



The **Phyllis Schlafly Report**



VOL. 27, NO. 11

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JUNE 1994

New World Order, Clinton-Style

World Trade Yes! World Government No!

Congress is expected to vote soon on whether or not to put the United States into a new World Trade Organization (WTO), a sort of Economic United Nations.

Like NAFTA, the WTO agreement will bypass the clear requirement in the U.S. Constitution that treaties are valid only if ratified by two-thirds of Senators. WTO will be submitted under a newly-invented procedure called "fast track," which labels the treaty an "executive agreement," forbids amendments, and calls for only a simple majority in both Houses of Congress.

The WTO will be much worse than the UN, because the WTO is based on the one-country-one-vote pattern. That means the United States will have only one vote out of 117 nations, and no veto. We'll have only the same vote as Somalia or Haiti or Cuba or Rwanda or Korea or Guyana (population 735,000) or Antigua (population 64,000).

Third World countries will hold 83 percent of the votes in the WTO. Most of them are dictatorships, are not our friends, and look upon international organizations as vehicles to redistribute U.S. wealth and technology to themselves. More than three-fourths of the WTO member nations voted against the United States on more than half of UN votes in 1993.

The WTO will make us subject to a new unelected multinational bureaucracy, headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland, that will set, administer and enforce rules of trade for the entire world.

The WTO is designed to function as the global trade pillar of a triumvirate that will plan and control the world's economy. The other two pillars are the World Bank, which loans capital to developing nations, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which supervises the flow of money around the world.

This three-legged plan to plan and control the world's economy was devised at the Bretton Woods Conference at the end of World War II. The World Bank and the IMF got off the ground rapidly (largely financed, of course, by the United States), but the global trade arm, then called the International Trade Organization (ITO), was blocked by President Harry Truman and U.S. Senators who concluded

that it would diminish U.S. sovereignty and interfere with U.S. domestic laws.

In the course of the ITO talks, the countries negotiated a reduction of global tariffs by a 1947 agreement called the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Originally, GATT was supposed to be a part of the ITO, but when ITO was rejected by the United States, GATT became the basic multilateral agreement on global trade.

Since the 1940s, there have been seven additional rounds of international trade negotiations under GATT. On April 15, U.S. representatives in Morocco signed the Final Act of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, the 22,000-page document that creates the WTO to replace GATT and is now being submitted to Congress.

WTO is very different from GATT. GATT was a contractual relationship among sovereign nations. All member nations must agree to any changes. If there is a dispute, action and penalties can happen only when all agree. The GATT staff in Geneva has little power.

The WTO is a supra-national body in Geneva that will set, administer, and enforce the global rules of trade. It includes a legislature (called the Ministerial Conference, consisting of 117 nations casting one vote each), an executive branch (including a Director-General, a multinational bureaucracy consisting of a secretariat, committees, councils, dispute panels, and review bodies), and a supreme court (that will decide trade disputes, and whose rulings cannot be vetoed by any nation).

The WTO's procedures are dramatically different from those now used by GATT. GATT requires a consensus decision to impose a penalty recommended by a dispute panel. Under GATT, the United States can reject rulings that intrude on our interests and we can veto sanctions.

Under WTO, we are locked in; unilateral action is forbidden. We must abide by the judgments of WTO's Dispute Settlement Board. It and WTO's dispute panels will deliberate and vote in secret.

Article XVI of the WTO obligates the United States to change our laws, regulations and administrative procedures to make them conform to WTO. The WTO will have the final say about whether U.S. laws meet WTO

requirements, and WTO can impose financial penalties and sanctions if WTO decides that our laws don't comply.

Of course, WTO is presented as a boost toward "free trade" and cutting tariffs. For that, we don't need WTO; GATT was adequate. Tariffs have been dramatically reduced since GATT was formed, and besides, free trade cannot be called free trade if it is mandated by a bureaucracy in Geneva.

The Office of Management and Budget warns that the cost of WTO will be \$14 billion over five years, and nearly \$40 billion over 10 years. The Clinton Administration is floating the idea of waiving the Congressional pay-as-you-go budget requirement and adding the cost of this deal onto the national debt.

The WTO would turn control of the U.S. economy over to a bunch of foreign bureaucrats in Geneva, accountable to no one. WTO would control U.S. trade, investment and technology, and make decisions about our jobs, production, labor standards, environment, and security.

The Congress must reject WTO if America is to remain an independent nation with the sovereign power to write our own laws and make our own decisions about our own livelihood.

U.S. Troops Under UN Command?

In the same week that the news media were preoccupied with Paula Jones filing her lawsuit, President Clinton signed a Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) asserting his authority "to place U.S. forces under the operational control of a foreign commander." This is the most unconstitutional transfer of power in the history of America. It will put U.S. troops under foreign command and also under the United Nations rules of engagement.

And it's a secret order! The White House won't let the American people see a copy of the PDD that Clinton signed. All we are allowed to see is a State Department "summary" (which probably conceals its most outrageous effects). This PDD, dated May 1994, is the same document that last year was called PDD 13. The number 13 was obviously ditched as bad PR. It was all ready for Clinton's signature in August 1993 when history intervened to delay it. In Somalia, U.S. troops were killed, wounded, captured, and dragged through the streets in humiliation. Adverse Congressional reaction put PDD 13 in a temporary deep freeze. But the New World Order advocates were determined to proceed with their objective.

Ours not to reason why, ours is but to do or die. And it will, indeed, be do or die for Americans in the U.S. Armed Services. That's what military service is all about: being ready to take orders, and do or die to carry them out. The only problem is that, when young Americans enlist, they rightfully expect that those giving the orders will be Americans, and that the orders will be according to American law and for American goals and interests.

This May 1994 PDD is called "The Clinton Administration's Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace

Operations." It should be called "The Clinton Administration's Policy on Transferring Congress's War Power to a Multilateral Organization under the United Nations."

Some people think Clinton doesn't have a foreign policy, but that's not true. Instead of a foreign policy designed to protect America and preserve our interests, the Clinton foreign policy is designed to subordinate American interests to a multinational authority.

This new PDD makes it our job to combat "current threats to peace," which include "territorial disputes, armed ethnic conflicts, civil wars, and the collapse of governmental authority in some states." There probably is not a year in recorded history when such events were not transpiring somewhere around the world, so when did it become our responsibility to get into the middle of the action?

Even if these troubles don't directly affect American interests, the PDD asserts that their "cumulative effect" requires us to act. But who says? Not until Clinton's secret PDD did any American official have the gall to say that resolving these conflicts are our job.

Not only has Clinton's secret PDD changed the goal of our foreign policy, but it has also changed the mission of our Armed Services. The PDD states that the "establishment of a capability to conduct multilateral peace operations is part of our National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy."

"The primary mission of the U.S. Armed Forces," continues this PDD, "remains to be prepared to fight and win two simultaneous regional conflicts." The PDD doesn't call this war; in classic Orwellian language, this PDD confirms that Clinton plans to deploy American forces for "peacekeeping." But peacekeeping's open-ended definition includes "promoting democracy, regional security, and economic growth."

The U.S. State Department doesn't win any battles on the battlefield, but it is very adept at winning rounds of doubletalk. This new PDD shows why. While the President, it says, "will never relinquish command authority over U.S. forces," on a case by case basis "the President will consider placing appropriate U.S. forces under the operational control of a competent UN commander for specific UN operations authorized by the Security Council."

This means that, while we still may call our President the Commander in Chief, Slick Willie will allege that "operational control is a subset of command," and then delegate operational control of U.S. forces to a foreigner who reports to the UN Security Council.

"The participation of U.S. military personnel in UN operations can, in particular circumstances, serve U.S. interests," the PDD asserts. However, under the U.S. Constitution, that should be a matter for Congress — not Clinton or the UN — to decide.

The new Clinton policy clearly subordinates U.S. interests to a multinational authority. As the PDD puts it, "The U.S. will continue to emphasize the UN as the

primary international body with the authority to conduct peacekeeping operations."

If U.S. servicemen are captured by an enemy while they are serving under multinational command as part of some peacekeeping force, the Administration will demand that they be "immediately released to UN authorities." That's not very reassuring.

Another slippery section of this new Clinton directive is the stipulation that the Department of Defense "will pay the UN assessment" for the "peacekeeping missions." That sounds like a cunning way to say "we're not cutting the defense budget" while actually diverting some defense appropriations into UN projects.

Are you ready to pay for the blue-helmeted operations of the New World Order? In money and in blood?

Weird Writings of Strobe Talbott

Strobe Talbott has two qualifications to be Clinton's chief adviser on foreign policy, especially Russia, and to be waiting in the wings to succeed Warren Christopher as Secretary of State. He was Clinton's roommate while they were both Rhodes scholars in England, and then he spent 22 years as a writer for *Time Magazine*.

In that capacity during the 1992 Presidential campaign, he wrote and selected news that excused Clinton's draft-dodging and presented his candidacy favorably to the American people. Birds of a feather flock together: by his own account, Talbott's trick knee kept him out of Vietnam, but not the squash courts at Oxford.

You can tell a lot about any man by examining his world view, and Talbott's is clearly spelled out in his prolific writings. He is eager to get rid of nationalism and patriotism and to replace American independence and sovereignty with world government.

World government is not just utopian idealism so much as it is a manifestation of arrogance. Talbott apprenticed himself to the foreign policy intellectuals, long dominated by Paul Nitze and George Kennan, who believe that an internationalist elite should control the whole world and everybody in it.

In his long article in the July 20, 1992 *Time* entitled "The Birth of the Global Nation," Strobe Talbott cheerfully predicts that, in the next century, "Nationhood as we know it will be obsolete, all states will recognize a single, global authority." Almost as though he is talking to children, he reminds us that "national sovereignty wasn't such a great idea after all."

Manifesting the elitists' characteristic disdain for those with contrary views, he asserts that "great minds thought alike . . . giving primacy to interests higher than those of the nation." Of course, he identifies himself with the "great minds" who are planning to make Americans "citizens of the world," subservient to an international bureaucracy.

In this *Time* article, Talbott reveals how his crowd measures progress on the road to world government. One landmark was the Rio Earth Summit which, he said,

signified the acceptance of "the transcending sovereignty of nature" rather than of nations. We can't deny that Mother Nature is an important fact of life, but that doesn't mean we want her as our political sovereign.

Talbott bragged about how national sovereignty has been diminished by the International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which, he said, are the coming world government's "protoministries of trade, finance and development." If the IMF and GATT are, indeed, diminutions of national sovereignty on the road to world government, the American people were never so advised.

Talbott is so out of touch that he actually thinks that it is now written in stone the that "the internal affairs of a nation are no longer off limits" to world government. His evidence for this incredible statement is that the UN authorized troops to help the starving Kurds in Iraq.

Since Talbott's goal of world government would have to include the Soviet Union, and since he has been a Russophile since long before the Communist empire broke up, he denies that the Soviet Union was ever a threat. "It never was," he says.

World government would require the repeal of both history and human nature, as well as of the United States Constitution. The notion that the world can live in democracy and stability under some international bureaucracy is an impossible pipe dream, as witness the powerful nationalistic drives in the former Yugoslavia and other battlegrounds around the world.

World government is not for the United States because we in America have a constitutional republic so unique, so precious, so successful that it would be total folly to put our necks in a yoke with any other nation. If the rest of the world wants to enjoy the blessings of liberty and prosperity, they can copy our system. We are not going to compromise with theirs.

Margaret Thatcher's common sense is a good antidote for Talbott's weird writings. As a student of history, she reminds us that we must accept "the legitimacy of nationalism as a basis for independent statehood. National pride, in combination with liberty and the rule of law, powerfully strengthens democratic government."

Indeed, it does. She further points out that people will consent to be governed and accept common sacrifices only when they feel themselves part and parcel of one another in a community of "shared history, loyalties, songs and myths, and, above all, a common language and culture." She reminds us that those sentiments cannot be created by a bureaucracy.

The Talbott crowd will not be able to achieve their goal of world government. No matter how many Leagues of Nations and United Nations they create, world government, like the horizon, will always recede.

However, since seventeen of Talbott's buddies from the Aspen Strategy Group and the Council on Foreign Relations are now senior policymakers in the Clinton Administration, they can create a lot of mischief while trying.

Federal Snoopers Want to Listen In

If you use a cordless or cellular phone, then any kid with a radio receiver can listen in on your calls — legally. Snoops can wiretap other phone conversations with a simple alligator clip, though it may not be legal without a warrant.

This annoying lack of privacy could soon come to an end because a marvelous new technology is now available for unbreakable encryption. By putting a special chip in your telephone, your voice could be scrambled in such a way that only the person at the other end can understand it. An eavesdropper would hear only gibberish, which all the world's fastest computers could not unscramble.

This new technology is not secret; it has been published in scientific journals. The Russians have it. Third World dictators and terrorists have it. If we have to fight World War III, we will never be able to break the enemy's codes, as we did in World War II.

Our federal law enforcement and spy agencies are not happy about this. The National Security Agency (NSA), which has a budget bigger than the CIA's and likes spying even more, has come up with a brilliantly devious plan to keep this great invention from becoming available to ordinary Americans.

The NSA has designed its own version of the encryption chip with an electronic "trapdoor" which enables the government to unscramble individual telephone conversations. With the endorsement of Bill Clinton, Al Gore, and Janet Reno, the NSA's snooper chip is on the way to becoming standard equipment in telephone networks throughout the United States.

The Clinton Administration has declared the snooper chip an "Escrowed Encryption Standard." This means federal agencies will soon begin buying millions of them for all government offices.

The Administration plans to use the massive purchasing power of the federal government to ensure that snooper phones dominate the marketplace. Then government contractors and everyone else dealing with the government will have to install them, too.

It might still be legal to buy secure (wiretap-proof) telephones; Mafia dons, drug kingpins and other sophisticated criminals will surely use them to talk to each other. But since secure phones are incompatible with the snooper phones everyone else will have, ordinary Americans would find them as useless as having 8-track tapes instead of cassettes, or Betamax video instead of VHS.

At the same time, the Clinton Administration has classified the snooper chip design as top secret. It's the first time in U.S. history that any federal standard has been kept secret.

Clinton even wants to force telephone and cable companies to install special equipment to assist direct government monitoring. His proposed Digital Telephony Act would do just that.

I suppose the federal snoops are tired of sending out field agents with alligator clips — they just want to flip a

switch in the comfort of their Washington or regional offices and listen in on your phone calls. Their bill has not yet been introduced this year, but one of its previous sponsors is Senator Joe Biden (the same Senator who lectured Robert Bork on privacy).

Clinton has renewed the ban on the export of all cryptographically secure products in order to thwart the development of international standards for secure private communications. This export ban has the effect of preventing Americans from buying secure encryption products because companies can't afford to produce electronic devices in a different version for export.

Clinton and the NSA are vigorously opposing H.R. 3627, introduced by Rep. Maria Cantwell (D-WA), which would allow the export of encryption technology that is commonly available overseas anyway. The principal effect of her bill would be to create a larger domestic market for electronic privacy products.

The feds say that there are top-secret reasons for their wiretap plan, and that therefore it should not be subject to public scrutiny. Don't believe it. In a free society, citizens should enjoy privacy, but the government should be accountable to the public for all its actions. Clinton has it exactly backwards — he supports secret government plans for the electronic monitoring of American citizens.

Vice President Gore likes to talk about the National Information Infrastructure, with futuristic talk of interactive television, data superhighways, and other technologies. Why doesn't he tell you that his plan includes an Orwellian scheme for the federal government to monitor private communications between Americans?

Clinton claims to believe in a constitutional right to privacy when the issue is getting an abortion. Isn't it strange that he doesn't think you have a constitutional privacy right to keep your medical records out of a national database, or to keep government wiretappers from listening in on your telephone conversations?

The model was his health plan. Hillary's health task force met in secret, defied the law and a court order to make its deliberations public, "lost" the minutes and personnel records, and then came up with a plan that involves a national ID card and a central database on which the feds can track everyone's medical history.

Tell your Congressman you want him to oppose the Digital Telephony Act and to support the Cantwell bill. Ask him to demand hearings on the government's plan to put a snooper chip in every telephone.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report
Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
ISSN0556-0152

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

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