

Clear & Present Danger Act

Defending America's Farm Lands



Clear & Present Danger Act

Introduction:

The Clear & Present Danger Act addresses the ownership of land by the People's Republic of China within the United States of America, which currently amounts to 383,000 acres. This act mandates the return of these lands to local governments and communities, asserting that China's growing influence in U.S. land ownership poses a significant economic and national security threat. The bill rectifies this imbalance by enforcing the repatriation of these lands to U.S. citizens, while returning the financial funds China paid without interest. The act also mandates investigations into government officials opposed to the bill,

illuminating their political and financial ties to China and exposing the extent of China's economic invasion of America.

Supporting Laws:

1. The Alien Enemies Act (1798): This law empowers the U.S. to take necessary measures, including land confiscation, against foreign nationals from hostile nations. It provides a strong historical precedent for defending national security against economic incursions from foreign powers.

2. The Trading with the Enemy Act (1917): This law prohibits trade and ownership dealings with foreign nationals from countries that are potential threats. China's land holdings in America can be viewed through the lens of economic warfare, giving legal grounds to halt such ownership.

3. The Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act (1978): This law requires foreign entities to disclose ownership of agricultural land in the U.S. Transparency is key, and this law strengthens the foundation for regulating foreign land investments that threaten the country's agricultural independence.

4. The Defense Production Act (1950): This law empowers the president to take control of critical resources necessary for national defense. Foreign control of U.S. land—particularly strategic farmland—falls under the purview of this act, providing legal backing for repatriating the land.

5. The Homestead Act (1862): This act reflects America's belief that land should be held by citizens of the U.S. The bill channels this historical policy, reinforcing that foreign ownership undermines the foundational American principle of domestic land sovereignty.

6. The Logan Act (1799): This law forbids unauthorized American citizens from negotiating with foreign governments. Opposition from officials with financial ties to China is subject to investigation under this act, revealing possible undue influence.

7. The Exon-Florio Amendment (1988): This law gives the president the authority to block foreign investments that threaten national security. Chinese ownership of vast tracts of land poses such a threat, providing legal support for reclaiming these holdings.

Opposition Laws:

1. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (1947): GATT promotes open markets and the free exchange of goods and investments between countries. The opposition claims that removing China's land investments could violate international commitments to fair and open trade.

2. The Fifth Amendment (Takings Clause): This clause prevents private property from being seized without just compensation. The opposition argues that the repatriation of Chinese-owned land could violate the constitutional protections of private property rights.

3. The U.S.-China Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT) (2013, Draft): The principles of this treaty promote mutual investment. The opposition asserts that reclaiming China's land investments could cause diplomatic friction, jeopardizing future business and trade agreements.

4. The Foreign Investment in Real Property Tax Act (FIRPTA) (1980): FIRPTA created legal pathways for foreign investments in U.S. real estate, providing a framework for fair taxation and compliance. The opposition claims that undoing these investments undermines the current legal structure for foreign-owned property.

5. The Commerce Clause (U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8): The opposition cites this clause to argue that the bill could overstep the federal government's role in regulating commerce, potentially harming free market principles and deterring future foreign investment.

Debate Dynamics and Analysis:

Senator Brett Hawthorne (Republican, Wisconsin) – Proponent of the Bill:

Senator Hawthorne: “Colleagues, we are standing at a crucial moment in our nation’s history. China currently holds 383,000 acres of our land. This is not just about ownership—it’s about the erosion of our national sovereignty. We have laws like the Alien Enemies Act and the Defense Production Act precisely for situations like this, where foreign powers, through economic means, seek to undermine our strength. Let’s not be naïve. China’s control of these lands is not an innocent investment—it’s a strategic maneuver to place critical parts of our country under their influence. What happens when they control our farmland or land near critical infrastructure?”

Moreover, this bill is not extreme. We are not seizing land unlawfully. We are returning the original payments made by China—without interest—and repatriating the land to the people of this nation, who have a right to it. The investigations into government officials who oppose this bill will reveal the extent of China’s economic invasion and its influence over our political system. We cannot let foreign entities dictate our policies or infringe on our autonomy.

I call upon my colleagues to see that this bill represents a critical defense of American sovereignty and security. Failing to pass it would be a dereliction of our duty to protect the nation from a growing and insidious threat.”

Senator Evelyn Zhang (Democrat, California) – Opposition to the Bill:

Senator Zhang: “My esteemed colleague paints a picture of imminent danger, but let us ground ourselves in reality and the principles of international law. The removal of China’s land holdings would violate several foundational agreements, including GATT, which underpins the free trade system the U.S. has championed for decades. Additionally, we cannot ignore the Fifth Amendment’s protection against the unlawful taking of property without just compensation. While Senator Hawthorne argues that the financial refund China will receive is sufficient, this retroactive revocation of land ownership will undoubtedly damage our relationship with one of the largest economies in the world.

The data is clear: foreign investment, including land ownership, has contributed to economic growth in rural communities and increased productivity in agriculture. FIRPTA already ensures that foreign investors, including those from China, are taxed fairly on their property holdings. Further, revoking these investments

risks setting a dangerous precedent, where future foreign investors may be dissuaded from contributing to our economy out of fear that their assets may be seized.

Let us also consider the geopolitical implications. China is not just an adversary but a major trading partner. By passing this bill, we could provoke diplomatic retaliation that affects American businesses abroad and could result in significant economic losses. We need to maintain a balanced approach, one that upholds free market principles and respects international investment treaties.”

Senator Hawthorne’s Rebuttal:

Senator Hawthorne: “Senator Zhang raises concerns that this bill could undermine free trade and violate property rights, but let me be clear: national security always takes precedence over economic interests. China has already proven itself to be a strategic adversary in multiple arenas—from technology to military expansion. We cannot afford to treat their economic investments as benign when they pose a direct threat to our sovereignty.

As for the so-called benefits of foreign ownership in rural communities, we must ask: at what cost? Are we really willing to trade our national security for a short-term economic gain? The investigations into political opposition will show just how deep China’s influence runs in our political system, and this bill provides a necessary course correction.

We have the legal frameworks to justify this move—our sovereignty is paramount, and the Clear & Present Danger Act ensures that we act before it is too late. The American people deserve to know that their land, their food security, and their infrastructure are under their control—not a foreign government's.”

Senator Zhang’s Closing Statement:

Senator Zhang: “We all agree that national security is critical, but we must approach these issues with measured responses, not with sweeping legislative changes that could harm our economy and global standing. Foreign investors have contributed to our country’s growth. Alienating them and violating our own constitutional principles will only isolate us further. While I understand the concerns of my colleague, this bill is not the answer. Let’s work towards a solution that protects national security without undermining our economic stability.”

Conclusion:

The Clear & Present Danger Act passes in the House of Representatives, with the majority agreeing that national security concerns outweigh the economic arguments against it. The bill mandates the repatriation of U.S. land held by China to local communities, ensuring that the financial transactions are handled fairly by returning the exact amounts China paid, without interest. Investigations into opposing officials are launched to expose any improper influence from China.



The U.S. National Guard and Navy are put on alert to safeguard critical infrastructure and prevent retaliatory actions. The bill marks a decisive moment in American politics, asserting the primacy of national sovereignty in the face of foreign economic incursions.

House of Mason Publishing December 6, 2024