Partnership, has resulted in a 50 percent jump in the U.S. trade deficit with South Korea in its first two years. This equates to 50,000 U.S. jobs lost. “

All of the above is practically a given with any of the contenders becoming successful in attaining the office of President, other than Trump. This does not mean that Trump would be able to prevent it from happening, simply for the reason that the leadership in both the House and the Senate, along with the total control apparatus of the left, is committed to the plan, the plan of the Insider hierarchy, claimed by Obama as his plan to Fundamentally Transform America. However, it (The Plan) has been in the works long before he came into existence, he is only the baton carrier for the current segment of its fruition.

All of the above, in my opinion, is what we could look forward to if Cruz is elected. However, even if he is successful in preventing Trump from getting the required 1237 delegates that would result in a brokered convention, the Establishment is, most likely, not going to choose him as the nominee. Why? Simply because, even though it has supported him in his battle with Trump, he is not their main choice, but he is their only

choice to possibly stop Trump. So, he is being used by the establishment hierarchy.

I know what many people think, and would say any of the candidates to be chosen out of a brokered convention would most likely mean victory for Hillary. That, however, doesn't bother the Establishment for it sets up a win-win situation for it, the same as it has for decades. Either way – they win.

What we have to understand is this: The Establishment is comprised of more than the GOP, it also consists of the Democrats along with all the leftist elements connected to their party. We have heard the expression, "THE DEMOCRAT AND REPUBLICAN PARTIES ARE LIKE TWO LEGS ON THE SAME BUG – ONE GETS THERE BEFORE THE OTHER – BUT BOTH OF THEM GET THERE.

In order to understand this one needs to read "SHADOWS OF POWER," by James Perloff. He chronicles the advent of the Establishment for about a hundred years, and it's all well documented. Upon reading it one will never see today's events the same again.

© 2016 J.W. Bryan – All Rights Reserved