



From the desk of: Gordon Wayne Watts, Editor-in-Chief, The Register
National Director, **CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: PART II®™**, Registered Trademark
<https://GordonWatts.com> / <https://GordonWayneWatts.com> / <https://ContractWithAmerica2.com>
2046 Pleasant Acre Drive, Plant City, FL 33566-7511
Direct: (863) 688-9880 ; (863) 687-6141 (both are text-capable)
Email: Gordon@ContractWithAmerica2.com ; Gww1210@Gmail.com ; Gww1210@AOL.com

Tuesday, 09 July 2024

The Honourable Glenn Rhoades
Director, National Operations
EMP Task Force on National and Homeland Security
W: <https://EMPTaskForce.us> ; E: Glenn.Rhoades@emptaskforce.us ; P: (303) 912-0096

Dear Glenn:

A short while back, you asked me (and others from from the professional community) to provide you objective & unbiased research regarding the allegations of threats & security risks we face from foreign countries, particularly China, buying up land near military bases & other sensitive facilities. Although not mentioned, I add also that buying up of farmland, US Bonds, & other financial instruments is often mentioned in the same breath, so I shall include that in my review.

Additionally, we face equally serious threats, including (but not limited to) solar flares, CME's (coronal mass ejections), EMP (electromagnetic pulse) attacks, cyber-security hacking, physical terrorism, and even severe weather (hurricanes, floods, etc.), which threaten our fragile power and telecommunications grid—which you address in your work as an unpaid volunteer for the **nonpartisan** EMP Taskforce (formally: “The Task Force on National and Homeland Security”), the official Congressional Advisory Board, which was established by the **bipartisan** Congressional EMP Caucus in 2011 to act as a surrogate for the **bipartisan** Congressional Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack—which sadly was disbanded, if memory serves me correctly, due, in part, **to lack of funding**. You know that my work, both personally (blogging, phoning, & emailing lawmakers) and professionally (with my online presence of news/commentary at *The Register*, and my **nonpartisan** research/advocacy page, Contract With America: Part II®), support the need to protect the grid—as well as the need to cut unnecessary “pork” spending **to fund needed upgrades** to the power grid & other key infrastructure. But – as we've agreed – **I shall limit my research, here, to the threats foreign interests might pose** – to avoid distractions.

Since you have indicated that your intended audience will probably be state, maybe even federal, lawmakers of **both** political parties, I owe it to you & your intended target audience to briefly introduce myself so readers can have confidence that I'm both smart enough to address this issue – **as well as (and more-importantly) be objective, unbiased, and “nonpartisan,”** especially given the long shadow I cast on any Google lookup of me – which shows I nearly won the 3RD-largest pro-life case since *Roe* – namely the legendary *Terri Schiavo* case, which I lost by a razor-thin 4-3 margin before the same panel that shut down former Gov. Jeb Bush (R-FL) by a decisive 7-0 margin. **[[1]]** This (me almost winning this case **all by myself**, and doing better than a sitting governor, all his legal team, **and** even the legal team of her parents, who lost in federal court 2-1) would probably assure readers that I'm “smart” enough to do quality research, but as this was a legendary “pro-life” case, we owe our Liberal neighbours, who might read this,

[[1]] Sources for above: [a] In Re: GORDON WAYNE WATTS (as next friend of THERESA MARIE 'TERRI' SCHIAVO), No. SC03-2420 (Fla. Feb.23, 2005), denied 4-3 on rehearing. (Watts got 42.7% of his panel)

LINK: <https://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2005/2/03-2420reh.pdf>

[b] In Re: JEB BUSH, GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, ET AL. v. MICHAEL SCHIAVO, GUARDIAN: THERESA SCHIAVO, No. SC04-925 (Fla. Oct.21, 2004), denied 7-0 on rehearing. (Bush got 0.0% of his panel before the same court)

LINK: <https://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2004/10/04-925reh.pdf>

[c] Schiavo ex rel. Schindler v. Schiavo ex rel. Schiavo, 403 F.3d 1223, 2005 WL 648897 (11th Cir. Mar.23, 2005), denied 2-1 on appeal. (Terri Schiavo's own blood family only got 33.3% of their panel on the Federal Appeals level)

LINK: <https://media.ca11.uscourts.gov/opinions/pub/files/200511556.pdf>

some assurance I'm objective, unbiased, & not a right-wing extremist “whacko”: **First**, we recall that Mrs. Schiavo was a “handicapped” or “disabled” pro-life case (not one related to abortion), and there were significant numbers of “Liberals” on our side. **Secondly**, a quick look at my flagship advocacy page (CWA: Part II) has a “similar name as Newt Gingrich's project, but – unlike Gingrich's project – mine does **not** seeks to elect Republicans – and makes it a “rule” to NOT endorse or support ANY political party, politician, or candidate – and remain “issues-based.” **Third**, while some of those “issues” include cutting “Liberal” pork spending (a traditionally Conservative cause), others include advocacy for affordable college, affordable healthcare, and other traditionally “Liberal” issues. The only similarity my “Part 2” has with Gingrich's project is that I require an “issue” to have at least sixty (60%) percent documented (or implied) polling support – and we don't address “controversial” issues that are divisive, such as abortion, gay marriage, or similar – no matter how important – because any “divisive” issues (even if justified) would detract from the project as a whole – and, as you well know, Glenn – it's hard to compete with well-funded and powerful lobbyists if our own advocacy has infighting and divisive arguments – so, while CWA:2 addresses multiple issues, none is anything that is “divisive” or partisan – based on the 60% polling threshold requirements. (By definition, a > 60%+ polling support abrogates and moots most/all divisiveness because it is widely accepted by citizens, and justified as an “issue” that needs advocacy to lawmakers & other politicians). **Lastly**, while some have occasionally criticised me for trying to address “multiple” issues (beside “grid” protection), it is well-documented that you, yourself, are on record[[2]] as calling for the “need critical and immediate attention and **funding** to move this nation into a more secured and resilient energy posture,” regarding (as you, yourself, say) “proven and available technological solutions **needed to protect the power grid**,” in your letter to U.S. Sec. Of Energy, Jennifer Granholm, dated 25 October 2022. (*Editor's Note: Emphasis added in in bold-faced & underlined for clarity ; not in original*). While I go a little further in <https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/#pork> calling for the cutting of a specific area of pork spending – to free up funding – nonetheless, I am doing (in principle) no more – and no less – than you when I address “multiple areas” of need – both grid, **the need to get funding**, and key tips to cut “pork” spending to free up “needed” funding addressed in the section immediately following. – **P.S.:** For those curious as to why I'd use such a “controversial” name such as “Contract With America,” it boils down to one simple thing: One of my best friends said I needed a simple and easy-to-remember name for my project – like “Mothers Against Drunk Driving,” but – as you & I both know that the need for funding perforce necessitates my project address multiple issues – this forced me to go beyond a “grid-based” title for my project – hence, “Contract With America: Part II” – which – according to the U.S. Patent & Trade Office – wasn't taken – was born. (*Besides, most youngsters don't recall the original CWA, and mine has a catchy ring to it—so little, if any, “negative” connotations exist for my catchy new project title.*)

OK, sorry for the verbose & (slightly) lengthy intro, but we owed it to readers to know what (if any) biased and/or qualifications the undersigned author of this research paper might have.

Now, here is what I find:

First, I find a couple of public statements by “Conservative” Republican lawmakers making these allegations. In a blog post dated 10-19-2022, U.S. Rep. Brian Mast (R-FL-21), asks readers “Why Is China Purchasing Land Across

[[2]] Letter from Glenn Rhoades to U.S. Sec. Of Energy, Jennifer Granholm, dated 10-25-2022, and lined at the following download mirrors:

LINK: <https://www.Energy.gov/sites/default/files/2022-11/Comment%20-%20Glenn%20Rhoades%20-%20SEAB%20Oct%202022.pdf>

PDF, clipped: <https://Archive.ph/tNCSu> HTML, unabridged: <https://Archive.vn/qKAHQ>

Wayback Machine: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20230129100051/https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2022-11/Comment%20-%20Glenn%20Rhoades%20-%20SEAB%20Oct%202022.pdf>

CWA2 Archive: https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/FannyDeregulation/GlennRhoades_comment_SEAB_Tue25Oct2022_PDF.pdf

Secretary of Energy Advisory Board SEAB Meeting (October 25, 2022)

* <https://www.Energy.gov/seab/articles/seab-meeting-october-25-2022>

* <https://Archive.ph/zr8NW>

* <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240708131021/https://www.energy.gov/seab/articles/seab-meeting-october-25-2022>

From A U.S. Military Base?”**[[3]]** Then, a press release dated 7-26-2023, by U.S. Rep. Mike Collins (R-GA-10), claims that “Today, Representative Mike Collins (R-Ga.) delivered a speech on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to sound the alarm on China buying up U.S. agricultural land.”**[[4]]** In particular, Mast alleges that: “Recent reporting shows that a CCP-affiliated corporation purchased farmland in North Dakota that is just a stone’s throw from high-capability military bases. The purchase raises the possibility that the Chinese government could use the farmland as a launching pad for espionage under the guise of operating a business.”

And Collins gives these key excerpts from his press release: “Xi Jinping has clearly stated that by 2049 he wants China to be the world leader—diplomatically, economically, militarily, even in space.” [] “China owns \$870 billion in U.S. Treasuries that finance our debt. And they either own or have a huge portion of the Chicago Stock Exchange, AMC movie theaters, General Electric’s appliance division, General Motors, and Smithfield Foods just to name a few.” [] “On another alarming note, folks. China owns 384,000 acres of American agricultural land. That’s a 30% increase just since 2019. And on top of that, they own land near an air force base in North Dakota. That’s a clear threat to our national security and that’s what the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill is going to address.” (*Editor’s Note: Use of ‘[]’ double brackets indicates a line break in original, but omitted here, for clarity/ brevity.*)

So, a “first order” impression is that there may be issues of concern that bear further research from unbiased sources – several to be safe – and get a better understanding of the nature, scope, and magnitude of the situation—whatever it is.

Even the left-leaning *NPR*, which we would not consider to have viewpoint bias in favour of Collins' and Mast's concerns, admits that “Although Chinese-owned land is a tiny fraction of all foreign-owned land in the U.S., its purchases have raised fears that the Chinese government could have control, through the Chinese corporations, over U.S. assets or gain access to U.S.-based information. Indeed, during the past four decades, Chinese companies and investors have bought up land in the U.S. as well as purchased major food companies like Smithfield Foods, the United States' largest pork processor. Corporations own the majority of that land. Now legislation in Congress would restrict Chinese ownership of U.S. Land,” regarding the financial effects of control or the espionage concerns of loss/theft of sensitive information.**[[5]]** *NPR* goes on to say that “lawmakers from both parties want to limit purchases by Chinese companies [regarding the aforementioned fiscal or espionage concerns], especially those with ties to the Chinese government, and individuals. To this end, there are several bills in Congress aimed at limiting Chinese ownership. Separately, the Biden administration is tightening its rules over who can buy land near military bases.” (*Editor’s Note: Comments added in [bracket], for clarify—but not in original.*) Besides the farmland next to the North Dakota military base mentioned earlier, *UPI* report that “Another piece of land in Michigan purchased in 2023 by a Chinese company is situated near the nation's largest National Guard training facility in Grayling. Officials for the Chinese company said the land will be used to build an EV battery plant.”**[[6]]**

[[3]] “Why Is China Purchasing Land Across From A U.S. Military Base?,” by U.S. Rep. Brian Mast (R-FL-21), *BLOG*, 19 October 2022, **LINK:** <https://Mast.House.gov/2022/10/why-is-china-purchasing-land-across-from-a-u-s-military-base> **ARCHIVE:** <https://Archive.vn/fDY8F> **Wayback:** <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240704024032/https://mast.house.gov/2022/10/why-is-china-purchasing-land-across-from-a-u-s-military-base>

[[4]] “Collins on China Buying Up U.S. Farmland,” by U.S. Rep. Mike Collins (R-GA-10), *PRESS RELEASE*, 26 July 2023, **LINK:** <https://Collins.House.gov/media/press-releases/collins-china-buying-us-farmland> **ARCHIVE:** <https://Archive.vn/qjj8s> **Wayback:** <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240620105650/https://collins.house.gov/media/press-releases/collins-china-buying-us-farmland>

[[5]] “China owns 380,000 acres of land in the U.S. Here's where,” by Ximena Bustillo, Connie Hanzhang Jin, *NPR* (and “Heard on All Things Considered”), June 26, 2023 · 5:01 AM ET, **LINK:** <https://www.NPR.org/2023/06/26/1184053690/chinese-owned-farmland-united-states> **ARCHIVE:** <https://Archive.ph/yyXmV> **Wayback:** <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240704193543/https://www.npr.org/2023/06/26/1184053690/chinese-owned-farmland-united-states>

[[6]] “Chinese ownership of U.S. Farmland, locations raise concerns,” by Mike Heuer, *UPI*, FEB. 8, 2024 / 2:30 PM, **LINK:** https://www.UPI.com/Top_News/US/2024/02/08/foreign-investment-farmland-china/6631706895056/ **ARCHIVE:** <https://Archive.ph/Em40T> **Wayback:** https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240228161654/https://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2024/02/08/foreign-investment-farmland-china/6631706895056/

UPI raised deeper concerns:

“Despite laws to protect agricultural land in about half of the nation's states and that restrict sales near military bases, information gaps exist regarding the buyers and owners of land.

"I don't know that we know for sure all the foreign land that potentially is owned by Chinese individuals or folks controlled by the Chinese government," U.S. Sen. Jon Tester, D-Wy., [told NPR](#) in June.

A Department of Defense report [issued Dec. 31](#) on Chinese military companies doing business in the United States reinforced that concern.

China has 46 military firms plus subsidiaries operating within the United States that are disguised as civilian entities, the report said.

Among them are prominent names, such as the Huawei Investment & Holdings Co. that owns telecommunications giant Huawei Technologies Co. and Semiconductor Manufacturing International Corp., which has seven subsidiaries listed along with the parent corporation.”[\[\[6\]\]](#)

So, here, we discover that China's questionable purchases are small in quantity, but of concern to some – both because of the concerns regarding motives a Communist country might have – as well as because of the sensitive locations and/or potential vulnerabilities from such purchases. And, to clarify, at least five (5) concerns have been raised for potential threats in my research so far: ((#1.)) Espionage ; ((#2.)) fiscal / financial concerns of buying out a sector, such as monopoly, control, abuse ; ((#3.)) physical threats due to proximity to military or other sensitive areas ; ((#4.)) The monopoly of agriculture land could – theoretically – allow a foreign entity to control America's food supply ; and, ((#5.)) Theft of DNA Code intellectual property, and/or genetically-engineered bio-weapons.

Others have echoed these concerns: **bluemarble** asks in a bold-faced font sub-header “**Why are lawmakers concerned about Chinese landownership?**,” and goes on to report that “Many of the state legislators who have supported bills to limit Chinese landownership cite [national security concerns](#) — for instance, that the Chinese government could use the land to set up espionage operations or that U.S. food security could be threatened if too much farmland is bought up. This was partially sparked by an alleged Chinese spy balloon seen flying across the country in 2023.”[\[\[7\]\]](#) **NBC NEWS** reports that “the total amount of U.S. agricultural land owned by Chinese interests is less than three-hundredths of 1%,” but went on to say that their “review also reveals a federal oversight system in which reporting of foreign ownership is lax and enforcement minimal.”[\[\[8\]\]](#) This is confirmed by **NPR**, which – in a bold-faced subtitle header “**USDA tracks foreign purchases, but doesn't investigate them,**” goes on to disclose that “USDA has a strict reporting requirement for land purchases 90 days after a transaction. But it doesn't have the authority to investigate these purchases, and can only assess penalties for late, incomplete or false filings.”

[\[\[7\]\]](#) “**State lawmakers are concerned about Chinese ownership of US land, but other countries own much more American acreage,**” by Hope O'Dell, AJ Caughey, **bluemarble**, Posted March 29, 2024 | Updated on Apr 04, 2024 (Blue Marble is a project of the Chicago Council on Global Affairs ; ©Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2024), **LINK:** <https://GlobalAffairs.org/bluemarble/china-foreign-land-ownership-explainer> ARCHIVE: <https://Archive.vn/8rDB6> Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240524213731/https://globalaffairs.org/bluemarble/china-foreign-land-ownership-explainer>

[\[\[8\]\]](#) “**Is China really buying up U.S. farmland? Here's what we found: NBC News reviewed thousands of USDA documents to find out how much agricultural land Chinese entities have reported purchasing since Jan. 1, 2022.,**” by Laura Strickler and Nicole Moeder, **NBC NEWS**, Aug. 25, 2023, 10:30 AM (UTC), **LINK:** <https://www.NBCNews.com/news/investigations/how-much-us-farmland-china-own-rcna99274> Google AMP: <https://www.Google.com/amp/s/www.nbcnews.com/news/amp/rcna99274> ARCHIVE: <https://Archive.ph/knwgG> Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240622163917/https://www.nbcnews.com/news/investigations/how-much-us-farmland-china-own-rcna99274>

Even the left-leaning **Cornell University** admits that there are concerns over this, and reports that “The Chinese spy balloon episode of 2023 – along with the thought that Chinese ownership of land near sensitive U.S. military or intelligence installations could compromise national security – have made foreign ownership of U.S. agricultural acreage a hot-button issue.”^{[[9]]}

In fact, the neutral or left-leaning **FactCheck.org**[®], which called out former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki Haley, for an exaggerated or incorrect claim about the amount of Chinese acreage purchases near military installations, gave – in the same article^{[[10]]} – the following warnings:

“Proximity to military installations, however, isn’t the only concern that some have about Chinese investors purchasing farmland in the U.S.

The U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, an independent government commission [created](#) in 2000 by Congress, warned in its [May 2022 report](#) about “the potential weaponization” of agricultural intellectual property.

“Using the genetic code data it has obtained on U.S. crops, China can strengthen its agricultural output by replicating years of U.S. research on its own farms, or it can take a more nefarious route,” the report said. “Similar to hacking a computer code, Beijing could easily hack the code or DNA of U.S. GM seeds and conduct biowarfare by creating some type of blight that could destroy U.S. Crops.”

It also warned about China gaining “undue leverage over U.S. supply chains,” citing the WH Group’s 2013 purchase of Smithfield Foods, Inc., which is the largest pork producer in the U.S. It was “China’s largest purchase of a U.S. asset to date,” totaling \$7.1 billion, including debt.

The WH Group, formerly Shuanghui Group, received financial backing from the Chinese government to purchase Smithfield Foods and obtained more than 146,000 acres of U.S. land in the process, including hog farms, processing plants and feed mills.”^{[[10]]}

^{[[9]]} “No, China is not buying up all US farmland,” by Tom Fleischman, *Cornell Chronicle*, May 29, 2024, [LINK: https://News.Cornell.edu/stories/2024/05/no-china-not-buying-all-us-farmland](https://News.Cornell.edu/stories/2024/05/no-china-not-buying-all-us-farmland) ARCHIVE: <https://Archive.ph/DswlE> Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240601105405/https://news.cornell.edu/stories/2024/05/no-china-not-buying-all-us-farmland>

^{[[10]]} “FactChecking Haley’s Claim on China, U.S. Farmland and Military Installations,” by Eugene Kiely, **FactCheck.org**[®], Posted on July 7, 2023, [LINK: https://www.FactCheck.org/2023/07/factchecking-haleys-claim-on-china-u-s-farmland-and-military-installations/](https://www.FactCheck.org/2023/07/factchecking-haleys-claim-on-china-u-s-farmland-and-military-installations/) ARCHIVE: <https://Archive.vn/5baMo> Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240620123246/https://www.factcheck.org/2023/07/factchecking-haleys-claim-on-china-u-s-farmland-and-military-installations/>

Editor’s Note: This article called out Haley as follows: “In a [July 2 interview](#), former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations [Nikki Haley](#) said China “bought 400,000 acres [of U.S. farmland] near our military installations.” But the 400,000 acres is the total (rounded up) held by Chinese investors — not the amount near military installations, as she said.” This seems to confirm that this is not a “right-wing” or “Conservative” think tank. Moreover, their own editor’s note – at the end of the article – states as follows: “Editor’s note: FactCheck.org does not accept advertising. We rely on grants and individual donations from people like you. Please consider a donation. Credit card donations may be made through [our “Donate” page](#). If you prefer to give by check, send to: FactCheck.org, Annenberg Public Policy Center, 202 S. 36th St., Philadelphia, PA 19104.”

As stated earlier, the overall amount of land that China has purchased is small – a fact quantified by **FORBES**, which reports that “Of the [109 countries](#) that own U.S. agricultural land, China ranks No. 18, far behind No. 1 Canada (12.8 million acres) and even and the Cayman Islands (672,000).”^{[[11]]} And even *that* may be an overestimate:

FarmProgress reports that – while “Outside ownership of U.S. cropland is drawing attention from Washington as concern rises about possible threats to food supply chains and other national security risks,” – nonetheless, “an [analysis](#) conducted by the U.S. Government Accountability Office — a non-partisan watchdog that reports to Congress — found mistakes in the data, including the largest land holding linked with China being counted twice. Other challenges include the USDA’s reliance on foreigners selfreporting their activity.”^{[[12]]}

However, besides the bio-engineering or food-chain concerns and the proximity to military or intelligence installations, the “fiscal” or “financial” warfare in similar behaviours must be considered “in context”: In 2021, **INVESTOPEDIA** reported that “China has steadily accumulated U.S. [Treasury securities](#) over the last few decades. As of January 2021, the Asian nation owns \$1.095 trillion, or about 4%, of the \$28 trillion U.S. national debt, which is more than any other foreign country except Japan. [1] [2] As the trade war between the two economies escalates, leaders on both sides seek additional financial arsenal,” and followed with this solemn warning:

“Some analysts and investors fear China could dump these Treasuries in retaliation and that this weaponization of its holdings would send [interest rates higher](#), potentially hurting economic growth. This article discusses the business behind the continuous Chinese buying of U.S. debt.”^{[[13]]}

While a trade war might also impede China's economy (by stunting trading and commerce of Chinese good and services), still, under the right circumstances, it might be a tool in the toolbox of weapons that could be employed against the U.S. Indeed, this past November, **Nikkei** reports that “China continues to pare its holdings of U.S. Treasuries, arousing market speculations over its motives. The country's stockpile of U.S. government debt hit the lowest level in 14 years at the end of August, with the pace of decline accelerating. [] Some analysts said Chinese monetary authorities are leading the move to shore up the yuan, while others blame it for a recent bond rout in the U.S.”^{[[14]]}

^{[[11]]} “How Much U.S. Farmland Does China Really Own? More Than Bill Gates—And Less Than 17 Other Countries,” by Emily Washburn, **FORBES**, March 1, 2023, 11:15am (EST), [LINK: https://www.Forbes.com/sites/emilywashburn/2023/03/01/how-much-us-farmland-does-china-really-own-more-than-bill-gates-and-less-than-17-other-countries/](https://www.Forbes.com/sites/emilywashburn/2023/03/01/how-much-us-farmland-does-china-really-own-more-than-bill-gates-and-less-than-17-other-countries/) ARCHIVE: <https://Archive.vn/72kff> Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240623143700/https://www.forbes.com/sites/emilywashburn/2023/03/01/how-much-us-farmland-does-china-really-own-more-than-bill-gates-and-less-than-17-other-countries/>

^{[[12]]} “China is buying up American farmland: As concerns grow, better data tracking is needed to understand just how much land is getting snatched up by foreign interests.,” By Kim Chipman, **FarmProgress**, January 19, 2024 (1 Min Read), [LINK: https://www.FarmProgress.com/business/china-is-buying-up-american-farmland](https://www.FarmProgress.com/business/china-is-buying-up-american-farmland) ARCHIVE: <https://Archive.vn/b6awH> Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240522235611/https://www.farmprogress.com/business/china-is-buying-up-american-farmland>

^{[[13]]} “Why China Buys U.S. Debt With Treasury Bonds,” by SHOBHIT SETH ; Reviewed by JULIUS MANSA, **INVESTOPEDIA**, Updated November 30, 2021, [LINK: https://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/040115/reasons-why-china-buys-us-treasury-bonds.asp](https://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/040115/reasons-why-china-buys-us-treasury-bonds.asp) ARCHIVE: <https://Archive.ph/jDKSR> Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240604125624/https://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/040115/reasons-why-china-buys-us-treasury-bonds.asp>

^{[[14]]} “What is behind the 40% drop in China's U.S. Treasury holdings?: Market players see Beijing selling American debt to prop up the yuan,” by Yusho Cho, Nikkei staff writer, **NIKKEI**, November 4, 2023, 12:39 (JST), [LINK: https://Asia.Nikkei.com/Spotlight/Datawatch/What-is-behind-the-40-drop-in-China-s-U.S.-Treasury-holdings](https://Asia.Nikkei.com/Spotlight/Datawatch/What-is-behind-the-40-drop-in-China-s-U.S.-Treasury-holdings) ARCHIVE: <https://Archive.ph/LZ3ZS> Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240705001730/https://asia.nikkei.com/Spotlight/Datawatch/What-is-behind-the-40-drop-in-China-s-U.S.-Treasury-holdings>

Then, on May 22 of this year, **REUTERS** reported that “As the trade war between the United States and China escalates, China is shrinking its holdings of U.S. Bonds.”**[[15]]** And, only eight days later, on May 30 of this year, **GLOBAL FINANCE** reported that “Talk of de-dollarization is back on the table after new data from the US Treasury Department revealed that China offloaded close to \$50 billion in US Treasuries in the first quarter and had reduced its holdings by more than \$100 billion in the year through to March 2023. The revelations come as China and the US are locked in an increasingly tense stand-off involving trade and China’s intentions toward Taiwan.”**[[16]]**

In all fairness, **GLOBAL FINANCE** goes on to report that “Not everyone is convinced China’s US debt sales represent anything aggressive as opposed to a routine realignment of debt management activities by the world’s second largest economy. But the question whether Beijing is dumping US debt, combined with a potential broader adoption of the renminbi, suggests the US government will need a strategy to manage the impact on perceptions of the greenback as the world’s reserve currency.”**[[16]]**

The image and finance concerns **GLOBAL FINANCE** raises about international perception of the strength of the U.D. Dollar as a reserve currency is a valid one, but the threats to our technology, information, and intelligence are just as great. So, whether there is anything malicious and nefarious with foreign interests (any country, not just China) buying up land – or U.S. Bonds – in large amounts – or it is just ordinary business, we can not assume all intentions are good, and must always take proper precautions in these areas, but we must not be paranoid or overreact with unreasonable “knee jerk” reactions to threats that may – or may not – be there. Earlier **NPR** offered a measured approach: “But even skeptics of Chinese investment in the United States say Congress needs to be careful that its measures don’t result in a backlash against Asian Americans. [] Singleton of FDD said blanket bans “run the risk of feeding into broader anti-Asian sentiment and xenophobia.”**[[5]]**

So, we must be prepared – not scared – and view all things fairly (as ill will or prejudicial relations with global neighbours might result in equal – or greater – harm via “blanket bans” than a proportionate and measured approach.

In fact, much of what the “spy balloon” saw when it went over the U.S. Was already known – and its slow pace allowed the local military bases to shut down sensitive radio transmissions well in time to avoid “snooping” by a low flying balloon.

However, the espionage threats are not the only ones: As others have pointed out in contemporary news reports – I believe even you, Glenn – the Chinese “spy balloon” was well large enough to contain a small nuclear warhead and/or an EMP device that could be used to cripple the power & telecommunications grid in a small area.

While the threats posed by the land acquisition and U.S. Bond purchases is real (and should be addressed by measured and reasonable State and Federal legislation – and commonsense safeguards on the personal level) – nonetheless, the threats that our fragile power, Internet, 911, GPS, & telecommunications grid faces from the inevitable solar flares (which are unpredictable, but inevitable – like hurricanes and tornadoes) – along with the very irresponsible spending and printing of dollars (we go about \$1 TRILLION deeper in debt every 90 or 100 days – no

[[15]] “China’s US bond shifts put dollar under geopolitical spotlight,” by Jamie McGeever, **REUTERS**, May 22, 2024, 6:45 AM (UTC), **LINK:** <https://www.Reuters.com/markets/asia/chinas-us-bond-shifts-put-dollar-under-geopolitical-spotlight-2024-05-21/> **ARCHIVE:** <https://Archive.ph/1dTT5>

Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240615112902/https://www.reuters.com/markets/asia/chinas-us-bond-shifts-put-dollar-under-geopolitical-spotlight-2024-05-21/>

[[16]] “China’s US Debt Sales Fuel Speculation,” by Mark Townsend, **GLOBAL FINANCE**, MAY 30, 2024, **LINK:** <https://GFMag.com/economics-policy-regulation/china-sells-us-treasuries-de-dollarization/> **ARCHIVE:** <https://Archive.ph/bpKPD>

Wayback: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240612155435/https://gfmag.com/economics-policy-regulation/china-sells-us-treasuries-de-dollarization/>

citations needed, as it's commonly known and/or can be Googled) – these threats, Glenn – which I address on my own online presence – are just as serious, and we must be careful to not overlook anything that – like the fools on the RMS TITANIC – are easily preventable – be it heeding iceberg warnings, purchasing sufficient lifeboats (they had way too few, as you recall), or basic common sense: The TITANIC was NOT unsinkable. **While you did not ask for an economic analysis, I will offer this as a “supplementary” and cautionary tale.**

**** ((Since this additional research is “supplementary” – technically a bit “off-topic” – & beyond what you requested – I will be brief, but I must include it for context. And – it has merit on its own as well – as it may help avert a crash of the dollar or crash of the Power Grid – if used wisely. So, please be patient with me, here.)) ****

First, our research finds that very close to one-hundred (100%) percent of lawmakers in both parties (Republicans and Democrats) outright refuse to even make feeble attempts to obey key economic planks in their own party platform, which is not without moments: Suppose a platform had a “good” idea in it (both Democrat and GOP platforms contain needed standards that – if done – would stabilize our faltering economy), **so I would like to do as the late Dr. Peter Pry might often do – and address this as both a practical – and a moral – problem:**

As a practical problem, if a lawmaker outright refuses to adhere to his/her own party platform, then we may – quickly see the “economic” threats posed – but (and here is the key), we must also quickly conclude that (unless very good justification exists to do otherwise), they have a “moral” failure for refusal to keep his/her word and obey his/her platform. This is important because – with such a “moral” weakness present, if a lawmaker won't even keep their word to obey their *own* party's platform, how might we trust them to do something extraordinary – such as address the threats you asked me to research for you? Hmm...

In fact, **THE REGISTER** has opened a formal investigation into this – □ □cross-posted for ... “redundancy” in case the grid (or my web-ring) becomes unstable:

- * https://GordonWatts.com/HigherEd_OpenInvestigation.html
- * https://GordonWayneWatts.com/HigherEd_OpenInvestigation.html
- * <https://Archive.vn/4zTf0>
- * https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240506022456/https://gordonwatts.com/HigherEd_OpenInvestigation.html

These key planks are needed to cut the largest area of discretionary pork spending and thereby avert disaster:

- * <https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/#pork>
- * <https://Archive.vn/laznT#pork>
- * <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240520235246/https://contractwithamerica2.com/#pork>

Well-documented and proved at:

- <https://GordonWatts.com/#crash>
- <https://GordonWayneWatts.com/#crash>
- <https://Archive.vn/LUDWn#crash>
- <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240513211014/https://gordonwatts.com/#crash>

The excessive “pork” spending must be cut to – as you and I have discussed before – to free up funding to fund upgrades to the power grid:

- * <https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/#grid>
- * <https://GordonWatts.com/n.index.html#grid>
- * <https://GordonWayneWatts.com/n.index.html#grid>
- * <https://Archive.vn/laznT#grid>
- * <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240520235246/https://contractwithamerica2.com/#grid>

The video of your legendary, and very popular, interview a few years back on **NIGHT DREAMS TALK RADIO** – which was lost, but recovered by me – is posted to these mirrors, in case you'd like to download or view a copy:

<https://GordonWatts.com/#grid>

<https://GordonWayneWatts.com/#grid>

<https://Archive.vn/LUDWn#grid>

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240513211014/https://gordonwatts.com/#grid>

In closing, as you aspire to advocate to your local state lawmakers regarding the potential threats posed by land acquisitions near sensitive military bases, I will leave you with the same advice Peter gave to me, and I will tell you like he told me. See below 2 conversations we had before he passed:

***** FIRST CONVERSATION – where I asked the late Dr. Peter Pry for advice on writing my lawmakers:**

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <peterpry@verizon.net>

Date: Fri, Nov 12, 2021, 8:49 AM

Subject: RE: BLACKING OUT CIVILIZATION WITH ROBOTIC TERRORISM

To: Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

Gordon—Yes, 10-20 kms is impressive. So impressive we have been trying for years to recruit Yuri Tkasch, who had been the USSR's chief NNEMP weapons designer, but he won't leave what's left of his design bureau, in Ukraine. As to contacting senators and congressmen: 1) A phone call to their office is more impressive than a letter or e-mail (they count the number of phone calls received on issues); 2) A letter is more impressive and is weighted more heavily than an e-mail; 3) Any communication should be respectful but firm. Display your expertise. Volunteer to provide congressman and staff with technical advice and help to understand the issue, draft legislation. 4) Reference and/or provide copy of President Trump's EMP Executive Order, noting it is also supported by the Biden Administration. Why is there no money in the infrastructure bill to implement the EMP Executive order, just studies? 5) Attached find an e-copy of my new book Blackout Warfare that you might want to send to enlighten them further. Thanks for being an EMP Warrior!—Peter

From: Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 8:37 AM

To: peterpry@verizon.net

Subject: Re: BLACKING OUT CIVILIZATION WITH ROBOTIC TERRORISM

Thanks for clarifying, Peter.

But even if directional (and not omnidirectional or radial), still, 10 to 20 km is real impressive.

In other news, you've read enough of my e-mails to lawmakers, where I cc copy you, that you kind of know my writing style. [] ... [Redacted for brevity: I asked him for advice on writing lawmakers re protecting the grid.]

***** SECOND CONVERSATION – where I asked Dr. Pry for permission to share our private e-mail exchange with lawmakers:**

from: Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

to: peterpry@verizon.net

cc: Peter.pry@emptaskforce.us, "Gww1210@aol.com" <gww1210@aol.com>, Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

date: Nov 16, 2021, 12:56 PM

subject: Dr. Pry, can I drop your name as a reference for EMP matters?

mailed-by: gmail.com

Dr. Pry,

you would not mind, would you, if I shared your advice about EMP matters with lawmakers would you? Here's the screenshot in question, a small snippet of my question, and your answer. It lends me great credibility when I can say "I'm friends with the legendary Dr. Peter Vincent Pry," and not simply that I am valedictorian of my electronics class as shown below...

AS, United Electronics Institute, VALEDICTORIAN

* <https://GordonWatts.com/education>

* <https://GordonWayneWatts.com/education>

Thanks,

--

Gordon Wayne Watts, editor-in-chief, The Register

www.GordonWayneWatts.com / www.GordonWatts.com

National Director, CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: PART II(TM)

<https://ContractWithAmerica2.com>

from: peterpry@verizon.net

to: Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

date: Nov 16, 2021, 1:20 PM

subject: RE: Dr. Pry, can I drop your name as a reference for EMP matters?

mailed-by: verizon.net

Gordon—Yes. Please do. As a fellow EMP Warrior, want to do everything possible to help. Keep fighting!—Peter

///

Sources:

(PDF format) <https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/Supporters-GRID-UPGRADE-FINAL.pdf>

(Webpage format) <https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/Supporters-GRID-UPGRADE-FINAL.html>

(ARCHIVE – webpage format) <https://Archive.ph/MYxb1>

(PDF format)

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20211117011914/https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/LetterToSenLoeffler/Supporters-GRID-UPGRADE-FINAL.pdf>

Editor's Note: The PDF versions posted above have a screenshot of the actual email exchange in question to verify my claims that I was friends with the legendary Dr. Peter Vincent Pry.

Glenn – I hope this helps. Let me know if there's anything else I can do.

Gordon ///