

EXCLUSIVE FROM HABEAS CORPUS CANADA

**THE FULL TEXT**

*Nota bene:* The Los Angeles Times is suppressing the full text of this article. It is “not available” to buy online. I tracked it down in a library, on microfilm, and scanned it. It took me five years to find it.

---

Support The Official Legal Challenge to North American Union:

**Paypal:** [Habeas.Corpus.Canada@live.com](mailto:Habeas.Corpus.Canada@live.com)

# With NAFTA, U.S. Finally Creates a New World Order

**■ Trade: Mexico is going to be the most important neighbor in U.S. history. With this pact, its path on the road to democracy and openness will be assured.**

---

**By Henry A. Kissinger**

NEW YORK

**B**efore the end of summer, President Bill Clinton will ask Congress to approve the North American Free Trade Agreement, linking the United States with Canada and Mexico in a free-trade area comprising a population of 370 million and a gross national product of \$6 trillion. It will represent the most creative step toward a new world order taken by any group of countries since the end of the Cold War, and the first step toward the even larger vision of a free-trade zone for the entire Western Hemisphere.

And yet, recent polls show that barely half the American people have even heard of it.

This offers the President a real chance for leadership in educating the public to the opportunity before them. Since the end of the Cold War, fear of communism can no longer serve as the cement of international order. With the collapse of the ideological challenge, traditional pat-

terns are disappearing. The world of the next century —with or without NAFTA. By then it will be a country with a population of more than 100 million and equal to the Asian "little tigers" such as Korea. Our de facto open borders make friendly relations a vital national interest. Twenty-million Mexican residents in the United States link the interests of the two nations on the human level. The healthier Mexico's economy, the lower the illegal immigration and the greater U.S. exports will be to an economy whose propensity to import from us is the highest in the world.

Even on strictly economic grounds, NAFTA is to our long-range advantage.

---

**When all the major Latin American countries have raised their sights to a new partnership based on values the U.S. has espoused for decades, a retreat from it by America would be a shattering blow.**

Most studies suggest the nation would gain more jobs than it would lose — though the problem is that those who lose jobs are not usually the ones who benefit from

terns of nationalism have gained ground nearly everywhere. The post-Cold War world has witnessed growing rivalries reminiscent of the tensions preceding World War I.

In this light, developments in the Western Hemisphere are crucial to global order. Here, a group of democratic nations has pledged itself to the Enterprise for the Americas initiative based on popular governments and market economies. The sole dictatorship remaining in the Western Hemisphere is Cuba; state-run enterprises are being privatized; nationalistic, protectionist methods of economic management are replaced by export-oriented economies hospitable to foreign investment and supportive of open trading systems. The revolution sweeping the Western Hemisphere points to an international order based on cooperation.

It is this revolution that is at stake in the ratification of NAFTA. What Congress will have before it is not a conventional trade agreement but the architecture of a new international system.

Strong presidential leadership in the ratification battle is urgently required. As the only nationally elected U.S. leader, Clinton is in the best position to put NAFTA into a broad strategic framework and explain why it serves the national interest. He must not permit the treaty's opponents to define NAFTA as a problem of economic arithmetic.

In this task, the President is entitled to bipartisan support. NAFTA's key provisions were concluded during the Bush Administration; its supplementary agreements are being negotiated in the Clinton Administration. But NAFTA is so vital to prospects for global progress that it merits a demonstration of nonpartisan unity.

America has never had a neighbor of the importance Mexico will acquire in the

gains in employment.

Nonetheless, let us not delude ourselves: The movement of U.S. industry to Mexico, cited by many NAFTA critics, has occurred despite current tariff barriers, which are already low. What the critics are seeking is not just a defeat of NAFTA, but an increase in tariffs against Mexico. Such a policy would put an end to any hope of a new Western Hemisphere relationship and encourage the rise of nationalism.

For Mexico has been in the vanguard of the revolution sweeping the Western Hemisphere. Not so long ago, its foreign policy was defined by anti-US rhetoric and its economic policy by statist left-wing attitudes. Import substitution, the euphemism for protectionism, was the dominant trend and anti-gringo suspicion a key feature of the internal Mexican debate.

Starting with the presidency of Miguel de la Madrid in 1982, Mexico began to reverse these patterns. Under President Carlos Salinas de Gortari, the process assumed tidal proportions. Salinas opened Mexico to foreign investment, lowered tariffs, insisted on free competition, quelled corruption and brought into office many young, highly trained technocrats.

In the interval between Salinas' election and his oath of office, I asked the newly elected president whether he could ever visualize a free-trade system in the Western Hemisphere. He replied that, given Mexican political history, this was a distant dream; the best he could accomplish would be sector-by-sector negotiation which, after a substantial interval, might be tied together into a comprehensive understanding. A year later, Salinas apparently decided that the cost of half-way measures was not far lower than the price of doing the right thing and opted to go all-out for what is now called NAFTA.

**Please see TRADE, M6**

# Trade

## Continued from M2

Salinas has overcome considerable domestic Mexican reservations. He has gone to great lengths to respond to U.S. concerns—even negotiating side agreements on the environment and labor that his left-wing opponents describe as interference in Mexico's domestic legislation.

Nonetheless, the ancient themes of Mexican political discourse are still just below the surface. They remain the staple of Salinas' left-wing opposition. NAFTA's defeat in Congress would be a stinging rebuff to the most market-oriented, democratic administration Mexico has ever had and would humiliate Salinas—a particular problem as Mexico gears up for next year's presidential election. It would be a disaster if U.S. actions encouraged the re-emergence of nationalistic candidates and reversed the trend toward cooperation between two neighbors.

History will surely record the Enterprise Initiative for the Americas as one of the most important U.S. initiatives since the Marshall Plan. The trade agreement with Mexico is the vital first step for a new kind of community of nations, built on a common base of democratic values, drawn together by the free exchange of goods, services and capital, dedicated to human rights and committed to the preservation of their common environment. It is a creative response to the coincidental decision by the major nations of Latin America during the past decade to move decisively down the road of economic opening and political reform; it looks far beyond the Organization of American States and its outmoded focus on national security.

At a moment when all the major Latin American countries have raised their sights to a new partnership based on values the United States has espoused for decades, a retreat from it by America would be a shattering blow to this vision for a new and better world.

A regional Western Hemisphere organization dedicated to democracy and free trade would be a first step toward the new world order so frequently cited but so rarely implemented. It would permit the countries to respond to any of the various ways in which the international order may evolve. Almost every country pays lip service to a global free-trading system. It would be shortsighted, however, to ignore the regional groupings emerging in both Europe and Asia as possible alternatives.

A Western Hemisphere-wide free-trade system—with NAFTA as the first step—would give the Americas a commanding role no matter what happens. If principles of the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade prevail, it will become a major participant in global economic growth; if regional groupings dominate, the Western Hemisphere with its vast market will more than hold its own.

Clinton has preferred not to deflect Congress from focusing on his economic package. But the stakes are too high to wait. He must take the lead in defining the issues—though he should not do this alone. Instead, he should enlist former presidents, secretaries of state and other leaders in one of the broad-based coalitions by which previous new departures in foreign policy — like the Marshall Plan—were put before the public. If that happens, Clinton's will be perceived as a seminal presidency whatever else transpires while he is in office. □

## HABEAS CORPUS CANADA

---

Support The Official Legal Challenge to North American Union:

Paypal: [Habeas.Corporus.Canada@live.com](mailto:Habeas.Corporus.Canada@live.com)

[www.habeascorpuscanada.com](http://www.habeascorpuscanada.com)

[www.nosnowinmoscow.com](http://www.nosnowinmoscow.com)

[www.mytalkcanada.com](http://www.mytalkcanada.com)

[www.habeascorpuscanadacomments.blogspot.com](http://www.habeascorpuscanadacomments.blogspot.com)

[www.canadian-state-of-the-union.blogspot.com](http://www.canadian-state-of-the-union.blogspot.com)

[www.youtube.com/crazyforcanada](http://www.youtube.com/crazyforcanada)

[www.wordpressera.com](http://www.wordpressera.com)

Note: The OCR of "With NAFTA, U.S. Finally Creates a New World Order" was made with ABBYY Screenshot Reader

### VIDEOS RELEVANT TO KISSINGER'S EDITORIAL:

(Proves Quebec is not "seceding", it's being used  
to dismantle Canada for North American and then Western Hemispheric Union:)

---

Gilles Duceppe Wants A North American Union: Eric Granger (30 April 2011)

English subtitles:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v-mIN7GMQdI>

*Duceppe: La souveraineté pour fonctionner ensemble*

English subtitles :

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3uT6tJM6xMQ>

Allan Gotlieb declares 9/11 "provocative agent" behind NAU (North American Union):

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oph\\_HsDVw8w](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oph_HsDVw8w)

### DOCUMENTS RELEVANT TO KISSINGER'S EDITORIAL:

#### ENGLISH TRANSLATION

For a Continental Integration Respectful of the Differences (23 March 2005 | Gilles Duceppe  
- Leader of the Bloc québécois | Le Devoir) English translation by Kathleen Moore

<http://en.calameo.com/books/000111790ae08bc88b826>

#### THE ORIGINAL FRENCH DOCUMENT:

*Pour une intégration continentale respectueuse des différences ( 23 mars 2005 / Gilles  
Duceppe - Chef du Bloc québécois / Le Devoir)*

<http://en.calameo.com/books/0001117905a6fb2bca0ad>

**PROOF THE CFR IS USING QUEBEC TO GET  
“A SUPRANATIONAL AFFILIATION” (I. E., CONTINENTAL UNION)  
FIVE YEARS BEFORE GOTLIEB’S “PROVOCATIVE AGENT” OF 9/11 –  
WHICH IS WHEN THEY GOT “SPP” INSTEAD  
TO “DEEPEN” KISSINGER’S NAFTA. GOTLIEB SAID NO ONE HAD THOUGHT  
OF IT BEFORE 9/11: UNTRUE - THE CFR HAD THOUGHT OF IT:**

---

**BRIEF RECORD (LCOC)**

"The Issue of Quebec's Sovereignty and its Potential Impact on the United States" before the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, One Hundred Fourth Congress, Second Session, September 25, 1996.

<http://en.calameo.com/books/0001117902e9261003933>

**THE 98-PAGE SUBCOMMITTEE RECORD:**

The issue of Quebec's sovereignty and its potential impact on the United States: hearing before the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, 104th Congress, 2nd session, Sept. 25, 1996

<http://en.calameo.com/books/0001117908860b85832a4>

**PROOF A “CONTINENTAL PARLIAMENT”  
WAS DISCUSSED BY A SO-CALLED QUEBEC “SEPARATIST” LEADER  
AND A SO-CALLED QUEBEC “LIBERAL”  
AS EARLY AS 1991:**

---

Parizeau Views a Continental Parliament For North America as Unrealizable, Frédéric Tremblay, Canadian Press (LE DEVOIR 23 December 1991)

English translation by Kathleen Moore

<http://en.calameo.com/books/000111790318d61e9e5d4>

**THE ORIGINAL FRENCH DOCUMENT:**

*Parizeau juge irréalisable un parlement continental pour l'Amérique du Nord, Frédéric Tremblay de la Presse Canadienne (Le Devoir - 23 décembre 1991)*

<http://en.calameo.com/books/000111790152de2b38af3>

I can track the plans for a “Canadian Community” and a “Canadian Union” as stage one of a “North American Community” and “North American Union” back to the 1960s in Quebec, shortly after the European Economic Community was started.

Everywhere, Big Business overlaps with the Rhodes Secret Society for world government, which is the RIIA-**CFR**-CIIA, and Communists.

I can prove in court that the referendums in Quebec to “secede” were really referendums to get the North American Union started.

I would argue that 9/11 was done because the 1995 Quebec referendum failed, the CFR’s bid to the 1996 Subcommittee for a “supranational affiliation” apparently failed, and something had to be done to advance Kissinger’s NAFTA in the meantime: SPP was a direct response to 9/11, which was done for North American Union, not *just* for the Iraq war.

A third – and final – referendum in Quebec by about late 2014-15 will be used to trigger the political dismantling of Canada and the U.S.A., now that vertical integration of the continent has largely been done under the SPP.

Beware of “secession” movements in America: the **CFR** needs one to complete the dismantling of North America that will start in Quebec.

The Quebec-Canada gang are all working with the CIIA – now called “Open Canada”: it’s the Canadian branch of the **CFR**.

“Secession” is illegal in Canada. The Constitution was designed that way in 1867 to prevent Canada’s being annexed to the U.S.A.

Annexation is unconstitutional for Canada. I am going to stop the North American Union right here.

Help me out, it’s expensive to file in court!

Kathleen Moore  
**HABEAS CORPUS CANADA**

---

Support The Official Legal Challenge to North American Union:

Paypal: [Habeas.Corporus.Canada@live.com](mailto:Habeas.Corporus.Canada@live.com)