

Smart Grid: *The Rest of the Story*

(Part 11)

Puppet Regime

It doesn't seem lawful that the Congress could transfer regulatory authority to an organization – the North American Electric Reliability Corporation that is comprised of utility company associations, utility companies and stakeholder interests that includes both Canadian and Mexican counterparts. Even if they retained the authority of FERC over the American utility companies and Regional Transmission Operators, the tangible and intangible elements of political and economic – and the real power of control of the electric grid makes the retention of authority by FERC kind of a bad joke. But the control of our electric grid is not the only example of the Congress handing over U.S. sovereignty to international organizations. And the authority that has been handed off is being used to wage non-military war against us. For example, on June 4, 2014, a local television station did a story about the EPA's proposed changes to the H2O Act and how it is going to have a negative effect on farmers.

[Proposed changes to Clean Water Act could land ag. businesses in hot water](#)

Excerpts:

The agency is trying to nix the word "navigable" from the original act, which would in turn allow the EPA to have total jurisdiction over every single water source, down to every puddle and ditch on farmers' private lands.

As the act currently stands, the EPA only has control over "navigable" resources, which means any large body of water you can navigate upon using a boat, such as the Snake River or even the various reservoirs across the state.

According to Idaho Farm Bureau's John Thompson, this effort by the EPA is because it hopes to try and make sure sediment and rocks do not end up polluting these navigable water resources as it flows-in from these smaller ditches and puddles from local farmlands.

Idaho became the 43rd state in 1890. Agriculture has always been a significant part of Idaho's economy. We have canals running through the state to irrigate the farmland. For 124 years, we've managed to muddle through without the EPA and without fouling the water for our downstream neighbors – Oregon and Washington. So why is the EPA now trying to take over our water sources? I think you find the answer to that question in the first paragraph – the progressive waging of non-military war against us. The EPA is a lot like FERC in terms of being a fraud as a domestic agency of the American government. They are implementing international environmental law behind the mask of a domestic agency and it has always been that way by design of the agency since it was created.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) was passed in 1969 and was signed into law by President Richard Nixon in 1970. The initiative was pushed through Congress by Henry "Scoop" Jackson. An Indiana professor, [Lynton K. Caldwell](#) worked with Jackson on the legislation. Caldwell is considered to be the architect NEPA and U.S. environmental policy.

From the [Environmental Protection Agency's history](#):

Forging such an institution actually represented the final step in a quick march towards national environmental consciousness. Congress recognized the potency of the issue in late 1969 by passing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). ***This statute recast the government's role: formerly the conservator of wilderness, it now became the protector of earth, air, land, and water.*** The law declared Congressional intent to "create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony," and to "assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings." Henceforth, all federal agencies planning projects bearing on the environment were compelled to submit reports accounting for the likely consequences--the now famous Environmental Impact Statements (EISs). Secondly, NEPA directed the President to assemble in his Cabinet a Council on Environmental Quality. Undersecretary of the Interior Russell E. Train agreed to be its first chairman. The Council's three members and staff would assist the President by preparing an annual Environmental Quality Report to Congress, gathering data, and advising on policy. Signing the Act with fanfare on New Year's Day 1970, Nixon observed that he had "become further convinced that the 1970s absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters, and our living environment. It is," he said, "literally now or never."

Implicitly, what this legislation did - as a matter of policy, was to put people in second place behind protection of the environment. Why? Because we live in the environment. It is our habitat. We can't live without using natural resources and their mission is to protect those resources. The conflict is inherent in the mission. In the history (link above), one of the paragraphs is headed "An Agency for the Environment". Think about that.

The 1970 legislation didn't actually create the EPA as an agency. It created the Council for Environmental Quality. The CEQ is an executive branch advisory council. The CEQ recommended creation of the EPA as an agency to manage the process of Environmental Impact Statements. The jurisdiction of the CEQ and the EPA was only *WITHIN* the federal government - to ensure that the federal government was cognizant of the environment for their projects and policies.

"Under presidential authority, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issues regulations to Federal agencies regarding the preparation and content of environmental impact statements".
Lynton Caldwell, the National Environmental Policy Act, 1998

NEPA and the implementation of it are deceptively simple. NEPA sets up the policy framework but does not articulate the details. This leaves the details to be defined on the fly. In effect, the CEQ was set up to manage the actions of all federal agencies through the simple mechanism of the Environmental Impact Statement - with the power of life and death of an action based on approval or disapproval of the EIS.

The Office of International Affairs under the EPA umbrella was created in 1970. According to William Ruckelshaus who was the first EPA Administrator, Russell Train who was the Chairman of the CEQ would handle the international aspects of the EPA's mission and Ruckelshaus would handle the domestic affairs. In his oral history of the EPA's beginnings, Ruckelshaus said the following:

Q: How would you characterize EPA's early involvement in international environmental affairs?

MR. RUCKELSHAUS: I primarily agreed with Russell Train that he should take over most of the international work. I did go to several conferences, was a delegate to the Stockholm Conference in 1970, and signed some international agreements to help both developed and developing countries with their environmental programs. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, we led the rest of the world in dealing with the environment.

The following is an excerpt from a book written by Caldwell, published in 1998, titled *The National Environmental Policy Act: An Agenda for the Future* (Pages 97-98):

The scope and substance of national foreign policy reflect changes in beliefs, values, and economies which have been occurring in industrialized countries during the past quarter-century. Issues once regarded as strictly with a nation's internal affairs (e.g. civil rights, labor policies, status of women, drug traffic, and the environment) have now become potential subjects of international inquiry and negotiation. They involve present and future activities of United States agencies at home and abroad. NEPA, properly interpreted, could guide reconciliation between domestic environmental, economic, and political values and priorities, along with international concerns and commitments.

NEPA by law is supplementary to the missions and mandates of all U.S. Federal agencies. The most celebrated (or, to some troublesome) provision of NEPA is the requirement of an environmental impact statement addressing any major effect on the environment of proposed legislation or administrative action. According to Nicholas C. Yost, who was general counsel to the CEQ under President Carter, NEPA-like legislation "has now been adopted in the national laws of more than 83 countries," making NEPA probably "the most imitated U.S. law in history".

The latter third of the twentieth century has seen the rapid "globalization" of economic activities, and communications, of military "peacekeeping," mass migrations of people, and of environmental impacts and concerns. The establishment of the United Nations and of numerous specialized agencies with international missions, along with the growth of national foreign aid programs, has resulted in an expanding and diversifying international law and policy infrastructure.

The significance as it pertains to the implementation of United Nations Agenda 21 as domestic policy is that the mechanisms for following the edicts of the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) are

built into the framework of the domestic environmental organization within the U.S. government itself. There is no need to write a white paper telling federal, state and local agencies to implement Agenda 21 because Agenda 21 policies are integral (i.e. the mission) within the CEQ and EPA and WITHIN EVERY AGENCY OF GOVERNMENT because of the design of NEPA.

UNEP was created as a result of the 1970 Stockholm Conference. The ultimate output from the conference was the Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment. A copy of their [40th year anniversary](#) history is available on their website. The following is from that history – emphasis added:

The Stockholm Conference had agreed on a Declaration with an associated set of Principles. It had agreed on an Action Plan of 109 recommendations: **the world's first tentative blueprint for planetary environmental management.** Its scope was enormous, calling for global cooperation to monitor the biosphere, safeguard ecosystems, curb marine pollution, improve housing in poor countries, collect genetic samples, protect whales and other endangered species, study energy needs and sources, aid population planning, conserve soils and forests and fisheries, promote environmental education and training and information exchange, and adapt trade and aid policies so as to share equitably the burdens of environmental protection. *Page 27*

Another quote from this 40-year history is the following:

“The Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment, taken together with the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development agreed in June 1992, now has pride of place among the **ever-growing corpus of international law relating to the environment.**” *Page 17*

And this one:

The World Bank, itself a Specialized Agency of the United Nations, though with a rather special statute and status, was increasingly active in the field of environment. As Robert McNamara, the World Bank Group's President, would later point out in his speech to the Stockholm conference: “Our experience is that environmental protection can be built into development projects as competently and successfully as any other requisite element.” The Bank, Mr. McNamara said, didn't limit its operations simply to the environment side of development projects. “It finances many projects that are specifically directed at environmental goals — urban water supply and sewerage treatment, for example, as well as soil erosion control, and water resources management.”¹⁷ *Page 15*

The significance of those quotes will become apparent within the rest of this story but the point for now is that the United Nations has so many specialized agencies that it's hard to keep track of them. It's like trying to keep track of a band of gypsies in a clothing store. They are all going in different directions but they all have a single mission.

At the bottom of page 113, the report says that through the early to the mid 1970's Germany was concerned that the environmental program was not focusing enough attention on international initiatives for the conservation of nature. In particular, they were concerned about migratory birds. Obviously, migratory birds cross borders. What happens next is a classic example of promoting one idea for one purpose without revealing the real underlying purpose.

Willy Brandt was the Chancellor of West Germany at the time. Brandt strongly supported the reunification of East and West Germany. He [resigned in 1974](#) when it was discovered that he had an East German spy in his cabinet. Note: reference to the Helsinki Final Act. In 1977, [Robert McNamara](#),

[then President of the World Bank](#) suggested the establishment of a commission with Willy Brandt as the Chairman. The name of the Commission was the Independent Commission on International Development. The Commission began work in 1977 and published their report in 1980. It was titled [A Programme of Survival](#) although it is most commonly referred to as North-South: A Programme of Survival.

The significance of this Commission cannot be appreciated without an understanding of the organization of the world system of policy development. Because of that, I've pulled out a section of the report that gives a good overview of the international institutions – along with the people involved in this commission. Of special note, on page 215, the Commission wrote:

UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim showed great interest in the formation of this Independent Commission, and agreed that he would receive the first copy of the Commission's Report.

[Pages 26-28, post war – Bretton Woods Institutions](#)

[Pages 215-226 – Annexe 2, Members of the Commission and Terms of Reference](#)

American members: Katharine Graham, Washington Post
Peter G. Peterson, Chairman of the Board of Lehman Brothers

Eminent Persons – invited to testify: Harlan Cleveland, USA
Henry Kissinger, USA

The following is an excerpt from the beginning of the report to explain the thinking behind the report:

Destruction or Development?

Our Report is based on what appears to be the simplest common interest: that mankind wants to survive, and one might even add has the moral obligation to survive. This not only raises the traditional questions of peace and war, but also of how to overcome world hunger, mass misery and alarming disparities between the living conditions of rich and poor.

If reduced to a simple denominator, this Report deals with peace. War is often thought of in terms of military conflict, or even annihilation. But there is a growing awareness that an equal danger might be chaos — as a result of mass hunger, economic disaster, environmental catastrophes, and terrorism. So we should not think only of reducing the traditional threats to peace, but also of the need for change from chaos to order.

The terms 'North' and 'South' are used to collectively refer to developed and developing countries respectively – or more accurately perceived as the rich countries and the poor countries. The purpose of the report was to provide an outline of what the world of countries should do as a mission "for the survival of all". Keeping in mind, this report was published in 1980...

- **Peak Oil** -

“... we face a situation where in the North technological innovations and material changes are more advanced than most people realize whereas in the South the consciousness and aspirations of many people seem to be ahead of material reality. To them we owe a new awareness of the environmental and ecological dangers to our planet.

In the crucial field of fuel energy mankind still behaves as if all these resources — up to now so abundantly wasted — were renewable. The oil stock of our planet has been built up in a long process over millions of years, and is being blown ‘up the chimney’ within only a few generations. Exhaustion of these resources is foreseeable but their replacement by alternative fuels is not. Pollution and exploitation are all-embracing, whether of the atmosphere or soil, or of seas which are being overfished with little regard to replenishment. Are we to leave our successors a scorched [19] planet of advancing deserts, impoverished landscapes and ailing environments?” Page 14

- **World Trade Organization & Energy**

An orderly transition is required from high dependence on increasingly scarce nonrenewable energy sources. **Immediate steps towards an international strategy on energy should be taken as part of the Emergency Programme recommended in the final chapter of the Report. Prices which reflect long-term scarcities will play an important role in this.**

An international trade organization incorporating both GATT and UNCTAD is the objective towards which the international community should work. Meanwhile, there is need for improvement in existing arrangements including wider development of **trade cooperation in such matters as the establishment and administration of rules, principles and codes covering restrictive business practices and technology transfer.**
Page 210

- **Disarmament**

Could one be content to call something a ‘new world economic order’ if it did not include major progress towards disarmament? Page 10

...The goal of building up a globally respected peace-keeping mechanism, powerful enough to prevent conflicts turning into warfare, should be kept constantly in mind. A strengthened role for the United Nations in securing the integrity of states should result in the reduction of national military expenditures, thus freeing resources for more constructive purposes, including development assistance. Page 89

Building on UN Consensus

The valuable and unprecedented basis for consensus in the UN system, for communicating between North and South, and between East and West, must be preserved. It is vital to get the best out of it, to strengthen it, and to build on it, utilizing the experience of the last three decades and the benefits of wide participation. An

increasingly interdependent world must organize itself for the different and more difficult tasks of the future, which will call not only for political will and wisdom, but for a framework of institutions and negotiations which can convert policies and ideas into action. Page 192

Injecting New Purpose into the Dialogue

In earlier chapters we have drawn attention to the common interests of all countries — North, South, West or East — in peace and disarmament, in the attack on poverty and hunger, in achieving an orderly energy transition and in protecting the environment. We have pointed to the strong mutual interests of all countries in worldwide economic growth, control of inflation and promotion of employment. We have underlined the need

for solidarity and for a more equal relationship between rich and poor nations in the councils and institutions of the world. Page 192

- **Economic Development**

...But all countries need an international environment that will be responsive to their development efforts. Herein lies part of the rationale for a new international economic order.

Statistical measurements of growth exclude the crucial elements of social welfare, of individual rights, of values not measurable by money. Development is more than the passage from poor to rich, from a traditional rural economy to a sophisticated urban one. It carries with it not only the idea of economic betterment, but also of greater human dignity, security, justice and equity. Page 35

- **Regional integration**

Wider participation in the development process should be encouraged; measures to achieve this could include **decentralized governmental administrative systems and support for relevant voluntary organizations.**

Regional and sub-regional integration, or other forms of close cooperation, still offer a viable strategy for accelerated economic development and structural transformation among developing countries especially the smaller ones. It supports industrialization and trade expansion and provides opportunities for multi-country ventures. Page 208

Did I mention that Willy Brandt was a Socialist – with a capital ‘S’? And the significance of his resignation was that he was collaborating with Communists against the interests of his own country – West Germany. Factor that into your thinking as this proceeds.

North-South – International Law for the Environment

[Montevideo Programme](#)

In 1981, the United Nations Environment Programme held their first conference to discuss the mechanisms to building a body of international environmental law. The meeting was held in Montevideo, Uruguay. In 1982, the program developed in 1981 was adopted by the Governing Council of UNEP and it became known as the Montevideo Programme. They followed the pattern established at the first conference to meet every ten years – followed by a meeting in the next year to adopt the body of international law written in the previous ten years. Adoption meetings occurred in 1992 in Rio de Janeiro and 2002 in Johannesburg, South Africa. They appear to have changed the schedule for the Fourth Montevideo conference. It was held in 2009 and Montevideo IV was adopted in 2010.

Excerpt from [Montevideo II](#) –

“In order to further elaborate the Montevideo Programme to address emerging environmental problems and develop relevant legal regimes, UNEP convened two sessions of the Meeting of Senior Government Officials Expert in Environmental Law for the Review of the Montevideo Programme in Rio de Janeiro in October/November 1991 and in Nairobi in September 1992 respectively. Through the two sessions, government experts from more than 80 developing countries and developed countries and observers from relevant organizations attended the meeting. Participants of the latter session of the meeting, taking into account the outcome of UNCED, in particular **Agenda 21**, considered a draft Programme prepared by the UNEP secretariat and agreed on the Programme for the Development and Periodic Review of Environmental Law for the Present decade.”

Stepping Stones of Treason by Treaty

What was the 1983 [La Paz Treaty](#) with Mexico? North-South regional integration.

International **Zone** by Treaty (La Paz)

Framework Agreement

(i.e. “Constitution-Free Zone”)

100 miles on either side of the border



Each Party designates a national coordinator....

In the case of the United States of America the national coordinator shall be the **Environmental Protection Agency**, and in the case of Mexico it shall be the **Secretaria de Desarrollo Urbano y Ecologia**, through the **Subsecretaria de Ecologia**.

RECALLING that the Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, proclaimed in Stockholm in 1972, called upon nations to collaborate to resolve environmental problems of common concern;

← **Treaty Clause**

What was the 1986 Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Waste [Treaty with Canada](#)? North-South **regional integration**. Excerpt – **recognizing international law** in connection with environmental issues:

REAFFIRMING Principle 21 of the 1972 Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, adopted at Stockholm, which asserts that states have, **in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law**, the sovereign right to exploit their own resources pursuant to their own environmental policies and the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other states or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;

Definitions:

For the purpose of this Agreement: (a) “Designated Authority” means, in the case of the United States of America, the **Environmental Protection Agency** and in the case of Canada, the **Department of the Environment**.

NAFTA Agreement – North-South **regional integration** ([Excerpt](#))

Preamble

BUILD on their respective rights and obligations under the **General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade** and other multilateral and bilateral instruments of cooperation.

Article 101: Establishment of the Free Trade Area

The Parties to this Agreement, Consistent with Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, hereby establish a free trade area;

...

Article 104: Relation to Environmental and Conservation Agreements

1. In the event of any inconsistency between this Agreement and the specific trade obligations set out in:

(a) the *Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora*, done at Washington, March 3, 1973, as amended June 22, 1979,

(b) the *Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer*, done at Montreal, September 16, 1987, as amended June 29, 1990,

(c) the **Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal**, done at Basel, March 22, 1989, on its entry into force for Canada, Mexico and the United States, or

(d) the agreements set out in Annex 104.1,

such obligations shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency, provided that where a Party has a choice among equally effective and reasonably available means of complying with such obligations, the Party chooses the alternative that is the least inconsistent with the other provisions of this Agreement.

2. The Parties may agree in writing to modify Annex 104.1 to include any amendment to an agreement referred to in paragraph 1, and any other environmental or conservation agreement.

Annex 104.1

Bilateral and Other Environmental and Conservation Agreements

1. The *Agreement Between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America Concerning the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Waste*, signed at Ottawa, October 28, 1986.

2. The *Agreement Between the United States of America and the United Mexican States on Cooperation for the Protection and Improvement of the Environment in the Border Area*, signed at La Paz, Baja California Sur, August 14, 1983.

The [Basel Convention](#) on the Control of Transboundary Movements Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal was the link for the bilateral and trilateral environmental agreements to come under the authority of international law in a step-by-step strategy of turning our government into merely a puppet regime of an international system of environmental law directed by international communists of the United Nations - aided and abetted by their U.S. embedded counterparts. The U.S. Senate [ratified the Basel Convention in 1992](#). The retention of sovereign rights domestically was meaningless because of the design and structure of the EPA and CEQ through the implementation of NEPA. By way of example:

US EPA <http://www.epa.gov/international/trade/index.html>

International Programs

You are here: [EPA Home](#) » [International Programs](#) » Environment, Trade and Finance

Environment, Trade and Finance

Both domestically and globally, **protecting human health and the environment is essential to sustainable economic growth and development**. EPA supports these goals by:

- working with **domestic and international partners**,
- providing **technical analysis and capacity building assistance** through knowledge-sharing and best practices, and
- supporting the **dissemination and use of environment-friendly technologies** and **environmentally-supportive investments** and financial instruments.

At the national level, EPA works with the Office of the [U.S. Trade Representative \(USTR\)](#) on environmental issues related to trade policy, and with the [U.S. Department of the Treasury](#) on the potential environmental impacts of proposed multilateral development bank investments.

Internationally, EPA provides policy advice and technical expertise on trade and finance issues related to the environment through a wide range of international organizations including the [World Trade Organization](#), [EXIT Disclaimer](#), the [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development](#), multilateral development banks such as the [World Bank](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#) and the [United Nations](#). [EXIT Disclaimer](#)



When the NAFTA Agreement was passed by Congress in 1993, what that did was to consolidate the La Paz Treaty with Mexico and the Treaty with Canada and the Basel Convention for international law jurisdiction to complete the hangman's noose for the American system of government.

In 1994, the [Commission for Environmental Cooperation](#) (CEC) was formed.

The Council is the CEC's governing body and is composed of the highest-level environmental authorities (cabinet level or equivalent) from Canada, Mexico, and the United States.

The Council oversees the implementation of the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC) and serves as a forum for the discussion of environmental matters within the scope of the Agreement.



The CEC is an intergovernmental organization located in Montreal, Quebec. The charter for them is the [North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation](#). It's not clear that the Congress ever voted on it – or that it would be necessary for them to vote on it because the authority for it was in the La Paz Treaty – and NAFTA agreement.

Excerpts:

PREAMBLE

The Government of Canada, the Government of the United Mexican States and the Government of the United States of America:

RECOGNIZING the interrelationship of their environments;

ACKNOWLEDGING the growing economic and social links between them, including the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA);

RECONFIRMING the importance of the environmental goals and objectives of the NAFTA, including enhanced levels of environmental protection;

EMPHASIZING the importance of public participation in conserving, protecting and enhancing the environment;

REAFFIRMING the *Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment* of 1972 and the *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development* of 1992;

If you've been following along – understanding the content of the agreements from the La Paz Treaty forward, you should be able to see that the CEC is the real government in the shadows and the people who present themselves as representing the American government are imposters working for a puppet regime.

And while we're on the subject of the meanings of things, I listened to Obama take the oath of office because I didn't think the second taking of it was made public. It turns out it was a simple ceremony in the Oval Office. [Obama swore to “protect and defend the Constitution”](#). What does that mean? Does it mean that he will protect and defend the parchment document? Or does it mean that he will protect and defend the principles embodied in it. I think we know the answer to that question now.