

reading the Defender, it gave us contact with the outside world.

The Defender has been most fortunate to have outstanding journalists like Lou Palmer, Vernon Jarrett, Faith Christmas, Jennifer Strasburg, and countless others.

So as they celebrate their 95th year anniversary, I simply want to say to the Defender and all of its staff persons, continue the great legacy, continue the great work. They have been an inspiration, and they continue to be a bright star that shines.

CHICAGO DAILY DEFENDER COMMEMORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, this evening I rise to pay special tribute to a publication of historic proportions in the city of Chicago.

Five years into the last century, the Chicago Defender created for itself a permanent place in the history of American journalism by becoming Chicago's most influential African American newspaper. Without fail, since 1905, the Daily Defender has provided news and information regarding African Americans and the Black Diaspora. In doing so, this newspaper fills an important void in Chicago's media because it tells the stories that much too often are not covered by other mainstream publications.

In the Defender's early years, its founder, Robert Sengstacke Abbott, realized several impressive achievements, including orchestrating the "Great Migration" campaign. This campaign brought about the mass exodus of African Americans from the racist South to the "promised land" of the north.

The continued visionary leadership of Mr. Abbott's nephew, Robert Sengstacke, has led to Sengstacke Enterprises which includes, not only the Chicago Defender, but also the Michigan Chronicle in Detroit, the Pittsburgh Courier in Pittsburgh, and the Tri-State Defender in Memphis, Tennessee.

The Defender family has become a responsive and generous corporate citizen over the many years. Their philanthropic arm, the Chicago Daily Defender Charities, has created, developed, and sponsored various community events, including the largest parade in the city of Chicago, the beloved Bud Billiken Parade. Each charitable effort has enriched the lives of our people, our city, and our Nation.

The Defender has provided a medium for several talented award-winning African American journalists, including Dr. Metz T.P. Lochard, W.E. DeBois, Langston Hughes, and Vernon Jarrett. Their outstanding work provided the foundation for the journalistic standard that the newspaper continues to meet today.

So on this day, I rise to congratulate the Chicago Defender on 95 years of consistent, vital, exemplary work. It is my hope and my express desire that the Defender will continue to publish into the next century and beyond.

OCCASION OF THE INTRODUCTION OF THE FARMERS FOR AFRICA ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, in this era of global economies, nations are becoming more interconnected and interdependent on one another. It is critical, therefore, that the economies of the developing nations are not left behind. It is critical that these nations have stable and efficient economies.

It is vitally important, therefore, that we assist in integrating Africa into the global economy. Boosting economic development and self-sufficiency for Africa are keys to achieving this end.

It is for these reasons and others that I was pleased to vote for the African Trade Development Act of 2000.

Generally we only hear about Africa when issues of hunger, welfare, and natural disaster emerge. It is true that hunger estimates in Africa range in upward of 215 million chronically undernourished persons. Yes, we need to be concerned and provide as much assistance as possible. However, there is an old cliché that says, "Give a man a fish, and he will eat for a day. Teach a man to fish, and he will eat forever." At no other time is this cliché more appropriate for African countries.

As a Nation we have the resources, the capacity, and the capability to teach the tools needed to ensure that their economies grow in strength and prosperity. One of the tools we can teach involve agribusiness. Agriculture is a primary sector in the economy for many African nations. It is here that we can provide the tools necessary to technologically upgrade the agriculture methods and processes. The proposed legislation, Farmers for African Act of 2000, provide these tools.

Farmers from the United States can help. Our farmers have the tools and skills to help. They have the ability to train African farmers to use and adopt state-of-the-art farming techniques and agribusiness skills.

In African countries like Mozambique, farmers need our help. Ravaging flood waters have left the lands devastated and thousands homeless and hungry. Their farmers need help. Our farmers can help. We ought to help.

Farmers in Zimbabwe need help. In that country, thousands of persons have received parcels of land to farm but do not have the agriculture skills or training to be successful. These farmers, too, need our help. Our farmers can help. We ought to help.

In Ghana, one of the most stable and productive countries in Africa, farmers

there, too, need our help. American farmers, through their efficiency in using the most modern technologically sound agriculture and agribusiness techniques, can help African farmers.

This will not only help boost African crop yield and efficiency so that these Nations can produce enough goods to feed themselves, but it will also improve the competitiveness of African farmers in the rural market.

In addition, through the establishment of partnerships between Africa and American farmers, we can also create new avenues for delivering goods and services to African countries in need.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting farmers. Join me in supporting farmers in Africa and America. The legislation I and others have introduced today is designed to establish a bilateral exchange program between Africa and America, one that benefits both continents.

Madam Speaker, the legislation is budget neutral. Let me repeat that. The legislation is budget neutral, because it is funded through the existing product purchasing programs.

The nations that will be helped by this program will purchase products from the United States, and part of the revenue from those purchases can be used to fund the activities contemplated by this bill. It will not cost American taxpayers anything.

It will help 45 agriculture and African nations as well as highlight the importance of increasing trade and exchange opportunities with Africa.

This is timely legislation. It is necessary legislation. Please join us in supporting this measure. With this legislation, America will assist in providing the tools that would enable African countries to be competitive in the global economy. The legislation provides the tools in helping African nations eat forever.

THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION, THE END OF GEOGRAPHY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. METCALF. Madam Speaker, during 1969, C.P. Kindleberger wrote that the "nation-state is just about through as an economic unit." He added that the U.S. Congress and right-wing-know-nothings in all countries were unaware of this. He added, "The world is too small. Two-hundred-thousand ton tank and ore carriers and airbuses and the like will not permit sovereign independence of the nation-state in economic affairs."

Before that, Emile Durkheim stated, "The corporations are to become the elementary division of the state, the fundamental political unit. They will efface the distinction between public and private, dissect the democratic

citizenry into discrete functional groupings, which are no longer capable of joint political action."

Durkheim went so far as to proclaim that through corporations' scientific rationality it "will achieve its rightful standing as the creator of collective reality."

There is little question that part of these statements are accurate. America has seen its national sovereignty slowly diffused over a growing number of International Governing Organizations. The WTO, the World Trade Organization, is just the latest in a long line of such developments that began right after World War II. I am old enough to remember that time.

But as the protest in Seattle against the WTO Ministerial Meeting made clear, the democratic citizenry seemed well prepared for joint political action. Though it has been pointed out that many, if not the majority, of protesters did not know what the WTO was and much of the protest itself entirely missed the mark regarding WTO culpability in many areas proclaimed, this remains but a question of education. It is the responsibility of the citizens' representatives to begin that process.

We may not entirely agree with the former head of the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, Thurman Arnold when he stated that the United States had "developed two coordinate governing classes: the one, called 'business', building cities, manufacturing and distributing goods, and holding complete and autocratic power over the livelihood of millions; the other, called 'government', concerned with preaching and exemplification of spiritual ideals, so caught in a mass of theory that when it wished to move in a practical world, it had to do so by means of a sub rosa political machine."

□ 1730

But surely the advocate of corporate governments today, housed quietly in efficiency within the corridors of power at WTO, OECD, IMF and the World Bank, clearly believe.

Corporatism as ideology, and it is an ideology; as John Ralston Saul recently referred to it as a highjacking of first our terms, such as individualism, and then a highjacking of Western civilization, the result being "the portrait of a society addicted to ideologies, a civilization tightly held at this moment in the embrace of a dominant ideology: Corporatism."

As we find our citizenry affected by this ideology and its consequences, consumerism, "the overall effects on the individual are passivity and conformity in those areas that matter, and nonconformity in those which do don't." We do know more than ever before just how we got here. The WTO is the red-haired stepchild of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, which began, in 1948, its quest for a global regime of economic interdependence.

But by 1972, some Members of Congress saw the handwriting on the wall,

and it was a forgery. Senator Long, while chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, made these comments to Dr. Henry Kissinger regarding the completion and prepared signing of the Kennedy round of the GATT accords. Here is what he said: "If we trade away American jobs and farmers' incomes for some vague concept of a new international order, the American people will demand from their elected representatives a new order of their own, which puts their jobs, their security and their incomes above the priorities of those who have dealt them a bad deal."

But we know that few listened, and 20 years later the former chairman of the International Trade Commission argued that it was the Kennedy round that began the slow decline in American's living standards. Citing statistics in his point regarding the loss of manufacturing jobs and the like, he concluded with what must be seen as a warning:

"The Uruguay Round and the promise of the North American Trade Agreement all may mesmerize and motivate Washington policymakers, but in the American heartland those initiatives translate as further efforts to promote international order at the expense of existing American jobs."

We are still not listening. Certainly the ideologists of corporatism cannot hear us. They are, in fact, pressing the same ideological stratagem in the journals that matter, like "Foreign Affairs" and the books coming out of the elite think tanks and nongovernmental organizations. One such author, Anne-Marie Slaughter, proclaimed her rather self-important opinion that State sovereignty was little more than a status symbol and something to be attained now through "transgovernmental" participation. That would presumably be achieved through the WTO for instance?

Stephan Krasner in the volume "International Rules" goes into more detail by explaining global regimes as functional attributes of world order environmental regimes, financial regimes and, of course, trade regimes. I quote: "In a world of sovereign states, the basic function of regimes is to coordinate state behavior to achieve desired outcomes in particular issue areas. If, as many have argued, there is a general movement toward a world of complex interdependence, then the number of areas in which regimes can matter is growing."

But we are not here speaking of changes within an existing regime whereby elected representatives of free people make adjustments to new technologies, new ideas, and further betterment for their people. The first duty of elected representatives is to look out for their constituency. The WTO is not changes within the existing regime, but an entirely new regime. It has assumed an unprecedented degree of American sovereignty over the economic regime of the Nation and the world.

Then who are the sovereigns? Is it the people, the "nation" in nation-state? I do not believe so. I would argue that who governs, rules; and who rules is sovereign. And the people of America and their elected representatives do not rule nor govern at the WTO but corporate diplomats, a word decidedly oxymoronic.

Who are these new sovereigns? Maybe we can get a clearer picture by looking at what the WTO is in place to accomplish. I took interest in an article in "Foreign Affairs," the name of which is "A New Trader Order," volume 72, number 1, by Cowhey and Aronson. Quoting their article: "Foreign investment flows are only about 10 percent the size of the world trade flows each year, but intra-firm trade, for example, sales by Ford Europe to Ford USA, now accounts for up to an astonishing 40 percent of all U.S. trade."

This complex interdependence we hear of every day inside the beltway is nothing short of miraculous according to the policymakers who are mesmerized by all of this. But, clearly, the interdependence is less between the people of the "nation" states than between the "corporations" of the corporate-states.

Richard O'Brien, in his book entitled "Global Financial Integration: The End of Geography," states the case this way: "The firm is far less whetted to the idea of geography. Ownership is more and more international and global, divorced from national definitions. If one marketplace can no longer provide a service or an attractive location to carry out transactions, then the firm will actively seek another home. At the level of the firm, therefore, there are plenty of choices of geography."

O'Brien seems unduly excited when he adds, "The glorious end of geography prospect for the close of this century is the emergence of a seamless global financial market. Barriers will be gone, service will be global, the world economy will benefit and so too, presumably, the consumer." Presumably?

Counter to this ideological slant, and it is ideological, O'Brien notes the "fact that governments are the very embodiment of geography, representing the nation-state. The end of geography is, in many respects, about the end or diminution of sovereignty."

In a rare find, a French author published a book titled "The End of Democracy." John-Marie Guehenno has served in a number of posts for the French government, including their ambassador to the European Union. He suggests this period we live in is an imperial age. Let me quote him: "The imperial age is an age of diffuse and continuous violence. There will no longer be any territory to defend, but only order, operating methods, to protect. And this abstract security is infinitely more difficult to ensure than that of a world in which geography commanded history. Neither rivers nor oceans protect the delicate mechanisms of the

imperial age from a menace as multi-form as the empire itself."

The empire itself? Whose empire? In whose interests? Political analyst Craig B. Hulet, in his book titled "Global Triage: Imperium in Imperio" refers to this new global regime as Imperium in Imperio, or power within a power: a state within a state. His theory proposes that these new sovereigns are nothing short of this, and I quote him: "They represent the power not of the natural persons which make up the nations' peoples, nor of their elected representatives, but the power of the legal paper-person recognized in law. The corporations themselves are, then, the new sovereigns."

And in their efforts to be treated in law as equals to the citizens of each separate state, they call this "National Treatment," they would travel the sea; and wherever they land ashore, they would be citizens here and there. Not even the privateers of old would have dared to impose this will upon nation-states.

Can we claim to know today what this rapid progress of global transformation will portend for democracy here at home? We understand the great benefits of past progress. We are not Luddites here. We know what refrigeration can do for a child in a poor country; what clean water means to everyone everywhere; what free communications has already achieved. But are we going to unwittingly sacrifice our sovereignty on the altar of this new god, "Progress"? Is it progress if a cannibal uses a knife and fork?

Can we claim to know today what this rapid progress of global transformation will portend for national sovereignty here at home? We protect our way of life, our children's future, our workers' jobs, our security at home by measures often not unlike our airports are protected from pistols on planes. But self-interested ideologies, private greed, and private powers' bad ideas escape our mental detectors.

We seem to be radically short of leadership where this active participation in the process of diffusing America's power over to and into the private global monopoly capitalist regime is today pursued without questioning its basis at all. An empire represented by not just the WTO, but clearly this new regime is the core ideological success for corporatism.

□ 1745

The only remaining step, according to Harvard Professor Paul Krugman, is the finalization of a completed Multilateral Agreement on Investments, which failed at OECD.

According to OECD, the agreement's actual success may come through, not a treaty this time, but arrangements within corporate governance itself, quietly being hashed out at the IMF and World Bank as well as OECD. We are not yet the United Corporations of America. Or are we?

The WTO needs to be scrutinized carefully, debated, hearings, and public

participation where possible. I would say absolutely indispensable, full hearings.

We can, of course, as author Christopher Lasch notes, peer inward at ourselves as well when he argued, "The history of the twentieth century suggests that totalitarian regimes are highly unstable, evolving toward some type of bureaucracy that fits near the classic fascist nor the socialist model."

None of this means that the future will be safe for democracy, only that the threat to democracy comes less from totalitarian or collective movements abroad than from the erosion of psychological, cultural, and spiritual foundations from within."

Are we not witness to, though, the growth of a global bureaucracy being created not out of totalitarian or collectivist movements, but from the autocratic corporations which hold so many lives in their balance? And where shall we redress our grievances when the regime completes its global transformation? When the people of each Nation and their State find they can no longer identify their rulers, their true rulers? When it is no longer their State which rules?

The most recent U.N. Development Report documents how globalization has increased inequality between and within nations while bringing them together as never before.

Some are referring to this, Globalization's Dark Side, like Jay Mazur recently in Foreign Affairs. He said, "A world in which the assets of the 200 richest people are greater than the combined income of the more than 2 billion people at the other end of the economic ladder should give everyone pause. Such islands of concentrated wealth in the sea of misery have historically been a prelude to upheaval. The vast majority of trade and investment takes place between industrial nations, dominated by global corporations that control a third of the world exports. Of the 100 largest economies of the world, 51 are corporations," just over half.

With further mergers and acquisitions in the future, with no end in sight, those of us that are awake must speak up now.

Or is it that we just cannot see at all, believing in our current speculative bubble, which nobody credible believes can be sustained for much longer, we missed the growing anger, fear and frustration of our people; believing in the myths our policy priests pass on, we missed the dissatisfaction of our workers; believing in the god "progress," we have lost our vision.

Another warning, this time from Ethan Kapstein in his article "Workers and the World Economy" in Foreign Affairs, Vol. 75, No. 3:

"While the world stands at a critical time in post war history, it has a group of leaders who appear unwilling, like their predecessors in the 1930's, to provide the international leadership to meet economic dislocations. Worse,

many of them and their economic advisors do not seem to recognize the profound troubles affecting their societies."

"Like the German elite in Weimar, they dismiss mounting worker dissatisfaction, fringe political movements, and the plight of the unemployed and working poor as marginal concerns compared with the unquestioned importance of a sound currency and a balanced budget. Leaders need to recognize their policy failures of the last 20 years and respond accordingly. If they do not, there are others waiting in the wings who will, perhaps on less pleasant terms."

We ought to be looking very closely at where the new sovereigns intend to take us. We need to discuss the end they have in sight. It is our responsibility and our duty.

Most everyone today agrees that socialism is not a threat. Many feel communism, even in China, is not a threat, indeed, that there are few real security threats to America that could compare to even our recent past.

Be that as it may, when we speak of the global market economy, free enterprise, massage the terms to merge with managed competition and planning authorities, all the while suggesting that we have met the hidden hand and it is good, we need to also recall what Adam Smith said but is rarely quoted upon.

He said, "Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform, combination, not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate. To violate this combination is everywhere a most unpopular action, and a sort of reproach to a master among his neighbors and equals. We seldom, indeed, hear of this combination, because it is usual, and, one may say, the natural state of affairs. Masters too sometimes enter into particular combinations to sink wages of labor even below this rate. These are always conducted with the utmost silence and secrecy, till the moment of execution."

And now precisely, whose responsibility is it to keep an eye on the masters?

I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, left and right on the political spectrum, to boldly restore the oversight role of the Congress with one stroke and join my colleagues in supporting H.J. Res. 90 in restoring the constitutional sovereignty of these United States.

STATE DEPARTMENT CITES PAKISTANI LINK TO TERRORIST GROUPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, yesterday the U.S. State Department released its annual report on terrorism worldwide called "Patterns of Global Terrorism, 1999 Report."