

Scholars explain president's plan for a North American Union

by Phyllis_Schlafly

Those who seek to understand what's behind the chatter about President George W. Bush's Security and Prosperity Partnership as a possible prelude to a North American Union, similar to the European Union, should read the 35-page White Paper published recently by the Hudson Institute called "Negotiating North America: The Security and Prosperity Partnership."

The Washington, D.C., think tank is blunt and detailed in describing where the Security and Prosperity Partnership is heading.

Here's how Hudson defines the Security and Prosperity Partnership's goal: "The SPP process is the vehicle for the discussion of future arrangements for economic integration to create a single market for goods and services in North America."

The key words are "economic integration," a phrase used again and again, into a North American "single market," another phrase used repeatedly.

"Integration" with Mexico and Canada is exactly what North American union means, but there's a big problem with this goal. "We the people" of the United States were never asked if we want to be "integrated" with Mexico and Canada, two countries of enormously different laws, culture, concept of government's role, economic system and standard of living.

Here's how Hudson explains the Security and Prosperity Partnership's process: "The most important feature of the SPP design is that it is neither intended to produce a treaty nor an executive agreement like the NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) that would require congressional ratification or the passage of implementing legislation in the United States. The SPP was designed to function within existing administrative authority of the executive branch."

Hudson explains further: "The design of the SPP is innovative, eschewing the more traditional diplomatic and trade negotiation models in favor of talks among civil service professionals and subject matter experts with each government. This design places the negotiation fully within the authority of the executive branch in the United States."

Indeed, the Security and Prosperity Partnership is very "innovative." The arrogance of the Security and Prosperity Partnership's "design" to give the executive branch full "authority" to "enforce and execute" whatever is decided by a three-nation agreement of "civil service professionals," as though it were "law," is exceeded only by its unconstitutionality.

The Hudson White Paper admits the problem that the Security and Prosperity Partnership completely lacks "transparency and accountability." Hudson freely admits "the exclusion of Congress from the process"; constituents who contact their Congressmen discover that members know practically nothing about the Security and Prosperity Partnership.

Hudson states that, under the Security and Prosperity Partnership, one of the U.S. challenges is "managing Congress." Is Congress now to be "managed," either by executive-branch "authority" or by "dozens of regulators, rule makers, and officials working with their counterparts" from Mexico and Canada?

The Hudson White Paper reminds us that the 2005 Council on Foreign Relations document called "Building a North American Community" bragged that its recommendations are "explicitly linked" to SPP. The Council on Foreign Relations document called for establishing a "common perimeter" around North America by 2010.

Hudson praises the Council on Foreign Relations document for "raising public expectations" about what the Security and Prosperity Partnership can accomplish. Hudson explains that, while immigration is not an explicit Security and Prosperity Partnership agenda item, "mobility across the border is central to the idea of an integrated North American economic space."

"Harmonization" with other countries is another frequently used word. One of the Security and Prosperity Partnership's signature initiatives is "Liberalizing Rules of Origin."

The Hudson Paper reveals the Security and Prosperity Partnership's cozy collaboration with "some interest groups and not others." Translated, that means collaboration with multinational corporations, but not with small business or citizen groups.

After the heads of state of the United States, Mexico and Canada met in Waco, Texas, in March 2005 and announced the creation of the Security and Prosperity Partnership by press release, the North American Competitiveness Council emerged as "a private sector forum for business input" to Security and Prosperity Partnership working groups. But, according to Hudson, it wasn't merely "private" because it was "given official sanction."

After the three amigos met in Cancun, Mexico, in 2006, President Bush provided taxpayer funding for a think tank called the Center for Strategic and International Studies to meet secretly and produce a report called "The Future of North America." That document's favorite catchword is "North American labor mobility," which is a euphemism for admitting unlimited cheap labor from Mexico.

The Hudson White Paper states that "SPP combines an agenda with a political commitment." That's exactly why those who want to protect American sovereignty don't like the Security and Prosperity Partnership.

Among the people who take the Security and Prosperity Partnership seriously are Rep. Virgil Goode, R-Va., who introduced a House resolution opposing a North American Union and a NAFTA Superhighway, similar resolutions introduced into the state legislatures of 14 states, and California Republican Rep. Duncan Hunter's amendment to prohibit the use of federal funds for Security and Prosperity Partnership working groups, which passed in the House by a vote of 362-63 on July 24.

The Hudson white paper suggests that it might be "necessary" for the Security and Prosperity Partnership to change its name and acronym. It is unlikely that a change of name will silence the American people who are outraged by the Security and Prosperity Partnership's goals and process.

Phyllis Schlafly is a lawyer, conservative political analyst and the author of the newly revised and expanded "Supremacists." She can be contacted by e-mail at phyllis@eagleforum.org.

Â© Copley News Service

Scholars explain president's plan for a North American Union by Phyllis_Schlafly