Turning U.S. Troops Over to UN Command

June 2, 1994 *by Phyllis Schlafly*

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.

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).

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 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 POD 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 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 reassunng.

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?