



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 30, NO. 4

P.O. BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

NOVEMBER 1996

Some Goals of the New World Order

The phrase "New World Order" was not invented by President George Bush, but it was popularized by him in 1990 in order to resuscitate the then-moribund United Nations and make it a sponsor of his Gulf War. Like Saddam Hussein, the New World Order concept survived the Gulf War intact.

"New World Order" has become a handy label to describe the various policies that challenge American sovereignty in the economic, political, diplomatic, and even educational venues. It's the underlying ideology behind trade policies that export American jobs and encourage illegal political contributions from foreigners. It's even the philosophy behind the trendy fads in public schools, such as multiculturalism, school-to-work, and global education.

The 1996 presidential campaign generated a lot of talk about moving America into the 21st century. But neither candidate addressed the fundamental issue: Will average Americans then enjoy a higher or a lower standard of living? The crux of this issue is whether U.S. policy should give preference to American workers and their jobs over non-American workers and their jobs. This jobs/trade issue is fundamental to the hope of our citizens to live the American Dream.

The Republican Platform adopted in San Diego (which some leaders boasted that they had not read, but which enunciated the views of grassroots Republicans) endorses a policy of "free and fair trade." The Platform's authors understood that the explosion in our trade deficit to an all-time high, including the \$34 billion trade deficit with China alone, is "siphoning American wealth into the hands of foreigners." The Platform criticizes Bill Clinton's "hollow agreements" for subsidizing competition with U.S. industries and financing socialism in less developed countries, and accurately states that those agreements discriminate against U.S. industries and agriculture.

Bob Dole appeared temporarily to endorse this message. In his San Diego acceptance speech, he said: "We must commit ourselves to a trade policy that does not suppress pay and threaten American jobs. By any

measure the trade policy of the Clinton Administration has been a disaster; trade deficits are skyrocketing, and middle-income families are paying the price." Unfortunately, Dole failed to develop this popular theme on the campaign trail.

"Free trade" has become the mantra of a strange-bedfellow coalition of old-right libertarians, Silicon Valley's nouveau riche supporting Clinton, multinational corporations riding the bulls in the stock market, politicians of both parties who receive contributions from the above, and those who are making such big money in faraway places like Indonesia and Korea that they can write checks for \$200,000 and \$400,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

The advocates of free trade constantly try to paint themselves as "conservatives" who support less government and more free market; and they describe their opponents as favoring more government regulation. But that's false. Free trade was never the policy of conservatives or Republicans prior to Richard Nixon's dramatic opening to China. Nixon lost all claim to conservative credentials when he instituted price and wage controls and said "we are all Keynesians now."

The benefits of what is called free trade are the direct result of federal trade and tax laws that are skewed to benefit some interests at the expense of others. These laws (mostly designed by highly paid lobbyists) have silently restructured our economy through trade treaties (falsely called "agreements" so they wouldn't have to muster a two-thirds majority in the U.S. Senate), high income and estate taxes on the middle class, and virtually unrestricted immigration.

The result has been the destruction of a large part of our manufacturing base and the massive loss of jobs that can support a family. Whereas in 1955 one wage earner could support a family, the average household now requires both spouses to be income producers. This change in our social structure is as massive and important as the much-commented-on giant increases in divorce and illegitimacy rates.

When Bill Clinton, Bob Dole and Newt Gingrich pushed NAFTA and GATT through Congress, the advocates of those treaties promised that Mexico would become a large and profitable market for U.S. exports. It has proved just the reverse. Our \$16 million merchandise trade deficit with Mexico has hit an all-time high, and Mexican imports are putting American tomato, avocado, and citrus farmers out of business.

Free-trade lobbyists have kept taxes high on the average worker in order to subsidize both imports of foreign products, which drive American industries out of business, and imports of foreign workers, who take jobs away from Americans. Entire industries have been rigged to hire foreign workers (often disguised as "temporary") on the false claim that there are no qualified Americans. Since 1990, six million legal immigrants have been brought into the U.S. work force, many in managerial and professional jobs. U.S. corporations find this profitable because they usually don't pay full-time wages and benefits. The most promising job prospects for Americans in the year 2000 are reported to be as cashiers, janitors, waiters, and prison guards.

Wal-Mart today employs about the same number of workers who held good jobs with the big three automakers in 1975. But 30 percent of Wal-Mart employees work only part time, and the majority of its full-time workers earn only a dollar or two above the minimum wage, with no health benefits or pensions.

Meanwhile, accountants and nurses are coming in from the Philippines, civil engineers to design roads and bridges from Iran, apparel industry workers from Cambodia and China, computer programmers from India, and health-care aides from Russia.

An End to Nationhood?

The ambitious plans of New World Order advocates go far beyond moving us into a global economy where American workers compete with Asians willing to work for 25 or 50 cents an hour. A political world order is also part of their agenda. The Republican Platform identified this goal by quoting the words of Bill Clinton's Rhodes scholar buddy, Strobe Talbott, who wrote in *Time* Magazine that "nationhood as we know it will be obsolete; all states will recognize a single global authority." (*Time*, July 20, 1992)

The sovereignty issues show how out of touch the Republican leadership in Congress, led by Bob Dole and Newt Gingrich, are with grassroots Republicans. Dole and Gingrich joined with Bill Clinton to ratify GATT in a lame-duck session in December 1994, an act which officially put the United States into the World Trade Organization (WTO), a sort of United Nations of Trade. The same bipartisan triumvirate put through the scandalous Mexican Bailout, which was the costly consequence of the 1993 NAFTA mistake.

But the Platform (written by grassroots Republicans and not read by Bob Dole) promises that "Republicans will not subordinate United States sovereignty to any international authority," and specifically promises that "Republicans will not allow the World Trade Organization to undermine United States sovereignty."

In its first case, the World Trade Organization ruled against the United States. Surprise, surprise! At issue was the Clean Air Act's strict limits on pollutants in gasoline, which Venezuela and Brazil were unable to meet. In the name of "free trade," they took their complaint to the WTO and won.

The adverse WTO ruling was embarrassing to the Republican leaders in Congress who had promised conservatives that such an attack on our sovereign right to make our own laws would never happen. It was even embarrassing to President Clinton and his U.S. Trade Representative, Mickey Kantor, who had promised the liberals that the WTO would never diminish our environmental regulations.

A global tax is another New World Order goal. U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali wants to finance the nearly bankrupt United Nations by imposing a global tax on foreign exchange transactions. A tiny rate of 0.5 percent would produce an incredible \$1.5 trillion, while an even smaller rate of 0.05 percent would produce \$150 billion. He is even toying with imposing a surcharge of \$1.50 on all international airline tickets. One of the chief promoters of these far-out notions for global taxes is the Clinton-appointed administrator of the U.N. Development Program, James Gustave Speth.

Some claim that Boutros-Ghali is floating the global tax in order to shame the United States into paying the \$1.4 billion the U.N. claims we owe. Some are suggesting that, if we don't pay up, the U.N. should cut off our U.N. voting rights, hit us with late-payment charges, and impose a ban on hiring U.S. citizens for U.N. jobs. But Americans don't think we are getting our money's worth from our payments to the U.N. Our assessments are 25 percent of the regular U.N. budget and 31 percent of the peacekeeping costs.

The Republican Platform assures us that Republicans will not allow any international organizations to "infringe upon either the sovereignty of the United States or the earnings of the American taxpayer." Will Republicans stick by their word?

The conviction of Army Specialist Michael New is another New World Order item that just won't go away. New was court-martialed and convicted for refusing to wear the U.N. uniform on a so-called "peacekeeping" expedition to Macedonia. The other 550 servicemen in his unit donned U.N. helmets, replaced their U.S. I.D. card with a U.N. I.D. card, and dutifully marched off to Macedonia, where Americans have no business being in the first place.

When Specialist New's commander gave the U.N.-uniform order to the 550 troops on October 2, 1995 in Schweinfurt, Germany, the only authority he cited consisted of "U.N. guidelines," "National Command Authority," "U.N. Charter," "Domestic Law," "Commander in Chief," and "U.N. Security Council Resolutions." New argued that the order to alter his uniform was a violation of the Army's regulation against wearing any unauthorized insignia, decoration, medal or uniform. New said, "I am not a U.N. soldier. I am an American soldier."

We wonder why the Clinton Administration didn't simply reassign New to some other duty, since the twice-decorated soldier has an exemplary record and was willing to obey any order to go anywhere in the world so long as he could wear a U.S. uniform. It seems clear that Clinton was determined to carry out this first step in transforming American soldiers into U.N. soldiers and didn't want to let one soldier stand in the way of taking America into the New World Order.

Why No Defense Against Missiles?

In the first Clinton-Dole television debate, Bob Dole let Bill Clinton get by with his boast that "no nuclear missiles are pointed at U.S. children." Dole could have retorted that a Russian general told CBS's 60 Minutes that he could retarget the powerful Russian ICBMs in a matter of minutes.

The United States has no system capable of shooting down ballistic missiles, whether they are from Russia or some rogue nation. That's an appalling default of leadership, since the U.S. government's number-one constitutional duty is to "provide for the common defense."

The reason we have no defenses against incoming ballistic missiles is our slavish adherence to the ABM (Anti-Ballistic Missile) Treaty. Written by Henry Kissinger and signed by Richard Nixon in 1972, it is today highly dangerous to U.S. security. It should have been held unconstitutional when it was signed because it pledged the United States government **not** to defend Americans against nuclear attack, despite the fact that national defense is the prime duty of our government.

Thirty-one years ago in 1965, I was privileged to be escorted with a small group through NORAD, the great hole in a Colorado mountain where our government headquartered its systems designed to track any object that might attack our nation from the skies. It was awesome to view what American scientific genius had developed and to know that our U.S. Armed Services had such precise technology to track and warn of any unfriendly action from the bad guys of the world.

After the tour was completed, the officer in charge took us into a small room and carefully closed the door for privacy. I'll never forget his words: "If NORAD receives information that the Soviets have launched a

nuclear missile at the United States, do you know what we have to shoot it down with? Not a cotton-pickin' thing."

I was shocked; and 31 years later in 1996, it is shocking that America still has no defense against enemy missiles. Despite the trillions of dollars we have spent on the military, despite all the offensive weapons we have built to kill civilians on enemy soil, we still have no way to shoot down incoming enemy missiles and save American lives.

The theory behind the 1972 ABM Treaty was Mutual Assured Destruction, popularly known by its acronym MAD. Each of the superpowers was supposedly deterred because of the knowledge that a massive launch by one side would be followed by massive retaliation, and that would assure the destruction of both countries. MAD was based on the rationale that the leaders of the two superpowers were rational and would act from a mutuality of self-interest and deterrence.

However, the biggest threat today comes from the "non-deterrables" (Libya, Iran, Iraq, and North Korea), countries that don't like us and behave in ways that we don't find rational and can't predict.

Ronald Reagan tried to remedy our nation's nuclear nudity when, on March 23, 1983, he called for building a Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). He asked the crucial question, "Would it not be better to save lives than to avenge them?" Ted Kennedy immediately ridiculed this as "Star Wars" and the liberal media, chanting those words like a Greek chorus, obligingly made sure that the false name stuck.

Faced by the implacable opposition of the Democratic Congress and the media, Ronald Reagan was not able to build SDI. But his announced determination to go forward with developing and deploying an anti-missile system was the principal reason why he won the Cold War without firing a shot.

The reasons why SDI has never been built are political (the liberals just don't like it and the Democrats don't want to give Reagan credit for it), technical (a slavish adherence to the 1972 ABM Treaty), and false claims that it would be too costly.

The rationale of the ABM Treaty is obsolete; it is a Maginot Line mentality. In 1972 the terrible ICBMs could only be built by the superpowers that had a sophisticated technological base. Now, 24 years later, we are in the era of the "poor man's missiles" that can be built and launched relatively inexpensively, and might even be bought at bargain-basement prices from cash-hungry Russians, who still have over 9,000 strategic nuclear missiles and 18,000 tactical nuclear weapons. The Russian political situation is very volatile, control over those weapons of mass destruction is uncertain, and some 25 nations are ambitious to join the nuclear club.

The cost argument doesn't stand up, either. SDI wouldn't cost any more than the relatively inefficient systems we are currently using to protect limited, designated areas overseas. SDI's cost is not excessive compared to the cost of other protections such as air superiority (hundreds of billions for the F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18 and F-22), or command of the sea (hundreds of billions for aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers and submarines), or superior ground forces (tanks, artillery, armored vehicles, and helicopters). SDI can be paid for by transferring funds from less important federal purposes, including less effective military projects.

Some people seem to think that the short-lived and victorious Gulf War is the model for all future wars. But just imagine how different it would have been if Saddam had had a long-range nuclear ballistic missile. Would we have dared to send our troops against Iraq if American cities were exposed to retaliation by the dictator President Bush described as a madman?

Continuing to try to adhere to the ABM Treaty means imposing on ourselves restrictions that do not apply to potential enemies. The United States should withdraw from the ABM Treaty immediately, as permitted in Article XV, and then build the most effective, affordable defenses that current technology permits.

Our government has taken the extraordinary step of closing off Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C. to protect the President against any possible bomb threat, however remote. American citizens need protection, too, the kind of protection in their homes and cities that SDI will provide.

China Doesn't Deserve MFN

It is ridiculous to allow Communist China to enjoy the same trading privileges with U. S. markets that friendly countries enjoy, a status called Most Favored Nation (MFN). China has stolen billions (not just millions) of dollars worth of U.S. intellectual property, thumbed its nose at signed trade agreements, and sold our weapons technology to rogue dictators. China locks up citizens who dare to speak out for freedom and forces women to undergo late-term abortions. China continues to persecute Tibet, uses slave labor to produce goods for export, and shows contempt toward any self-government for Hong Kong. China even tried to threaten Taiwan's democratic election process by firing rockets at the island, and issued a veiled threat against Los Angeles.

China's expanding economy is financed by a \$34 billion trade surplus with the United States that has cost Americans 700,000 jobs. This trade surplus is partially based on stealing our products (computer software, video films, musical recordings, compact disks, other intellectual property, books, etc.) instead of buying them. Pirated CDs and CD-ROMs are made in China in an estimated 31 government-licensed plants. China itself

can use only about two percent of the CDs produced, so the rest go into the international market and cheat U.S. companies out of sales. China signed an agreement to stop this theft in February 1995, and reaffirmed its promises in 1996, but little has changed. China defiantly rejects the whole concept of copyrights and trademarks.

China has made so much money from U.S. trade that it is trying to buy SS-18 strategic missiles, components and technology from Russia or Ukraine. SS-18s are the biggies that can reach the United States from a launch on the other side of the world.

One of the most outrageous Chinese "businesses" was selling weapons at a 400 percent mark-up to U.S. big-city gangs that want to wipe out their rivals. It was a sophisticated worldwide operation that must have enjoyed the complicity of the Chinese government.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF) finally did something useful. They arrested seven Chinese Communist agents for smuggling 2,000 AK-47 automatic assault rifles into the United States in violation of our gun control laws. Those arrested had direct links to China's Defense Ministry and Deng Xiaoping's son-in-law. To conceal the source of the weapons, the money had been laundered through Beijing's state-run bank in Hong Kong. In the 18-month U.S. sting operation, the Chinese discussed with our undercover agents the future sale of explosives, anti-tank rockets, and shoulder-fired anti-aircraft systems capable of knocking planes out of the sky. One Chinese boasted he could bring 300,000 AK-47s into the U.S. (*New York Times*, May 24, 1996, page A7)

Selling all kinds of weapons is big business for Communist China. It has sold missiles to Iran and nuclear reactor technology and materials to make enriched uranium to Pakistan.

The internationalist clique that continually calls for "free trade" ignores the fact that China has slapped a 30 percent tariff on goods it imports from the United States. In China, the ruling clique threatens to "punish" U.S. companies if we dare to criticize the \$2 billion piracy of our intellectual property.

Americans are looking for leaders who understand that the sovereignty issues are crucial to the continued freedom and independence of the United States.

<http://www.eagleforum.org>

eagle@eagleforum.org

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by the Eagle Trust Fund, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Periodicals Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Subscription Price: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: 50¢ each; 3 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.