



Written by [Christian Gomez](#) on February 17, 2020

Published in the February 17, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 04

When a Political Win Is a Loss

On January 29, 2020, two weeks after the U.S. Senate overwhelmingly passed the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act (H.R. 5430) — a 239-page bill that both approves and implements the separate 2,410-page trade USMCA scheme — President Trump signed the legislation into law. A week earlier, in his remarks delivered at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, Trump praised the new agreement, contrasting it with NAFTA. “As I mentioned earlier, we ended the NAFTA disaster — one of the worst trade deals ever made, not even close — and replaced it with the incredible new trade deal, the USMCA — that’s Mexico and Canada,” Trump boasted.



The new USMCA will take effect once all three nations ratify the agreement — with only Canada remaining to complete the process. Despite President Trump’s strong aversion for the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement, his assertion that NAFTA is no more is not entirely accurate, at least according to those closest to the negotiation of the new agreement.

At the signing ceremony held in Mexico City, for the “Protocol of Amendment to the Agreement Between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada” — a 27-page document of changes made to the USMCA agreed to by House Democrats — Canadian Deputy Prime Minister Chrystia Freeland, who also served as Canada’s top negotiator on the USMCA, praised the progressive nature of the agreement and also touted how it “preserves NAFTA.” “When this agreement is enacted, NAFTA will not only be preserved; it will be updated, improved, and modernized,” Freeland said.

Among the changes negotiated by House Democrats that were agreed to by the Trump administration, and the governments of Canada and Mexico, were language for stronger enforcement provisions to Mexico’s recently passed national collective bargaining legislation, removing the previous language that Democrats feared would have resulted in higher costs for pharmaceuticals, and the addition of seven multilateral environmental agreements to the USMCA’s environmental chapter, along with a clause for the addition of future agreements. These additions were made to what Freeland had previously described as being a “very progressive agreement.”

Despite Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s repeated insistence that the changes made by members of her party resulted in an immeasurably better agreement than what the Trump administration had first given to Congress in late 2018, the reality is that the USMCA was already more progressive than the original NAFTA. Unlike NAFTA, the USMCA included new chapters on the environment and labor.

Even before House Democrats tampered with the language of the agreement, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer, Canada’s Liberal Party government, and the socialist government of former Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto had already hashed out a deeply globalist trade scheme that included the promotion of collective bargaining laws; mandated protections for “gender-identity” and other “gender-related issues” in the workplace and additional protections for “migrant workers”; promoted the UN Agenda 21/Agenda 2030 concept of “sustainable development”; and subordinated the



Written by [Christian Gomez](#) on February 17, 2020

Published in the February 17, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 04

United States to international global governance organizations and conventions, such as the World Trade Organization, International Labour Organization, and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), otherwise known as the Law of the Sea Treaty (LOST). All of this was already contained in the original USMCA proposal that Trump gave his seal of approval to when he signed the agreement in Buenos Aires, Argentina, on November 30, 2018.

Many of these same globalist entrapments were also contained in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which President Trump has fervently repudiated as the “worst trade deal ever negotiated.” Ironically, as several former Obama trade officials have noted, many of the same trade negotiators who worked on the TPP also worked on Trump’s USMCA and were present at Trump’s original Rose Garden press conference when he announced the completion of the agreement on October 1, 2018. “Ironically, he called them horrible negotiators when running for office,” Trevor Kincaid, the former deputy assistant U.S. trade representative for public and media affairs under the Obama administration, told the Huffington Post.

Although Lighthizer did not serve in the Obama administration or work on the TPP, he did have frequent conversations with his predecessor, Michael Froman, Obama’s U.S. trade representative, throughout the course of the USMCA negotiations. At a “markup session” for the implementing bill, H.R. 5430, in the Senate Finance Committee, minority member Senator Tom Carper (D-Del.) took credit for putting Lighthizer in touch with Froman. “When our friend Robert Lighthizer was nominated to be trade rep, he came to see all of us. And I suggested to him that he reach out to Michael Froman, trade rep during the [Obama] administration,” Carper revealed. “I said Michael had been involved in negotiating something called Trans-Pacific Partnership. They had already negotiated pieces of that trade agreement with Canada and Mexico, 12 nations in all, 40-percent of the world’s trade. And I said to Mr. Lighthizer, I said before you go reinventing the wheel; find out what was negotiated in the last administration.”

“I urged him to put Michael on his speed dial as he went forward. To his credit, they have communicated a lot in the last couple of years. I think it’s been good for those negotiations,” Carper touted.

The biggest similarity to the TPP, and the most destructive to U.S. sovereignty, is the USMCA’s chapter on “Administrative and Institutional Provisions” (Chapter 30), which establishes the creation of a “Free Trade Commission.” The original 1994 NAFTA also established a “Free Trade Commission”; however, the powers and functions outlined in Chapter 30 more closely resemble (virtually word-for-word) those of the TPP’s “TPP Commission.” Then-U.S. Senator Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) warned about the sovereignty-destroying nature of the TPP Commission, calling it a “nascent European Union” that was seeking to develop the TPP into an EU-style Pacific Union or Pacific-Rim Union. The USMCA’s Free Trade Commission, just like the TPP Commission, would oversee a vast bureaucracy of supranational committees and bi-national panels; could propose changes to the agreement, virtually transforming it into a “living agreement”; and would largely influence the movement of labor or people (i.e., migrants) across borders.

The Free Trade Commission’s duties read very much like an EU-lite, serving as yet another building block in the globalist quest to create a “competitive” North American Union, which in itself would be a steppingstone for even larger economic integration into a global economic union or one-world government.



Written by [Christian Gomez](#) on February 17, 2020

Published in the February 17, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 04

Trump's USMCA is anything but a "better deal" for American national sovereignty and independence. Its various glob-alist entrapments are a further advance in the pincer strategy for global integration and world government. However, all hope is not lost. Article 34.6 in Chapter 34 of the agreement reads: "A Party may withdraw from this Agreement by providing written notice of withdrawal to the other Parties." It further elaborates: "A withdrawal shall take effect six months after a Party provides written notice to the other Parties. If a Party withdraws, this Agreement shall remain in force for the remaining Parties."

As globalists become distracted with promoting other sovereignty-destroying trade schemes such as a Trans-Atlantic Union, it is imperative to continue educating both the electorate and Congress about the dangers of the USMCA, in addition to new trade schemes promoted by the current and future administrations. For the sake of preserving our Republic's freedoms and the right to self-governance under the Constitution, Congress must withdraw from the USMCA and stop the globalists' trade agenda for world government.

Photo credit: AP Images



Written by [Christian Gomez](#) on February 17, 2020

Published in the February 17, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 04

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.